

THE INDIAN
ANNUAL REGISTER

July—December 1944

VOL. II

19909

V2: 1n3N

H4-2

V.2

Printed by D. N. Singha at the
Singha Printing Works
30, Badur Bagan Street
and
published by N. N. Mitra,
16/i, Komedaan Bagan Lane, Calcutta.

Issued
from 1919]

THE INDIAN

[27th. Year
of Issue

ANNUAL REGISTER

An Annual Digest of Public Affairs of India

Recording the Nation's Activities each year in matters Political,

Economic, Industrial, Educational, Social Etc.

BEING ISSUED IN 2 SIX-MONTHLY VOLUMES



Volume II] July-Dec. 1944 [Volume II

Editor :—Nripendra Nath Mitra

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION PAYABLE IN ADVANCE Rs. 15 ONLY
VOLUMES: CLOTH BOUND Rs. 8 EACH POSTAGE EXTRA
FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTION PAYABLE IN ADVANCE Rs. 16 ONLY.

PUBLISHED BY

THE ANNUAL REGISTER OFFICE

16-1, KOMEDAN BAGAN LANE. P. O. PARK STREET. CALCUTTA.

CALENDAR FOR 1944

JANUARY	MAY	SEPTEMBER
S. ... 2 9 16 23 30 M. ... 3 10 17 24 31 T. ... 4 11 18 25 ... W. ... 5 12 19 26 ... Th. ... 6 13 20 27 ... F. ... 7 14 21 28 ... S. 1 8 15 22 29 ...	S. ... 7 14 21 28 ... M. 1 8 15 22 29 ... T. 2 9 16 23 30 ... W. 3 10 17 24 31 ... Th. 4 11 18 25 ... F. 5 12 19 26 ... S. 6 13 20 27 ...	S. ... 3 10 17 24 ... M. ... 4 11 18 25 ... T. ... 5 12 19 26 ... W. ... 6 13 20 27 ... Th. ... 7 14 21 28 ... F. 1 8 15 22 29 ... S. 2 9 16 23 30 ...
FEBRUARY	JUNE	OCTOBER
S. ... 6 13 20 27 ... M. ... 7 14 21 28 ... T. 1 8 15 22 29 ... W. 2 9 16 23 ... Th 3 10 17 24 ... F. 4 11 18 25 ... S. 5 12 19 26 ...	S. ... 4 11 18 25 ... M. ... 5 12 19 26 ... T. ... 6 13 20 27 ... W. ... 7 14 21 28 ... Th 1 8 15 22 29 ... F. 2 9 16 23 30 ... S. 3 10 17 24 ...	S. 1 8 15 22 29 ... M. 2 9 16 23 30 ... T. 3 10 17 24 31 ... W. 4 11 18 25 ... Th 5 12 19 26 ... F. 6 13 20 27 ... S. 7 14 21 28 ...
MARCH	JULY	NOVEMBER
S. ... 5 12 19 26 ... M. ... 6 13 20 27 ... T. ... 7 14 21 28 ... W. 1 8 15 22 29 ... Th 2 9 16 23 30 ... F. 3 10 17 24 31 ... S. 4 11 18 25 ...	S. ... 2 9 16 23 30 M. ... 3 10 17 24 31 T. ... 4 11 18 25 ... W. ... 5 12 19 26 ... Th. ... 6 13 20 27 ... F. ... 7 14 21 28 ... S. 1 8 15 22 29 ...	S. ... 5 12 19 26 ... M. ... 6 13 20 27 ... T. ... 7 14 21 28 ... W. 1 8 15 22 29 ... Th. 2 9 16 23 30 ... F. 3 10 17 24 ... S. 4 11 18 25 ...
APRIL	AUGUST	DECEMBER
S. ... 2 9 16 23 30 M. ... 3 10 17 24 ... T. ... 4 11 18 25 ... W. ... 5 12 19 26 ... Th. ... 6 13 20 27 ... F. ... 7 14 21 28 ... S. 1 8 15 22 29 ...	S. ... 6 13 20 27 ... M. ... 7 14 21 28 ... T. 1 8 15 22 29 ... W. 2 9 16 23 30 ... Th 3 10 17 24 31 ... F. 4 11 18 25 ... S. 5 12 19 26 ...	S. ... 3 10 17 24 31 M. ... 4 11 18 25 ... T. ... 5 12 19 26 ... W. ... 6 13 20 27 ... Th. ... 7 14 21 28 ... F. 1 8 15 22 29 ... S. 2 9 16 23 30 ...

THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER JULY—DECEMBER 1944

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHRONICLE OF EVENTS	1
JULY 1944	1
AUGUST 1944	4
SEPTEMBER 1944	14
OCTOBER 1944	20
NOVEMBER 1944	26
DECEMBER 1944	32
INDIA IN HOME POLITY	37
Food Scarcity in Bengal & Kerala	37
The Modern State & the People	38
Regimentation of Body & Mind	38
Position of India in the British State	39
Bengal comes within War Strategy	40
"Denial Policy" was the result	41
Nazimuddin Ministry & the Famine	42
It was a creature of British Policy	42
Mr. Casey brought no change	43
Gandhiji tries to meet Lord Wavell	44
British Distrust and Fear	45
Gandhiji's Retreat from 1942 position	45
Mr. Gelder's purpose in seeking the interview	46
British Rulers reject it	47
Mr. Churchill's "Tory Democracy"	48
The unalterable Tory Policy	48
Of setting Community against Community	48
Since the Birth of Christ	49
Sir Syed Ahmed's response to the Dufferin Appeal	50
Evolution of the Separatist Idea	51
Mr. Rajagopalachari persuades Gandhiji to accept it	51
Rajaji-Jinnah irresponsibility	53
Gandhiji challenges the "Two Nations" Theory	53
Gandhiji's Questions & Mr. Jinnah's replies	54
Lahore Resolution creates more complications	54
Rajagopalachari formula	55
Mr. Jinnah could not personally endorse it	55
Gandhiji writes to Jinnah	56
Mr. Jinnah's reply	56
An old episode recalled	56
Spirit and technique of Jinnah politics	57
Poisoning human relations in India	58
Oath against oath	59
Raja Maheswar Dayal Seth's statement	60
Gandhiji cannot ably negotiate on equal terms	61
The minorities in India	62
The position in the Punjab	63
The Sikh revolt	63
Their scheme of division in the Punjab	64
Muslim League caught in its own logic	65
Communist Solution	65

Soviet Union and its Experience	...	66
Material ties binding Soviet Union	...	66
Cultural Autonomy of Communities	...	67
Illustrating this Autonomy for the solution of India's Problem	...	67
British Administrators disavow responsibility	...	68
Contribution of other parties to the solution	...	68
Non-Party Leaders' Conference	...	70
Their Criticism of Suggestion to Government	...	71
British Excuse and the American Public	...	71
The Johnson Episode of 1942	...	72
Mr. William Philips—President Roosevelt's second Personal Representative	...	73
Persona non grata—person not in good graces	...	74
Sir Olaf Caroe's cable to India office	...	74
Colour prejudice in U. S. A. & British Empire	...	75
Failures of our past	...	77
Genesis of "Pakistan" idea	...	78
THE COUNCIL OF STATE	...	81
AUTUMN SESSION—NEW DELHI—8TH. TO 21ST. NOVEMBER 1944	...	81
Adjournment motions disallowed	...	81
Payment after demobilisation	...	81
Coal Shortage	...	81
Special Tribunals	...	83
Rights of Indian's Overseas	...	83
Industrialisation of India	...	83
Debate on Food Position	...	85
Rights of Indians Overseas	...	82
Army Officers for Civil Posts	...	83
Relief of distress in North Behar	...	83
Position of Indians in S. & E. Africa	...	84
THE CENTRAL LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY	...	87
AUTUMN SESSION—NEW DELHI—1ST. TO 21ST. NOVEMBER 1944	...	87
Misuse of National War Front Funds	...	97
Debates on Food Position	...	98
Three Amendments Moved	...	99
The Bakhtiarpur Ry. Station Accident	...	100
Discussion of Bombay 15 Years' Plan	...	100
Protection of New Delhi Mosques	...	101
Economic Sanctions against S. Africa	...	101
Government Ban on "Satyarth Prakash"	...	106
Factories Act Amendment Bill	...	108
Cultivation of Rice	...	108
Debate on the Food Situation	...	108
Amendments to Food Debate	...	109
Swagotra Marriages Among Hindus	...	111
Official Bills Passed	...	112
Public Debt Bill	...	112
Nationalisation of Insurance	...	113
Cultivation of Rice	...	113
Public Debt Bill	...	114
Rice Fund Bill	...	115
Official Bills Passed	...	115
Post-War Economic Development	...	115
Law related to Banking Companies	...	116
Food and Agricultural Organisation	...	117
LAWS PASSED IN 1944	...	119
Government of Bengal	...	119
Government of the Punjab	...	119
Government of Orissa	...	120
Government of Assam	...	121
Government of Sind	...	121
Government of Bombay	...	122

Government of Madras	123
Government of the United Provinces	126
Government of Central Provinces & Berar	127
Government of Bihar	127
Government of N. W. F. Province	128
THE RAJAGOPALACHARIAR FORMULA	129
JINNAH—RAJAGOPALACHARIAR CORRESPONDENCE	129
Letter from "C. R." dated New Delhi, April 8, 1944	129
Basis for settlement	129
Letter from "C. R." dated New Delhi, April 17, 1944	130
Telegram from Jinnah to "C. R." dated July 2, 1944	130
Telegram from "C. R." dated Panchgani, July 4, 1944	130
Jinnah's Telegraphic Reply dated July, 5, 1944	130
"C. R.'s" telegram, Panchgani dated July, 8, 1944	130
RAJAGOPALACHARI'S REPLY TO CRITICS	130
OPPOSITION TO RAJAGOPALACHARI FORMULA	132
MR. SASTRI CONDEMNNS THE FORMULA	133
THE GANDHI JINNAH CORRESPONDENCE	135
Letter from Gandhi, Panchgani July, 17	135
Letter from Jinnah, Srinagar, July, 24	135
Letter from Jinnah, dated September, 10	135
Letter from Gandhi, dated September, 11	136
Letter from Jinnah dated September, 11	137
Letter from Jinnah dated September, 13	138
Letter from Gandhi dated September 14	138
Letter from Jinnah dated September, 14	139
Letter from Gandhi dated September, 15	140
Letter from Gandhi dated September, 15	141
Letter from Jinnah dated September, 17	141
Letter from Gandhi dated September 19	143
Letter from Jinnah dated September 21	143
Letter from Gandhi dated September 22	145
Letter from Jinnah dated September 23	145
Letter from Gandhi dated September 23	146
Letter from Jinnah dated September 23	146
Letter from Gandhi dated September 24	147
Letter from Jinnah dated September 25	147
Letter from Gandhi dated September 25	149
Letter from Jinnah dated September 26	150
Letter from Gandhi dated September 26	150
Letter from Jinnah dated September 26	151
MAHATMA ADDRESSES PRAYER MEETING	151
THE LAHORE RESOLUTION OF THE LEAGUE	152
BREAKDOWN OF UNITY TALKS	152
Regret in Britain & America	152
Leaders' views on Breakdown	154
Indian Press Comments on Breakdown	159
MAHATMA GANDHI'S LETTER TO VICEROY	161
Lord Wavell Refuses to entertain Mahatma's request	161
Viceroy's reply—New Delhi—22 June 1944	161

NATIONAL GOVERNMENT DURING WAR	...	161
Gandhiji Explains Demand	...	161
Interview to British Paper	...	161
His First Statement on the Interview	...	163
His Second Statement on the Interview	...	164
Gandhiji Explains to Pressmen	...	166
Gandhiji Explains Gelder Interview	...	167
Britain Using Jinnah as a Cloak	...	169
Amery refrains from comment	...	170
Eden Announces debate in Commons	...	170
Mahatma Gandhi replies to critics	...	170
General Approval in America	...	171
Anxiety to end deadlock	...	171
Gandhiji's Call to Allied Nations	...	173
British Journal Answered by Mr. Gelder	...	173
British Rejection of Offer	...	175
Gandhiji Pained and Amazed	...	175
Gandhiji replies to critics	...	176
Gandhiji to perform 'Symbolic Act' on Aug., 9	...	178
Gandhiji's advice to Sikhs	...	179
Gandhiji's reply to Bengal Deputation	...	180
Mr. K. S. Roy on Talks with Gandhiji	...	181
VICEROY REJECTS GANDHIJI'S OFFER	...	181
No National Government During War	...	181
British Government not to part with Power	...	183
THE ALL INDIA SPINNERS' ASSOCIATION	...	184
Mahatma Gandhi's Appeal	...	184
THE ALL INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE	...	187
WORKING COMMITTEE—LAHORE—29TH. JULY 1944	...	187
Proceedings and Resolutions	...	187
COUNCIL MEETING—LAHORE—30TH JULY 1944	...	188
Mr. Jinnah's Criticism of the Formula	...	188
Form of the Formula	...	189
Merits of the Proposal	...	190
Plebiscite Proposal	...	190
Muslims and August Resolution	...	191
Gandhi's Letter to Mr. Jinnah	...	191
Resolution on
Demand for recalling Punjab Governor	...	193
Expulsion of Punjab Premier	...	193
THE SIND PROVINCIAL MUSLIM LEAGUE	...	194
WORKING COMMITTEE—KARACHI—7TH. JULY 1944	...	194
Ministers Asked to Resign	...	194
THE ALL INDIA HINDU MAHASABHA	...	195
WORKING COMMITTEE—NEW DELHI—9TH. JULY 1944	...	195
Text of Resolutions	...	195
WORKING COMMITTEE—NEW DELHI—6TH. OCTOBER 1944...	...	196
Text of Resolutions	...	196
THE OPEN SESSION OF THE MAHASABHA	...	197
26TH. SESSION—BILASPUR—24TH. TO 26TH DECEMBER 1944	...	197
Presidential Address	...	198
Draft Constitution for India	...	202
RESOLUTION—2ND DAY—BILASPUR—25TH. DECEMBER 1944	...	202
Amending of Cripps Plan	...	203
RESOLUTIONS—3RD. DAY—BILASPUR—26TH. DECEMBER 1944	...	203
Principles for Future constitution	...	203
Settlement of Muslims in Assam	...	204
Ban of "Satyarth Prakash"	...	205

Missionary Activity in Mandla District	...	205
Opposition to Draft Hindu Code	...	205
Retrocession of Berar Opposed	...	205
Economic Plan for India	...	206
President's closing remarks	...	206
Mr. Savarkar's Attack on Gandhiji	...	206
THE ALL PARTIES HINDU CONFERENCE	...	207
Lahore—13th August 1944	...	207
Proceedings and Resolutions	...	207
Opposition to Rajagopalachari Formula	...	207
Vivisection of India condemned	...	209
THE ALL PARTIES SIKH CONFERENCE	...	210
WORKING COMMITTEE—AMRITSAR—1ST. AUGUST 1944	...	210
Formula detrimental to Sikhs	...	210
THE ALL PARTIES SIKH CONFERENCE	...	211
AMRITSAR—20TH AUGUST 1944	...	211
Sikh Demand for Independent State	...	211
Central Akali Dal's Statement	...	215
THE SIKH COMMUNISTS' CONFERENCE	...	215
Amritsar—11th September, 1944	...	215
Faith in Gandhiji's Leadership	...	215
THE ALL INDIA AKALI CONFERENCE	...	218
5th. Session—Lahore—14th. October, 1944	...	218
Presidential Address	...	218
Resolutions—2nd Day—Lahore—15th. October, 1944	...	219
Demand for Independent Sikh State	...	219
Gandhiji's Assurance to the Sikhs	...	221
THE AKALI JUBILER CONFERENCE	...	222
The Akali Jubilee Conference	...	222
1st. Session—Jandiala—25th. November 1944	...	222
Presidential Address	...	222
THE PUNJAB HINDU MAHASABHA CONFERENCE	...	223
Ludhiana—10th. November 1944	...	223
Presidential Address	...	223
Ludhiana—2nd. day—11th. November 1944	...	225
Resolution on	...	225
Communal Raj in Punjab	...	225
Gandhiji should lead Mahasabha	...	225
Ludhiana—3rd. day—12th. November 1944	...	226
Disintegration of Punjab Hindus	...	226
Presidential Procession	...	226
Satyarth Prakash Conference	...	226
A. I AKHAND HINDUSTHAN CONFERENCE	...	227
Third Session—Gujranwala—18th. November 1944	...	227
Presidential Address	...	227
Resolutions	...	228
THE AKHAND HINDUSTHAN CONFERENCE	...	228
New Delhi—7th. October 1944	...	228
Presidential Address	...	228
2nd. day—New Delhi—8th. October 1944	...	229
Resolutions	...	229
THE A. I. SHIA POLITICAL CONFERENCE	...	230
Working Comm.—Lucknow—22nd. October 1944	...	230
TEXT OF CORRESPONDENCE WITH JINNAH	...	230
Syed Ali Zabeer's Letter	...	230
Mr. Jinnah's Reply	...	231

Shia Committee's Resolution	232
Mr. Jinnah's Reply unsatisfactory	232
THE A. I. SCHEDULED CASTES FEDERATION	232
Working Committee—Madras—23rd. September 1944	232
Plea for Separate Treatment	232
Communal Unity Issues	233
SCHEDULED CASTES' FUTURE	233
Dr. Ambedkar's Advice	233
Allegations against Gandhiji	234
Talks with Mr. Jinnah	234
Advice to Justice Party	234
CONGRESS WORKERS' INFORMAL CONFERENCE	236
Bombay—28th. and 29th. October 1944	236
Resolution on	
Fifteen Year Plan Condemned	236
Food Policy	236
Communist Propaganda Criticised	237
Constructive Programme	237
Campaign against Corruption	237
Programme for Congressmen	237
Mahatma Gandhi's Suggestions	237
Training in Constructive Effort	238
Service to the Kisans	238
Work among Labourers	238
Duty to Students	239
THE NON-PARTY LEADERS' CONFERENCE	239
Standing Committee—New Delhi—19th. November, 1944	239
Committee to solve communal problems	239
Standing Committee—Allahabad 3rd. December, 1944	241
Statement on Political Situation	241
Appeal to Provincial Legislators	241
Release of Congress Leaders	242
PUNJAB ARYAN PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE...	242
Welcome Address—Lahore—26th. November, 1944	242
Lala Khushal Chand's Address	243
Presidential Address	243
Save India from religious persecution	243
Pakistan—Child of Provincial Autonomy	244
Ban Condemned	245
Withdraw unjust order	245
A Political stunt	245
Rajput's Resolve	246
Harijan's support	246
THE PUNJAB STUDENTS' CONFERENCE	247
Open Session—Ludhiana—11th. November, 1944	247
The Welcome Address	247
Presidential Address	247
Muslim Ministers' misdeeds	248
Gandhiji and "C. R." Formula	248
THE ALL INDIA STUDENTS' FEDERATION	249
8th. Session—Calcutta—28th. December, 1944	249
Mrs. Naidu's Call to Students	249
Quarrel over words	249
How to forge unity	250
Dr. B. C. Roy's Address	250
President's Address	251
Resolutions—2nd day—Calcutta—29th. December, 1944	251
Failure on Unity talks	251

THE ASSOCIATED CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE	...	252
Annual Session—Calcutta—14th. December, 1944	...	252
Presidential Address	...	252
India—A Major World factory	...	252
Liquidation of Sterling Balances	...	253
H. E. Viceroy's Address	...	254
Tribute to British forces	...	254
Indian troops praised	...	254
Victory over Japs on India's Eastern Frontier	...	255
Lord Munster's visit	...	255
War-time Economic measures	...	255
Fight against Inflation	...	256
Commodity Control	...	256
Food Problem	...	257
"Rice shortage our main trouble"	...	257
The Transportation system	...	257
Coal Position	...	258
"India has gained during War years rather than lost"	...	258
Post-War Planning	...	259
Dangers of Too Rapid Industrialisation	...	259
Financing of Planning	...	259
Training of Technicians	...	260
Post-War Taxation	...	260
Sterling Balances	...	260
India must present a united front	...	261
"Quit India" and Satyagraha criticised	...	261
Executive Council—A "National Government"	...	261
Proceedings & Resolutions	...	262
Income-Tax Tribunal	...	262
War risks Insurance	...	263
Compensation for damage by Military vehicles	...	263
Post-War Trade Policy	...	263
THE CHAMBER OF PRINCES	...	264
NEW DELHI—4th. DECEMBER, 1944	...	264
Resignation of Standing Committee	...	264
Difference with Political Dept.	...	264
Joint Services	...	265
Minimum Standards of Administration	...	265
Attachment of smaller States	...	265
Post-War planning in States	...	266
Treaty Rights	...	266
Princes set up Council of Action	...	267
No Resolution of Crisis	...	267
Crisis in 1936 recalled	...	268
Princes' Draft Resolution	...	268
Chancellor on Amery's Reference	...	268
THE ALL INDIA STATES CONFERENCE	...	260
NEW DELHI—7th. DECEMBER, 1944	...	269
Chancellor's Address	...	269
Post-War Development	...	270
Princes' Declaration on Internal Reforms	...	270
MR. PHILLIPS' MISSION IN INDIA	...	271
American Communist's Allegations	...	270
Colonel Johnson—the first occupant	...	272
Advent of Mr. Phillips in New Delhi	...	272
Meeting with Mr. Churchill	...	272
Mr. Eden's Reported cable to Washington	...	273
Johnson's resolution in House of Representatives	...	273
Senator Chandler's Demand	...	274
British Spokesmen's Denial	...	274
Lord Halifax's denial	...	274
Mr. Sol Bloom on Mr. Phillips' resignation	...	274
Mr. Phillips declines to comment	...	275
Mr. Krishna Menon meets Mr. Phillips	...	275

British Commentator's report	...	275
Senator Chandler offers proof	...	275
British Embassy's worry	...	276
Mr. Phillips' report to President Roosevelt	...	276
Date for Independence must be fixed	...	277
American rights to intervene	...	277
Text of Phillips' Letters to Roosevelt	...	277
Deadlock must be broken;	...	278
Indians' lack of confidence in British Promises	...	278
Reactions in Delhi	...	279
J. J. Singh's Revelations	...	279
Seal Supports Johnson's move	...	280
London Journal attacks Senator Chandler	...	280
New York Journal's Comments	...	281
Debate continues unabated	...	281
BOMBY DOCKS EXPLOSION REPORT	...	282
Inquiry Commission's findings	...	282
Causes of the disaster	...	282
Government accept findings	...	282
Commission's report	...	283
Events leading to the tragedy	...	283
Time of outbreak of fire	...	284
Fire not considered serious at first	...	284
Failure to get at heart of fire	...	285
No effective warning of fire given	...	285
Primary cause of the disaster : The war factor	...	286
Improper Stowage	...	286
Sabotage of accidental ignition	...	286
Failure to appreciate gravity of situation	...	286
Inadequacies in action	...	287
Government Resolution	...	287
Orders passed to coordinate action	...	288
Omission to give warning to other ships	...	288
Regulation for handling of dangerous cargo	...	288
INDIA IN PARLIAMENT & ABROAD	...	291
House of Bords—London—25th. July, 1944	...	291
House of Commons—London—28th. July, 1944	...	297
THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY CONFERENCE	...	312
India's Proposals rejected	...	312
THE BRITISH LABOUR PARTY CONFERENCE	...	312
Demand for release of Indian Leaders	...	312
THE MYSORE UNIVERSITY CONVOCATION	...	314
Dewan Bahadur K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar's speech	...	314
THE TRAVANCORE UNIVERSITY CONVOCATION	...	318
Sir V. T. Krishnamachari's Address	...	318
THE AGRA UNIVERSITY CONVOCATION	...	322
Sir Mirza M. Ismail's Address	...	322
THE NAGPUR UNIVERSITY CONVOCATION	...	325
Sj. C. Rajagopalachari's Address	...	325
THE PATNA UNIVERSITY CONVOCATION	...	331
Sir Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan's Address	...	331
THE UTKAL UNIVERSITY CONVOCATION	...	340
Dr. Sachchidananda Sinha's Address	...	340
THE ALLAHABAD UNIVERSITY CONVOCATION	...	343
Sir Kailash Haskar's Address	...	343
THE DELHI UNIVERSITY CONVOCATION	...	353
Sir Maurice Gywer's Address	...	353
THE PUNJAB UNIVERSITY CONVOCATION	...	355
Sir Manohar Lal's Address	...	355
THE BOMBAY UNIVERSITY CONVOCATION	...	359
Mr. B. J. Wadia's Address	...	359

Chronicle of Events

July 1944

There was a debate in the House of Lords on the political situation in India. Lord Strabolgi criticized the methods of censorship as prevailed in India. Lord Faringdon raised the question of India's food situation. He wanted to know what provision was being made to deal with it.

Lord Munster, replying to the debate in the Lords on India, said: "His Majesty's Government have not departed in any way from the intentions declared in the Cripps Mission and.....repeated by the Governor-General."

In the House of Commons, replying to the debate on India, Mr. Amery gave renewed assurances that Britain stood by the promises of independence after the war and that the offer made by Sir Stafford Cripps still held good.

Mr. Amery laid stress on the food situation in India and the consequent strain on India's economy.

Syed Badruduja, ex-Mayor of Calcutta, presiding over the Lahore Majlis Ahrar Conference, condemned the Pakistan scheme and the League Ministries.

Mr. Fenner Brockway said in London, "The refusal of the Viceroy to meet Gandhiji is one of the major defeats of the war."

In the House of Lords, the Bill to amend the Government of India Act, 1935, was given a second reading without discussion.

The Government of Orissa reviewed the grounds on which security prisoners in the province were detained under the Restriction and Detention Ordinance.

H. E. the Governor of Bengal, in a broadcast from Calcutta, referring to Bengal's food situation, said: "We are almost out of the wood so far as this year is concerned."

The Indian delegation offered a compromise proposal to the World Monetary Conference (Bretton Woods) regarding the release of India's blocked sterling balances.—The proposal was opposed by Britain, the U. S. A. and France.

Mr. B. G. Kher, former Premier of Bombay, was released from detention.

A joint statement signed by Sardar Santokh Singh, M.L.A., Sardar Harnam Singh, President, All-India Sikh League, Sardar Jogindar Singh and others referring to the formula of communal settlement of Mr. Rajagopalachari, supported by Mahatma Gandhi, said: "We strongly protest against this offer, on behalf of the Sikh community, and hereby declare that the Sikhs will fight to the bitter end against the proposal."

Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee, presiding over a meeting of the Bengal Provincial Hindu Mahasabha in Calcutta, said: "The terms now offered to Mr. Jinnah by Mr. C. Rajagopalachari contemplate a division of India, from the very initial stages, based on communal consideration."

The Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes, the Nawab of

Bhopal, presiding at the final sitting of the Standing Committee, reviewed the war situation and made a statement on the war effort of the States.

The Executive Committee of the Nationalist Christian Party of Bombay expressed happiness over Mahatma Gandhi's efforts for evolving a communal settlement.

The Famine Inquiry Commission presided over by Sir John Woodhead started work in New Delhi.

1st. The full text of Mahatma Gandhi's letter of June 17 to the Viceroy and the Viceroy's reply on June 22 was released for publication from New Delhi.

A Small Savings Scheme to popularise thrift habit and to provide greater facilities for the easy purchase of National Savings Certificates and Stamps was inaugurated in Calcutta and adjacent industrial area.

Sir William Beveridge, who prepared a plan for full employment to follow up his social security scheme, made his first public comment at Sheffield on the Government white paper outlining their employment policy.

An Ordinance was issued from New Delhi to provide for and regulate the payment of compensation for death, personal disablement or damage to property arising from the explosion in the Bombay docks on April 17.

The Working Committee of the All-India Majlis-i-Ahrar decided at Lahore to turn down the invitation of Mr. Jinnah to join the Muslim League.

2nd. The Labourite *Daily Herald* urged the British Parliament to take up without delay "the complaint" about India's food situation contained in the manifesto of 27 prominent Indian Leaders.

Of about a hundred Congress detainees, who were ordered to be released during June by the Punjab Government, only 7 were not interned in their Home Villages or Towns. The rest, like all those previously released, numbering about 300, were interned.

3rd. Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar, supply member, Government of India spent four days in Calcutta discussing with the Coal Control Board, colliery owners, the Coal Commissioner and other officials, measures calculated to bring about the greatest possible output of coal and to make the best possible use of it.

Syed Badruduja, ex-Mayor of Calcutta, presiding over the Lahore District Majlis-Ahrar Conference (at Lahore), condemned the Pakistan Scheme and strongly criticized the League Ministers.

4th. In the Bengal Legislative Council, the President (Sir B. P. Singh Roy) gave his ruling regarding competency of the House to impose a tax on agricultural income from lands owned by the Ruler of an Indian State and Bengal. The point arose in connexion with Agricultural Income Tax Bill (as passed by the Bengal Legislative Assembly).

Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan, General Secretary, All-India Muslim League, announced at Srinagar, that a meeting of the council of the All India Muslim League would be held at Lahore on the 30th. and 31st. July.

Mr. Fenner Brockway in an interview, in London, said: "The refusal of the Viceroy to meet Gandhiji is one of the Major defeats of the war."

The Bill to amend the Government of India Act of 1935 in regard to several minor points was given a second reading in the House of Lords without discussion, after a brief explanation by the Under-Secretary for India, the Earl of Munster.

Prof. Archibald Hill, addressing the East India Association, (in London), stressed the urgency of a new approach to the Indian problems.

5th. In the Bengal Legislative Council, the Chief Minister Sir Nazimuddin stated: "The Government of India will give back the 10,000 tons of rice which the Government of Bengal have sent to Assam. It is purely a question of a temporary loan which will be repaid by the Central Government from the quota reserved for the Army from outside Bengal."

6th. In the House of Commons, Indian famine conditions were referred to when Mr. Sorenson (Labour) asked if Mr. Amery was aware of the public warning against the recurrence of famine conditions issued by 27 influential Indian industrialists and whether he was satisfied that adequate steps had been taken

to avoid such a recurrence.—Mr. Amery : "Yes, The Government of India and the Provincial Governments have been actively pursuing the measures described in my answer on April 6."

7th. In the Bengal Legislative Council, Government's scheme relating to the rationing of "Bhog" offerings to Hindu deities was outlined by Mr. H. S. Subrawardy, Civil Supplies Minister, when he announced the appointment of a committee to assist Government in carrying out the scheme.

Mr. J. K. Mitter, presiding at the first Quarterly General Meeting of the Bengal National Chamber of Commerce in Calcutta, reviewed the food situation in Calcutta and in the province.

The Working Committee of the Sindh Provincial Muslim League, at its meeting at Karachi, passed a resolution calling on the Sindh Ministry to resign from office forthwith.

Sir Jwala Prasad Srivastava, Food Member, Government of India, issued a statement on food imports.

8th. Mr. V. D. Savarkar, President, Hindu Mahasabha, in an interview in New Delhi, said: "It is a paradox that the Hindu Mahasabha which is dubbed a communal body, is actually more national than the Congress which claims to be a national body." The Congress, he added, was not national in its outlook because it was unjust to Hindus and showed preference to Muslims.

The Government of Orissa reviewed the grounds on which security prisoners in the province were detained under the Restriction & Detention Ordinance.

The Indian Information Service (Washington) reported that arrangements were made to ship 400,000 tons of wheat to India before October 1.

9th. Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, in a statement from Panchgani, said: "My efforts to secure Mr. Jinnah's powerful help in pushing through an honourable settlement of the communal question have reached a stage when the public have to be taken into confidence."

The 19th meeting of the Standing Committee of the A. I. Newspaper Editors' Conference met in the office of the "Sind Observer" at Karachi.

The two-day session of the first Sindh Journalists' Conference began at Karachi. Members of the Standing Committee of the A. I. N. E. C. also attended the Conference, which was inaugurated by Mr. S. A. Brelvi. Mr. Devdas Gandhi presided.

10th. H. E. the Governor of Bengal, in a broadcast from Calcutta, referring to Bengal's food situation, said: "We are now within reasonable sight of having procured the minimum total of rice to see us through until the next Aman crop in November. This means that we are almost out of the wood so far as this year is concerned."

The Working Committee of the All India Hindu Mahasabha, adopted a resolution in New Delhi, opposing coalition with the Muslim League in forming Ministries in provinces and favouring coalition with political parties other than the League on the basis of an agreed programme.

In the Bengal Legislative Council, consideration of the Agricultural Income-tax Bill, as passed by the Assembly, was resumed. Mr. Humayun Kabir (Proja) criticized the retrospective character of the measure and suggested that it should come into force from April 1, 1945.

Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee, Working President, All India Hindu Mahasabha, issued a statement from New Delhi, in which he said: "Destitutes are slowly coming into Calcutta again, and it is natural that the matter has received prompt notice outside Bengal."

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, in the course of a Press statement from Allahabad, said: "There is almost a universal desire in India for an early solution of the present political impasse. It is abundantly clear from Gandhiji's correspondence with the authorities that he is anxious for a settlement and this settlement need have no reference at all to the threat of civil disobedience which must disappear in the atmosphere of settlement."

A deputation representing Six Muslim Associations met Malik Khizar Hyat Tiwana, Premier of the Punjab, and requested him to reconsider his attitude towards the Muslim League.

The Sindh Journalists' Conference which met at Karachi for two days under the presidentship of Mr. Devdas Gandhi, concluded after passing a number of resolutions. The Conference resolved that the continuance of the political

deadlock was responsible for the continuance of restrictions on the Press and declared that, in the interests of free and healthy journalism, the political deadlock should be resolved and political leaders should, as a first step, be released to create the necessary atmosphere for ending the deadlock.

- 11th. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, in a statement from Allahabad on the correspondence between Mr. Rajagopalachari and Mr. Jinnah to solve the communal deadlock, said: "I am glad that the stagnant water of the pool have been stirred. I have no doubt that the vast majority of Hindus and Muslims alike will welcome a settlement on just and reasonable terms."

Mr. Amery, replying to a question in the House of Commons, said he had consulted the Government of India on the question of applying the increases in family allowances to British officers of both British and Indian Services in India.

In the Bengal Legislative Council, details of communal disturbances that took place in May in Khulna and Jessore districts were given by the Chief Minister.

The Working Committee of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha, in a resolution from New-Delhi, said: "In view of the reports received about the Working of the Muslim League Ministries in the different provinces showing that not only legitimate rights and interests of the Hindus and other minorities have suffered but such administration has proved generally detrimental to the interests of the province as a whole, the Working Committee calls upon the Hindus and other non-Muslim members of the provincial legislatures to withdraw their co-operation with the Muslim League."

A Communiqué said: "The Governor of Orissa has assigned to Mr. S. L. Maewood, who has been appointed Adviser to His Excellency, the business of Government, arising in the following Secretariat department, Education, Health and Local Self-Government, Revenue, Development, Law, Commerce and Labour and Supply and Transport. His Excellency will be in direct charge of Home (including Civil, Defence, Publicity and Reconstituting sections) Finance and P. W. D."

The Indian delegation offered a compromise proposal to the World Monetary Conference (Bretton Woods) regarding the release of India's blocked sterling balances. The compromise provided that a part of the Sterling holdings, to be determined by the conference, be released for conversion into other currencies—The proposal was opposed by Britain, the U. S. A. and France.

- 12th. The Bengal Legislative Council further considered the Agricultural Income-tax Bill as passed by the Lower House.

A meeting of the representatives of those affected by the Paper Control Order was held in Bombay, Sir M. S. A. Hydari, Secretary, Industries and Civil Supplies Department, Government of India presiding.

Mr. Amery, replying to questions by Labour member, Mr. Sorenson and Mr. Harvey about Mahatma Gandhi's pronouncements, said: "I have seen Press accounts of certain statements made recently by Mr. Rajagopalachari and an interview with Mr. Gandhi by a correspondent of the *"News Chronicle"*."

Mr. Eden, leader of the House of Commons, indicated that the House would discuss India shortly.

- 13th. Mahatma Gandhi, in an informal talk at Panchgani, reiterating his faith in the destiny of a free India, declared: "I live for a cause and if I perish it is for the cause."

Mahatma Gandhi, in handing over to Press representatives two statements for publication, explained that they were two sets of notes prepared after discussion with Mr. Stuart Gelder, *"News Chronicle"* war correspondent in India.

- 14th. Mr. B. G. Kher, former Premier of Bombay, was released from detention and left for Bombay. Mr. Kher was arrested on the morning of August 9, 1942 along with other Congress Leaders, and had been kept in detention at Yerawada since then.

Mahatma Gandhi, in a talk with Pressmen at Panchgani said: "I have received bitter criticism of my views expressed in the Gelder interview. Some of my correspondents say that, under the influence of moderates and moneyed men, I have betrayed the cause of the country."

In the Bengal Legislative Council, Mr. K. O. Roy Chowdhury introduced a Bill—Commercial Firms Bill—designed to regulate security of service, provident

fund, gratuity and pension and life assurance of persons employed in commercial firms.

Mr. Fenner Brockway, Secretary, Independent Labour Party, wrote in the *New Leader*: "We in the Independent Labour Party stand completely behind the Indian National Congress and all Sections of Indians who demand the independence of India. We never cease in our opposition to British imperialism.

A joint statement signed by Sardar Santokh Singh, M.L.A., Sardar Harnam Singh, President, All-India Sikh League, Sardar Jogindar Singh and others said: "The formula for Communal Settlement of Mr. Rajagopalachari, which is supported by Mr. Gandhi has created a stir in the Sikh Community. How can Mr. Gandhi make such an offer to Mr. Jinnah in the face of the definite assurance given by the Congress in its Lahore session of 1929 to the Sikhs to the effect that the Congress will be party to no communal settlement which does not give full satisfaction to the Sikhs.—"We strongly protest against this offer, on behalf of the Sikh Community, and hereby declare that the Sikhs will fight to the bitter end against the proposal."

- 15th. Dr. N. B. Khare, member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, commenting on Mahatma Gandhi's pronouncement said (in New Delhi): "It is clear that Mr. Gandhi has accepted Mr. Rajagopalachari's proposal of dividing the country into more than one political state. According to Mr. Gandhi himself vivisection of India was a sin, so the Mahatma at the present moment is willing to do a sinful act consciously."

Mahatma Gandhi, in an interview at Pachgani, observed: "My plan contemplates immediate recognition of full independence for India as a whole, subject to the limitations, for the duration of the war, to meet the requirements of the Allied operations. The Cripps plan, as I understand it, dealt more with the future than with the immediate arrangements."

A meeting of the Working Committee of the All-India States Muslim League, was held at Nagpur under the chairmanship of Mr. Rasul Khan, President of the Muslim League of Baroda State.

- 16th. Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, in an interview at Pachgani, said: "It is gratifying to note that apart from the Mahasabha's uncompromising attitude, Mr. Gandhi's acceptance of my scheme has been widely welcomed. The opposition of the Mahasabha leaders to any Congress-League settlement on the basis of self-determination for predominantly Muslim areas is nothing surprising or new. Their opposition must be taken for granted. It cannot be met by any terms acceptable to the Muslim League. If we accept the argument of the Mahasabha the result will be undoubtedly continuance of the deadlock and of British rule for all time."

Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherjee, presiding over a meeting of the Council of the Bengal Provincial Hindu Mahasabha in Calcutta, said: "The terms now offered to Mr. Jinnah by Mr. C. Rajagopalachari contemplate a division of India from the very initial stage based on communal considerations, after tearing to pieces existing provinces like Bengal and the Punjab into small fragments. Such an offer was only aimed at placating Mr. Jinnah's megalomania."

H. H. the Maharaja of Kashmir, Lt. Gen. Sir Hari Singh, Indian representative on the British war cabinet, paid an official visit to Indian troops in Italy on his way to India.

- 17th. In the Bengal Legislative Council, Mr. N. N. Mahajanabish gave notice of an adjournment motion to criticize a Government circular issued to all district officers, relating to the publication in the "Calcutta Gazette" of rice prices in the districts.

The Bengal premier, Sir Nazimuddin, inaugurating the proceedings of the Rangpur District Muslim League Conference said: "The League is the only organization by which the Muslims could maintain their political existence, but the time has come when the League should extend its activities also to constructive work for all-round betterment of the Muslim masses."

- 18th. India's sterling balances in Britain were referred to during the debate in the House of Commons on a £ 1,000,000,000 vote of credit for war expenditure.

The question of the continuance in office of the League Ministry in Sindh came up before the Council of the Sindh Provincial Muslim League in the form of the resolution already passed by the Working Committee of the Provincial League calling for the resignation of the Ministry.

At the meeting of the Central Consumers' Council in New Delhi, it was announced that a slightly higher quota of Kerosene had been arranged from October and it was suggested by those present that brass sheets should be distributed in the widest manner possible so that utensils might reach the remotest villages.

19th. Mahatma Gandhi in a Press interview at Pachgani said: "The independence of India as a whole is a certainty. That it may not come in my life time is a matter of indifference to me. I can but work for it till the end of my life."

The Nawab of Bhopal, presiding at the final sitting of the Standing Committee of the Chamber of Princes (in Bombay) reviewed the war situation and made a statement on the war effort of the States.

20th. The Speaker of the Sindh Assembly, Syed Miran Mohd. Shah admitted an adjournment motion of Sheikh Abdul Majid, holding that an Ordinance is an extraordinary law as distinct from the ordinary law and the manner of its application, such as the prevention of an M. L. A., from performing his duty to his constituency, does constitute a matter of urgent public importance.

Mr. Savarkar, President, Hindu Mahasabha, in a statement from Bombay criticized Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Rajagopalachari for conceding the Pakistan claim to Muslims without consulting other organizations and, in particular, the Hindu Mahasabha.

21st. The British news magazine *Cavalcade* sent four questions to Mahatma Gandhi. The fourth question stated: "Will you outline your conception of the role of a free India in the post-war world with special relations to the peoples of the British commonwealth and the United States of America?" Mahatma Gandhi replied: "My proposal is an acid test and I have no shadow of doubt that its hearty acceptance by Britain will immediately turn the scales and ensure the defeat of the belligerent powers and fill exploited nations of the earth with hope. You see that I am therefore fighting for no small stake."

Mr. N. V. Gadgil, President of the Maharashtra Provincial Congress Committee, said at Poona, "I do not see any feeling of defeat or opportunism in Gandhiji's various statements. There is no need for Congressmen to worry or get confused."

22nd. The Bengal Provincial Hindu Mahasabha was asked by Mr. V. D. Savarkar to observe the first week of August as the Akhand Hindusthan and Anti Pakistan week" to protest against Mr. Rajagopalachari's scheme for Communal Settlement.

The Executive Committee of the Nationalist Christian Party of Bombay issued a statement expressing happiness over Mahatma Gandhi's efforts for evolving a communal settlement as evidenced by the proposals emanating from Mr. C. Rajagopalachari to Mr. Jinnah.

The All India Urdu Congress held its session at Hyderabad (Rees). The inaugural session of the Congress was presided over by the Nawab of Chhatari.

23rd. Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Labour Member, Government of India in a speech in Bombay, said: "I am glad that Mr. Gandhi has begun to move in the direction of a communal settlement, late as it is; Mr. Gandhi has realised that a communal settlement is a necessary precursor to a National Government."

Mr. S. A. Brelvi, presiding over the first All-India Urdu Journalists' Conference at Hyderabad (Dn.) expressed the view that it was in the hands of writers in Urdu to hasten or delay the day when the majority of the people of this country would hail Urdu as their national language.

24th. Quazi Mahomed Isha, President, Baluchistan Muslim League and member of the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, in a statement from Bhopal, on Mr. Rajagopalachari's proposals for a communal settlement, said: "The Muslim nation refuses to accept the position of a petitioner."

In the Bengal Legislative Council, an adjournment motion criticizing a Government Circular issued to all district officers relating to the publication in the "Calcutta Gazette" of rice prices in the districts was lost without a division.

H. H. the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir replying to an address presented on behalf of the people of the State on his return to Srinagar, said: "What I saw and heard while in England convinced me of the high determination of every man and woman to achieve complete victory and lasting peace, no matter what the sacrifice involved might be."

The inauguration of the Kohlapur Assembly was performed at Kohlapur at

the Durbar Hall, by the President, Mr. A. N. Mitchel, Prime Minister of Kohlapur.

In the Sindh Legislative Assembly, Mr. Abdul Majid moved an adjournment motion "to discuss the failure of the Premier on Saturday to promise immunity from prosecution as abettors to those who are stated to be ready to prove before a Court of law or a tribunal that they paid an illegal gratification of Rs. 70,000 to a Minister for getting the control rates manipulated as was asserted by Mr. Nichaldas C. Vajirani in his speech on the 22nd instant."—The Premier said that the offer was merely a suggestion and in any case, bribery was not a cognisable offence, and there were other legal causes open to the parties concerned. The motion was ruled out of order.

25th. In the House of Lords, opening the debate on the political situation in India, Lord Strabolgi said that the Labour Party wanted facts on this subject. There had been fierce Censorship in India, both military and political. There had been complaints that the military censorship had been aimed primarily at preventing news reaching the British people which was already known to the enemy and not to prevent news reaching the enemy. The political censorship had been most rigid and it had been very difficult to obtain accurate information about what was going on in the political field.

Lord Faringdon raised the question of India's food situation in the House of Lords. He said that many people were becoming increasingly uneasy. He wanted to know what provision was being made to deal with it.

Lord Munster, replying to the Lords debate on India, said: "His Majesty's Government have not departed in any way from the intentions declared by the Cripps Mission and which have been repeated again by the Governor General in his speech to the combined Legislatures and the proposals stand in their entirety."

26th. Sir J. P. Srivastava, Food Member, at a Press Conference in New Delhi, said: "I view the food situation in Bengal and in the country generally with much greater confidence than I did last year."

In the Bengal Legislative Council, the Chief Minister, Sir Nazimuddin announced: "The Government propose to take early steps to institute an inquiry by a high judicial officer into the working of the administrations of the Howrah Municipality during the past few years and into the allegations against the executive of the Municipality."

Mahatma Gandhi, interviewed on the Lords debate said: "I have read the debate in the Lords on the Indian question with attention. I confess I am disappointed."

27th. The first session of the reconstituted Travancore Srimulam Assembly was held at Trivandrum under the presidency of the Dewan-President, Sachivottwam Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar.

Mr. F. B. Wace, Secretary, Supplies and Transport, Punjab Government commented on Lord Munster's remarks during the food debate in the House of Lords that the Punjab Government's scheme of purchase of food grains through agents was not working altogether satisfactorily.

28th. Mahatma Gandhi in a Press interview at Panchgani said: "I say unhesitatingly that underground activities, even though utterly innocent in themselves should have no place in the technique of non-violence. Sabotage and all its means including destruction of property is in itself violence."

Mr. L. S. Amery, Secretary of State for India, replying to the Commons debate on India, initiated by Mr. Pethwick Lawrence (Lab) gave renewed assurances that Britain stood by the promises of independence after the war made to India two years ago. The offer made by Sir Stafford Cripps still held good.

Mr. Amery said that Mr. Gandhi had expressed his views on the immediate situation, and so long as that was the basis of his proposals, they did not afford even a starting point for a profitable discussion with the Viceroy or with the interned Congress Party Leaders.

In the Bengal Legislative Council, the Government's action in applying to the Central Government for the services of a number of army officers to hold liaison posts in the province was criticized by the Opposition.

29th. In the House of Commons, Mr. Amery, in his reply to the debate on India said: "By far the greatest consequence of the strain imposed upon India's

economy has been the strain on the food situation. That had been, and would continue to be, quite apart from the war, an increasingly serious problem."

A reference of exceptional importance was made by the Governor-General, acting under sec. 213 of the Government of India Act, to the Federal Court regarding the powers of the federal legislature to provide for the levy of Estate Duty in respect of property other than agricultural land passing upon the death of any man.

30th. The Muslim League Council authorized Mr. Jinnah to conduct negotiation with Mahatma Gandhi with a view to trying to arrive at a settlement of the communal question.

Mahatma Gandhi, in a press interview on the House of Commons debate, emphasized that the British Government's rejection of his offer did not in any way affect the formula for a communal settlement.

31st. Work was started on the Railway Board's scheme for the expansion of the communication system of Indian Railways. This is apart from the 16 crore plan for the development of the tele-communications system under the Posts and Telegraphs Department.

The Famine Inquiry Commission presided over by Sir John Woodhead started work in New Delhi and had informal talks with officers of the Food Department, gathering information and generally settling procedure and programme.

Sir Jogendra Singh, Member-in-charge of Education, Health and Lands, presiding over the 14th. conference of Registrars of Co-operative Societies in Bombay, said: "I can think of no other activity which could raise our Motherland from poverty to power than the spirit of co-operation inspiring all our social and economic activities."

August 1944

There was some correspondence between His Excellency the Viceroy and Mahatma Gandhi on the political situation in India. Mahatmajji was requested "to submit a definite and constructive policy", on which Mahatma Gandhi offered some substantive proposals, which were ultimately considered as unacceptable.

A draft Hindu code prepared by the Rau Committee was published for the purpose of eliciting public opinion thereon.

Lord Hardinge of Penhurst died at Kent.

The Working Committee of the All-Parties Sikh Conference passed a resolution rejecting Mr. Rajagopalachari's formula.

Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherjee sounded a note of warning that India was about to enter the most bitter and critical phase of Hindu Muslim relationship.

Master Tara Singh, the Akali leader, returned to public life.

The Working Committee of the All-Parties Sikh Conference demanded reservation of five percent shares in the Central Government services.

The Patna City Municipality was superseded for three years.

Master Tara Singh, the Akali Leader, expressed the view at Lahore that in the event of India being divided into Pakistan & Hindustan the Sikhs would claim Sikhistan, comprising Lahore and Amritsar, the two most important centres associated with Sikh history.

A representative Conference of the Hindus of the Punjab passed a resolution protesting against the C. R. formula.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya was entirely opposed to the idea of Pakistan.

The Maharajahdiraj of Darbhanga, presiding at the All-India Landholders' Conference in Calcutta, appealed to the landholders to play their part in shaping the future of the country.

The Sikh Panthic Conference rejected the C. R. formula.

At a meeting of the Committee of the Bihar Chamber of Commerce it was resolved to send a telegram to H. E. the Viceroy to release the Congress Working Committee members and thereby initiate a move for ending the deadlock.

1st. In the Bengal Legislative Council, the consideration of the Agricultural Income-tax Bill was continued. Five clauses relating to computation of agricultural income-tax and allowances were passed. All amendments to modify the clauses were defeated.

A draft Hindu Code prepared by the Hindu Law Committee of which Sir B. N. Rau was Chairman, was published from Madras for the purpose of eliciting public opinion thereon.

2nd. Lord Hardinge of Penshurst, former Viceroy of India, died at his home in Kent.

Sir J. P. Srivastava food member, Government of India, replying to a memorandum submitted to him at Lucknow, by a deputation of leading citizens of the U.P. on the subject of communal settlement, said: "I do not wish to damp the ardour of those of our countrymen who are anxious to find a compromise formula; they are actuated by the best of motives; but with all respect to them, I hold that the communal problem cannot be solved by agreeing to the demand for Pakistan."

The Working Committee of the All-Parties Sikh Conference passed a resolution at Lahore, rejecting Mr. Rajagopalachari's formula for a communal settlement, and calling upon the Sikhs to carry on a country-wide agitation for its rejection. Sardar Baldev Singh, Development Minister, Punjab, presided.

Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee gave the warning at Poona that India was about to enter the most bitter and critical phase of Hindu-Muslim relationship. He appealed to Indians to raise their voice against the scheme for Pakistan and Mahatma Gandhi to withdraw his offer to Mr. Jinnah.

The suggestion that the Standing Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament on Indian Affairs should be revised was made to Mr. Amery, Secretary of State for India, in the House of Commons by Sir Ralph Glyn.

3rd. In the Bengal Legislative Council, consideration of the Agricultural Income-tax Bill was resumed. The opposition moved an amendment for the deletion of a sub-clause to clause 25 relating to assessment.

Master Tara Singh, the Akali Leader, decided to return to public life, in order to guide Sikh opposition to the C. R. formula for a Communal settlement.

Sir Feroz Khan, in a broadcast from London, sounded a note of warning that the food situation in India remained grave and shortages of the previous winter might be repeated.

4th. Mr. M. A. Jinnah, President, All-India Muslim League, in pursuance of the resolution passed at the Karachi session of the All-India Muslim League in Dec. 1943, appointed a Planning Committee whose main function would be to survey the conditions of India, particularly of the Pakistan area, with a view to preparing Muslims to participate effectively in the commercial, industrial and agricultural expansion, especially after the war.

5th. The 44th. meeting of the Provincial Board for Anglo-Indian and European Education, Bengal, was held in Calcutta.

Sir Maurice Gwyer, former Chief Justice, Federal Court, in a note on the question of self-determination in Mr. Rajagopalachari's formula and in the Cripps offer, said: "There is one point in Mr. Rajagopalachari's formula for the settlement of the Hindu-Muslim question, especially in relation to the Cripps offer, which needs some clarification, viz., when precisely the issue of separation is to be decided."

The Working Committee of the All-Parties Sikh Conference adopted a resolution demanding reservation of five per cent shares for Sikhs in the Central Government Services, in view of "the importance of the Sikhs in the country

and the Army, and their proportion in the total population of the smaller minorities in British India."

- 6th. A Press Note from Cuttack stated: "It has been decided by the Orissa Government to requisition surplus stocks of paddy and rice in Ganjam district, which are still in the hands of large stockists in the villages."

Mr. Jinnah, in a Press interview at Lahore on the Gandhi-Jinnah Meeting, assured the Sikh Community and Sikh leaders that the Muslim League would endeavour to meet their just demands "in a very fair and reasonable way?"

A Press Note from New-Delhi said: "The Famine Inquiry Commission have just completed the hearing of evidence of officers of the Food Department, Mr. R. H. Hutchings, Secretary, Mr. B. R. Sen, Director General, Food, Mr. Somerset Butler, Special Officer, Mr. W. H. Kirby, Rationing Adviser and Mr. Christie, Deputy Secretary."

The Patna City Municipality was superseded for three years from Aug. 5 and the District Magistrate of Patna was appointed to be in charge of the municipality.

Sir C. P. Ramaswamy Iyer, Vice-chancellor of the University of Travancore, repudiated the theory propounded by Mr. Edward Thompson and others both in India and abroad that the Indian States were mere creations of the Paramount Power and as such could lay claim to no special rights or privileges and could even be eliminated.

Khan Bahadur S. Mahamed Jan. M. L. C. (Bengal), in a statement, said: "While Mr. Jinnah appealed to the Press and to the Leaders of all Communities 'to maintain complete truce and apply their energies to create an atmosphere of friendliness and goodwill', he felt no scruple to cast aspersions upon those Muslim parties who are opposed to his present politics by describing them as 'mush-room political coteries attempting to create dissunity and disruption among the Muslims.'"

- 7th. It was announced at Lahore that the Punjab Government would enter the market for a loan of Rs. 2,70,00,000 in the form of a further issue of the 3% Punjab Bonds, 1953. The bonds would bear interest of 3% p. a.

Mrs. V. L. Pandit in an interview at Allahabad said: "Satisfaction has been expressed that no recurrence of last year's tragedy can take place in Bengal and that the general condition is free from anxiety. This picture is a misleading one and famine in Bengal cannot be referred to in the past tense."

The Famine Inquiry Commission heard Mr. Tyson, Secretary, and Sir Pheroze Kharegat, Additional Secretary, Education, Health and Lands Department.

In connexion with the second anniversary of the arrest of Indian leaders the India League issued a public appeal (from New York) for release of leaders addressed to Lord Halifax, signed by 110 prominent Americans including leading educationists, authors, columnists, Church and Labour spokesmen.

- 8th. The Mysore Government served an externment order on Rev. R. R. Keitham, the American missionary and social worker in India, directing him to leave Mysore State before August 17.

His Excellency Sir John Colville, Governor of Bombay, addressing a recruiting meeting in Pandharpur declared: "I have no sympathy with those who call for freedom, yet will take no part in the war".

Mahatma Gandhi, in an interview at Wardha said: "I would urge upon critics not to mind my inconsistencies, so-called or real. Let them examine the question on its merits and bless the effort if they can."

At the invitation of the Chief Minister (Bengal) Sir Nazimuddin, Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee, Rai H. N. Choudhury and Dr. Nalinaksha Sanyal, representing the opposition in the Bengal Legislature, met him at a conference in the Assembly buildings to discuss the Secondary Education Bill with a view to coming to a settlement on the controversial provisions of the measure.

Mr. P. N. Saprú, in an interview at Allahabad, said: "I value the integrity of India very much, but I confess that I attach great importance to the independence of the Indian people."

- 9th. The Bengal Legislative Council was adjourned for want of quorum.

H. H. the Maharaja Bikaner, in a statement to the press, called for a full recognition and encouragement of the new forces at work in the Indian State and declared that the Princes did not consider themselves separate from the rest of India, and that they wished to see India rise to her full height, in which "the States have a rightful and important place to fill."

10th. Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar, Supply Member, Government of India, met the general committee of the Indian Jute Mills Association and discussed coal economies, coal allocations, the position of mills outside the Association Membership and the Association's dump scheme.

In the Bengal Legislative Council, Khan Bahadur M. Hossain, Minister for Agriculture, replying to questions on the high prices of fish and vegetables, stated: "Bengal Government have acquired 3,000 acres of land for growing vegetables, and the major portion of the produce will go to the Military, so that they may no longer encroach on the supplies meant for civilian consumption."

Mr. Srinivasa Sastri, in a Press statement from Madras, appealed to Mahatma Gandhi and his colleagues "to abandon their present misguided enterprise" for a solution of the communal problem.

11th. Mr. V. D. Savarkar, in a telegram to Mr. N. C. Chatterjee, from Bombay, said: "It is most encouraging to note Hindu Bengal has risen to the occasion to defend the integrity of India. Our fathers got smashed the partition of Bengal. We, their sons, must smash the proposed partition of India even before it is settled."

The Secretary of State for India appointed Sir Torick Ameer Ali, acting chief Justice of Bengal, as one of his advisers from November. 11.

Master Tara Singh, the Akali leader, expressed the view at Lahore: "In the event of the partition of India into Hindusthan and Pakisthan, the Sikhs would not rest content without a Sovereign State of their own, comprising Lahore and Amritsar, the two most important centres associated with Sikh history and culture."

Sir Azizul Haque, member of the Viceroy's Executive Council in charge of Commerce, Industries and Civil Supplies Department declared in Calcutta: "The Government of India are making all efforts to safeguard India's internal economy from the impact of forces after the war."

Sir C. P. Ramsawamy Iyer, Dewan of Travancore in an interview at Trivandrum, said: "There are occasions where plain speaking at all costs becomes an elementary duty; and it is heartening at this juncture to read the moving appeal by Mr. Srinivasa Sastri."

12th. Mr. Rafi Butt, in an interview at Lahore, said: The main object of the Muslim League Planning Committee is to draw up a programme for the economic regeneration of the Muslim Community.

The Famine Inquiry Commission held its first meeting in Calcutta. The Commission heard the evidence of Major-General Wood, Director General of Munition Production and formerly Secretary, Food Department, Government of India.

13th. A representative Conference of the Hindus of the Punjab, (at Lahore) passed a resolution strongly protesting against the C. R. formula.

Mr. Srinivasa Sastri, addressing a public meeting in Madras, in an exhaustive and critical analysis of the C. R. formula, strongly opposed it.

14th. At the joint Session of the two Houses of the Travancore Legislature, a record surplus, of Rs. 125.33 lakhs (for 1944-45) was anticipated by the Financial Secretary to the Travancore Government, Mr. S. Narayana Aiyar. Sir C. P. Ramsawami Aiyar, Dewan President, presided.

Sir Feroz Khan Noon resumed his duties as Defence Member of the Viceroy's Council.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, in a statement at Allahabad, said: "I am entirely opposed to the idea of Pakistan."

15th. In the Bengal Legislative Council, the Chief Minister, Sir Nazimuddin explained the arrangements made by the Government for the distribution of quinine and other anti-malarial drugs in the districts.

A statement issued by prominent leaders of the Punjab including Sir Gokulchand Narang, said: "The Hindus of the Punjab stand united for the Geographical and political unity of India, but the C. R. formula aims at dismemberment and disintegration of the country."

Allama Mashriqui, the Khaksar leader, expressed the hope that Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah would be able to come to a settlement in the course of a letter from Lahore to the two leaders.

16th. The Calcutta Corporation adopted a resolution supporting the move of Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah to end the political deadlock in India and wishing their every success.

Sir John Woodhead (Chairman) gave an idea of the task before the Famine Inquiry Commission at an informal meeting of the members of the Commission and representatives of the Calcutta Press and news agencies in Calcutta.

17th. The Bengal Legislative Council, by 22 votes to 13, defeated an adjournment motion relating to the alleged non-availability of rice at Midnapore and neighbouring villages.

The Famine Inquiry Commission heard the evidence of Mr. M. O. Innes, formerly grains purchasing officer under the Bengal Government.

The Punjab Government during the week ended August 10, despatched 4,436 tons of food grains to the deficit provinces. Of this, 1,537 tons of wheat was sent to the N. W. F. P.

18th. The Maharajadhiraja of Darbhanga, presiding at the All-India Landholders' Conference in Calcutta, made an appeal to landholders to play their legitimate part in shaping the future of the country.

In the Bengal Legislative Council, the Agriculture Minister, Khan Bahadur S. M. Hossain made two statements, one about the Government plan to increase the milk supply in the provinces and the other relating to the appointment of Army officers to some civilian posts.

The Famine Inquiry Commission examined witnesses (in Calcutta), Major-Gen. Paton, formerly surgeon-General, Dr. B. Mookerjee and Major Lakshman, past and present directors of Public Health respectively.

The Government of Bengal directed an enquiry into certain allegations made personally against Mr. B. P. Pain (Minister for Communications and Works), when holding the office of Chairman of the Howrah Municipality.

Correspondence passed between His Excellency the Viceroy & Mahatma Gandhi. The Viceroy stated inter alia: "If you submit to me a definite and constructive policy, I shall be glad to consider it."—Mahatma Gandhi's proposals were not accepted.

19th. The Famine Inquiry Commission examined more witnesses on medical and public health services.

The Rt. Hon. Srinivas Sastri expressed the view in Madras that the latest pronouncement of the Viceroy had worsened the situation and was calculated to frustrate efforts to bring about Hindu-Muslim settlement.

20th. At the concluding session of the All-India Landholders' Conference in Calcutta various problems affecting the rights and welfare of the landholding Community were discussed. Maharajadhiraja Babadur U. C. Mahtab of Burdwan presided.

The Sikh Panthic (representative) Conference held at Amritsar under the presidentship of Mr. Mohan Singh adopted a resolution condemning and rejecting the O. R. formula and authorizing Master Tara Singh to carry on negotiations with various organizations in the country with a view to safeguarding the claims and rights of the Sikh Community.

The Bombay Legislative Congress Party at its meeting in Bombay, adopted a resolution supporting the proposals made by Mahatma Gandhi for the solution of the political deadlock and condemning the attitude of the British Government towards them, as revealed in the statements of the Secretary of State in the House of Commons and of the Viceroy in his reply to Mahatma Gandhi's letter.

21st. The Famine Inquiry Commission in Calcutta heard the Nawab of Dacca, who was Minister for Agriculture and also acted as Minister for Commerce for a short time in the Fazlul Haque Ministry.—The Nawab gave an account of the steps he took to establish the Directorate of Civil Supplies and his assessment of the deteriorating food position at the time.

Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, in a statement from Madras said: "If power is not to be transferred, the formula, of which the last clause is the linchpin, no longer stands. The Pakistan basis of the meeting between the two great leaders is cut off."

Mr. M. A. Jinnah, in a statement from Bombay observed: "I categorically deny that I have ever made an offer or sent any scheme referred to in that report to any member of the Sikh Community or any body else. On the

contrary, I have, both publicly and privately, requested the Sikh leaders, to send me their considered proposals which they deem to be in the best interests of the Sikh Community, assuring them that I shall endeavour to meet them in every possible way".

22nd. The Famine Inquiry Commission heard Mr. P. N. Bannerjee, who was formerly Minister of Revenue (Bengal) and was the first Minister of Civil Supplies in the Fazlul Haque Ministry.

The Fisheries Department of the Government of Bengal, in order to improve fish supply in Calcutta and to increase its production in the districts, worked hard to give effect to various schemes spread over the entire province.

23rd. Master Tara Singh, the Akali leader, commenting on Mr. Jinnah's statement said at Amritsar: "Mr. Jinnah, while contradicting the false report of his making an offer to the Sikhs, invites the Sikhs to send him proposals for safeguarding Sikh interests. Why should the Sikhs send their petition to Mr. Jinnah: why should he presume that he and Mr. Gandhi are the final authorities who can seal the fate of the Sikhs?"

Dr. B. S. Moonje, in a Press statement from Bombay, made an appeal to Hindu youths "not to see Mr. Gandhi, go to Bombay to see Mr. Jinnah, if they desire to save the Hindu nation from committing suicide.

24th. The Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, addressing the members of the Mahanstra Mandal, Vepery, Madras, reiterated his opposition to Pakistan and threw out a suggestion that the issue be decided by a board of arbitrators consisting of a Chinese, a Frenchman and an American.

25th. Mr. Rajagopalachari, addressing a public meeting at Triplicane, made an appeal to Indians to trust Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah and abide by their decisions.

The Travancore Assembly continued discussion on the Land Revenue and Income-Tax demand.

The Government of Mysore announced the appointment of Mr. T. Singaravelu Mudaliar as Vice-chancellor of the Mysore University in place of Mr. E. G. Mc Alpine.

26th. Sir Thomas Rutherford, Governor of Bihar, in his speech at a Provincial Durbar at Ranchi, dealt on the policy and programme of the Provincial Government.

Mr. V. D. Savarkar, in a message to Mr. S. Pande, Secretary, All-India Hindu Students' Federation, said: "We must stand by the integrity of our motherland and defend Hindustan to the last breath.

In the Sri Mulam Assembly (Trivandrum) discussion on the demand for a grant of Rs. 55,42,685 for the Registration Department, moved by Mr. Madhva Kumpa, Director of Registration, was continued.

27th. Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, addressing a public meeting in Madras, referred at the outset to the movement contemplated in Aug. 1942 and said that there was a large section of the people, namely Muslims, who said that they had nothing to do with that movement.

The *Manchester Guardian* raised the question whether elections for the Indian Provincial Legislatures should not be held at once—"as soon, that is, the military situation renders it safe to release the interned Congress leaders."

28th. Sir Sultan Ahmed, Member for Information and Broad-casting in his address to the Publicity Advisory Committee (New Delhi) surveyed the progress of the Government of India's publicity activities.

29th. At a joint Press Conference in Calcutta, a strong plea to the public to be their own censors, both in speech and writing, was made by high military spokesmen of the Eastern Command.

30th. Mr. M. A. Jinnah sent a telegram to Mahatma Gandhi advising that September 7—or any day thereafter—would suit him for his meeting with Mahatma Gandhi.

Mr. M. K. Vellodi, Textile Commissioner, Government of India, accompanied by Mr. T. Jones, Textile Controller, Bengal, visited the Muslim Chamber of Commerce, Calcutta, and discussed with the representatives of the Chamber, questions relating to cloth and yarn trade.

The Travancore Sri Mulam Assembly reassembled, Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, Dewan President presiding, and transacted non-official business.

31st. Members of the Famine Inquiry Commission who spent nearly a week in different districts of Bengal visiting a number of towns and villages and inspecting transport arrangements, distribution, storage and medical facilities, returned to Calcutta.

At a meeting of the Committee of the Bihar Chamber of Commerce, held at Patna, it was decided to send a telegram to H. E. the Viceroy to release the Congress Working Committee members and thereby initiate a move for ending the deadlock.

September 1944

The Gandhi-Jinnah negotiations which were carried on since September 9, broke down on September 27, when the two leaders met for the last time for one and a half hours. Mr. Jinnah handed over to Pressmen copies of the correspondence which passed between him and Mahatma Gandhi in the course of the Bombay talks.

The correspondence revealed that the two leaders could not come to an agreement on the question of the two nations theory, plebiscite and other issues.

Giani Sher Singh, an Akali leader stated at Lahore that the Sikhs would demand an independent Sovereign Sikh State in the event of Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah agreeing to the proposal of a division of the country into Hindu India and Muslim India.

Pearl Buck became the Joint Honorary President of the India League of America.

85 professors of the Delhi University, signed a joint statement supporting Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah.

Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah met at the latter's residence in Bombay on September 9th.

A deputation on behalf of the Hindu Women's Association waited on Sir Asoka Roy, Law Member, Government of India re: Hindu Intestate Succession Bill.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah, President of the All-India Muslim League issued an *Id* message, in which he stated that he was glad to note that the Muslims were "moving from strength to strength."

Sikh opposition to Rajagopalachari-Gandhi formula was voiced by a number of speakers at Rawalpindi, including Master Tara Singh, Sardar Mangal Singh and Sardar Ajit Singh.

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Labour Member to the Government of India, at a meeting at Hyderabad, emphasised that the goal of the Depressed classes was the sharing of the power of the Government of the country.

Dr. B. S. Moonje expressed his view in Madras that the division of India into Hindustan & Pakistan would neither promote unity nor secure Independence.

The India (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill which made certain minor technical amendments to the Government of India Act was given a second reading in the House of Commons.

Mr. V. D. Savarkar, President of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha, in a statement from Bombay said that the proposal to vivisect India had assumed "a far more dangerous aspect.....than it had on the day when the (Gandhi-Jinnah) talks began".

1st. A Press Note stated that evidence was recorded before the Famine Inquiry Commission by the official Congress Parliamentary Party which was represented by Dr. N. Sanyal and Dr. A. C. Ukil.

Giani Sher Singh, a prominent Akali leader, said at Lahore: "If Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah finally agree upon the division of the country into Hindu India and Muslim India, the Sikhs would demand the creation of an independent sovereign Sikh State."

2nd. Mr. M. A. Jinnah, President of the All-India Muslim League, in a statement from Bombay, said: "My attention has been drawn to a report of Master Tara Singh's interview that has appeared in the Press. The statement made by Master Tara Singh that I had made an offer to Raja Maheswar Dayal Seth, which was discussed at a Delhi meeting of Hindus and Sikhs is entirely untrue."

Mr. A. K. Fazlul Huq, former Bengal Premier, convened a conference in Calcutta of all-India Nationalist Muslims to consider their attitude and programme in respect of the proposals for a Hindu-Muslim settlement and the C. R. formula.

The Famine Inquiry Commission heard the evidence of representatives of the Indian federation of labour, the Radical Democratic Party, the Communist Party of Bengal, the Bengal Provincial Kishan Sabha and the Bolshevik Party of India.

3rd. Mr. K. Akram Khan, Vice President of the Bengal Provincial Muslim League, Dr. A. M. Malek, M.L.A., Secretary, Bengal Muslim League Parliamentary Party and Mr. Abdul Kasim, M.L.A., joint secretary, Bengal Coalition Party, issued a statement strongly criticizing Professor Thompson's letter to the *Spectator* on the Indian deadlock.

4th. Pearl Buck became the joint Honorary President of the India League of America with Dr. Lin Yu tang, Chinese author and philosopher.

A Press Note stated that continuing their examination of non-official witnesses, the Famine Inquiry Commission heard representatives of the Marwari, Bengal National, Indian and Muslim Chambers of Commerce.

5th. The Travancore Sri Chitra State Council commenced session at Trivandrum, with Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, Dewan President, in the chair.

The Akali leader, Master Tara Singh, told Press representatives that the Rajagopalachari-Gandhi formula was positively dangerous to the Sikhs. He said: "It is not so much the vivisection of India as that of the Sikhs. According to this the Sikh community will be so divided that one half of them will go under Muslim rule and the other half under Hindu rule. This is certainly a death blow to one political status and we cannot agree to it."

Sir J. P. Srivastava, food member, addressing the Committee of the Indian Merchants' Chamber on the food situation in India, said: "Taking the country as a whole, in respect of price control and of movement under the basic plan, the position is not too unsatisfactory. I do not suggest that the food problem has been solved or that we are yet out of the wood."

Mahatma Gandhi presided over a meeting of the All-India Village Industries Association at Sevagram. It was decided to arrange for training in rural hygiene and sanitation and to carry out tests in Maganwadi to examine the possibilities of using bullocks in connection with the manufacture of paper pulp.

6th. 85 Professors, including four Principals, belonging to different Colleges of the University of Delhi, signed a joint statement which said that the meeting between Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah offered an opportunity to make a decisive shift in the political situation.

Sir R. K. Shanmukham Chetty, giving an account of the Bretton Woods conference to students in Madras, said that this was the first of the great peace conferences as it undertook to tackle some of the problems which the peace would force on the world.

7th. A Press Note on how Bihar faced the food crisis on the previous year was described by the representatives of the Bihar Government headed by Mr. R. E. Russel, Adviser to the Governor of Bihar, in their evidence before the Famine Inquiry Commission in Calcutta.

8th. Mahatma Gandhi told Mr. Hari Prasanna Miera, General Secretary, All-India Hindu Students' Federation at Wardha: "I will not ignore or compromise a single interest, be sure."

9th. Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah met at the latter's residence (Bombay). Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah, in a joint statement, said: "We have had

these hours' frank and friendly talk which will be resumed at 5-30 p. m. on Monday."

Lt. Col. Malik Khizr Hyat Khan Tiwana, Premier of the Punjab, protested against the reflections on the Indian Army by Mr. William Phillips, President Roosevelt's personal representative in India.

The Famine Inquiry Commission heard Mr. Tarak Nath Mukherjee, Revenue Minister, Bengal on the organization of relief measures during the famine of the previous year.

Mr. N. C. Chatterjee, presiding at the Barisal Hindu Conference, reiterated his condemnation of the Rajagopalachari formula.

- 10th. Mr. M. S. Aney, Government of India's Representative in Ceylon, in a Press statement, wished success to Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah in arriving at a settlement of the Hindu Muslim problem, first, on the footing of an undivided and indivisible India and secondly, with due regard to the interests of other minorities.

Mr. Tushar Kanti Ghosh put Bengal's special difficulties before Mahatma Gandhi at Bombay in detail and expressed apprehension that her interests might not be safeguarded if a proper realisation of such difficulties was not made at the time.

- 11th. The talks between Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah lasted from 5-30 p. m. Just after his talks, addressing the congregation at Birla House, Mahatma Gandhi said: "We are fully alive to our responsibility and are straining every nerve to come to a settlement. But we realise that ultimately the result lies in God's good hands. You should, therefore, all pray that He may guide us and give us wisdom to serve the cause of India."

Mahatmaji added that Mr. Jinnah told him: "If we part without coming to an agreement, we shall proclaim bankruptcy of wisdom on our part."

A deputation on behalf of the Hindu Women's Association waited on Sir Asoka Roy, Law Member, Government of India when they submitted their protest against the enactment of the proposed Hindu Intestate Succession Bill.

Release of political leaders and the establishment of a National Government were urged by the Commonwealth Party of England, in a booklet, which embodied the Party's policy for the year 1944-45.

- 12th. The Gandhi-Jinnah talks were resumed at 10-30 a. m. and lasted two-and-a-half hours in the morning. The leaders met again in the afternoon from 5-30 to 7 p. m.

The Bombay Government's post-war reconstruction plan was the subject of a long discussion when the Bombay Provincial Rural Development Board resumed its meeting.

- 13th. The Gandhi-Jinnah talks were resumed. In the morning the two leaders met for two hours and a quarter.

In the Memorandum furnished to the Famine Inquiry Commission were mentioned the large increase in the population of Calcutta, the effect of air raids, disturbances in trade, large scale purchases by industrial concerns and rise in prices.

A deputation on behalf of four associations waited on Sir Asoka Roy, Law Member, Government of India, and explained the reasons for their opposition to the Hindu Law Committee as also the draft Hindu Code published by the committee.

Sir Aziz-ul-Haque, Commerce Member, Government of India, when he met the Bombay Muslim Chamber of Commerce in Bombay, declared: "There would be no occasion for any Government intervention if tradesmen behaved properly and sought moderate profits, but if they created conditions of famine in particular commodities, then the Government would certainly intervene."

- 14th. A Press Note said what relief organizations were able to achieve and the nature of the problems which engaged the attention of the Famine Inquiry Commission, when they heard the evidence of non-official relief societies.

His Excellency Sir Maurice Hallett, Governor of the United Provinces, opening the annual session of the Council of the Indian Roads Congress at Lucknow, emphasised that there must be an All-India Transport Board to co-ordinate the development of railways, road transport and air lines, to deal also with the development of the Indian postal and telegram system, and in particular the improvement and extension of the telephone service.

The Calcutta University requested the Government of India to exempt it from the operation of the Paper Control Order. It also asked for permission to manufacture answer books and to print its calendar pamphlets, handbooks and textbooks as before.

The resumed Gandhi-Jinnah meeting lasted about 100 minutes.

Mahatma Gandhi's 75th. birthday was celebrated in Bombay.

- 15th. A deputation of the Princes' Chamber waited on the Viceroy to discuss questions relating to the Indian States in general. The deputation included the Chancellor, the Pro-Chancellor, and the rulers of Baroda, Bahawalpur, Bikaner, Patiala, Dholpur, Dungarpur and Rampur.

Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah met again, the talks lasting an hour and 40 minutes.

- 16th. Mr. Lalchand Hirchand, in his presidential address at the 12th. annual meeting of the Indian Sugar Mills Association, held at Cawnpore, observed: "I cannot agree to the total control, as is being exercised at present by the Government. Any system of control must bear a relationship to the level of economic development of a country. The striking features of the war-time economic controls in India is that there is control without development.

A Press Note stated how the famine situation developed in Bengal, the measures which the Government took and the widespread nature of the problems which faced the province were reviewed by Sir Nazimuddin, Chief Minister, before the Famine Inquiry Commission.

The Commission also heard Mr. N. R. Sarker who gave an account of the policy pursued by the Government of India, of which he was member from August 1941, until February, 1943. In a memorandum furnished to the commission, Mr. Sarker gave his analysis of the causes of the famine and his views on the future.

- 17th. A meeting of the Working Committee of the Bengal Provincial Hindu Mahasabha was held in Calcutta, Dr. S. P. Mookerjee presiding. The meeting passed a resolution contending that due to the bad storage arrangements of the Bengal Government, thousands of maunds of foodstuff become decomposed and had to be thrown away.

The Gandhi-Jinnah meeting lasted an hour and a half.

Sir A. Ramaswami Mudaliar, supply member, opening the National Rolling Mill near Calcutta said that the progress the country had made during the war, especially industrial progress, was a matter of great satisfaction. To some extent, it had exceeded pre-war ideas.

Sir Zia-ud-Din Ahmed, Vice-Chancellor, Aligarh Muslim University and a signatory to the Sargent scheme of post-war education, in an article examined the scheme from the Muslim point of view.

- 18th. Sir John Burder and Messrs Guthrie, Campbell and Fairbairn gave evidence before the Famine Inquiry Commission on behalf of the Bengal Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah, President of the All-India Muslim League issued an "Id" message. He said: "Since my last "Id" message to you, our progress as a nation has been steady and solid. We have moved from strength to strength, and to-day, I am happy to say, I find the Mussalmans of India united as one man, ready for any sacrifice for the advancement of our national cause."

- 19th. The Gandhi-Jinnah talks lasted 90 minutes. Mahatma Gandhi's earnest prayer to all present was that if they had the good of the country at heart and wanted India to be free and independent at the earliest moment, they should establish the closest bonds of friendship between Hindus and Muslims and members of all other communities. That was the best that every one of them was expected to do and could do.

Sikh opposition to Rajagopalachari—Gandhi formula was voiced by a number of speakers including Master Tara Singh, Sardar Mangal Singh, M.L.A., (Central) and Sardar Ajit Singh, Frontier Minister, in the course of speeches delivered at the Rawalpindi Akali Conference.

Mr. G. O. DeCruz, President of the Southern India Anglo-Indian and Domiciled European Association referred to the future of Anglo-Indians in the national life of the country, with particular reference to education and colonisation.

- 20th. Id-ul Fitr, one of the most important Muslim festivals, which marks the end of the 30 days' fast in the month of Ramzan, was celebrated throughout India. Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Labour Member to the Government of India, at a meeting organized by the Hyderabad State Scheduled Castes' Federation, emphasised that the goal of the depressed classes was the sharing of the power of the Government of the country.
- 21st. The Gandhi-Jinnah talks lasted over 100 minutes. The main point at issue appeared to be the question of plebiscite. While the Rajagopalachari formula insisted on a plebiscite before Pakistan is brought into being, Mr. Jinnah was understood to be determined on Muslims having the right to Pakistan without a plebiscite. H. E. Mr. R. G. Casey, Governor of Bengal, in a message broadcast to the people of Bengal from Calcutta, said: "The comparative steadiness of the price of rice at its substantially reduced level is solid cause for both satisfaction and confidence in the progress Bengal is making towards recovery, although no one is complacent about it."
- The revised draft code of Hindu Law, prepared by the Hindu Law Committee, appointed by the Government of India, was published for general information. Mr. Srinivasa Sastri, in a speech in Madras, strongly defended his proposal for reference of the Pakistan issue to an international court of arbitration. He failed to understand how, when Indians agreed to divide, anybody in the world would regard them as a united body. That division of India into Pakistan and Hindustan would neither promote unity nor secure independence for them, was the theme of an address delivered by Dr. Moonje in Madras.
- 22nd. The Policy Committee of the U. N. R. R. A. passed a resolution which would empower the U. N. R. R. A. to extend its activities to India should famine and disease prevail there. Mr. B. M. Birla in his presidential address at the second quarterly general meeting of the Indian Chamber of Commerce, Calcutta, discussed the question of industrialisation of the country and the difficulty in the way of its achievement.
- 23rd. The Gandhi-Jinnah talks lasted an hour-and-a-half. Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan, announced the postponement of the Muslim League Committee which was fixed for September 27. Dr. B. S. Moonje, addressing a public meeting in Madras, appealed to all Hindus to consolidate their ranks as the only effective means of safeguarding the integrity of India and her freedom in the future. Dr. P. Varadarajulu presided over the meeting. The Mysore Government sustained two defeats in the Representative Assembly, when the House expressed itself against the Mysore Prisons (amendment) Bill and the Mysore City Municipalities (Amendment) Bill. The Secretary, Hyderabad State Andhra Conference issued a statement on the food situation in the State, stressing the immediate need for effecting certain changes in the procurement scheme adopted by the Government. The Working Committee of the All-India Scheduled Castes Federation in a resolution adopted in Madras, expressed disapproval of "the secret negotiations which are being carried on by Mr. Jinnah for a settlement between the Hindus and Muslims" on the ground that communal settlement of a sectional character "is harmful in every way". Rao Bahadur N. Sivaraj presided. Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Labour Member, Government of India, participated in the deliberations.
- 24th. Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, addressing a public meeting in Madras, canvassed the view that the Scheduled Castes were a separate element in the national life of India. Rao Bahadur N. Sivaraj presided. Mahatma Gandhi in a statement referred to the publication of a report in a local paper that the Sevagram Ashram was to be disbanded.
- 25th. The Gandhi-Jinnah talks continued. A meeting of the Muslim League Assembly Party was held under the presidency of Mr. Ghulam Hossain Hidayatullah to discuss certain administrative matters on which the provincial League working committee had made adverse comments. The meeting was held at the instance of the premier who had been

directed by the League High command to place the matter before the League Assembly Party.

The Nawab of Chhattari, President of the Nizam's Executive Council, inaugurating the 19th. annual session of the Bombay Provincial Muslim Educational conference at Poona, outlined certain features which, he said, should be stressed in the education of Muslims.

Khan Bahadur M. Khuhro, Revenue Minister, Sindh, who resigned, was arrested at his residence.

26th. Mr. L. S. Amery, Secretary of State for India, who returned from inspecting Indian divisions fighting in Italy, vigorously repudiated at a Press conference the allegations published in the U.S.A. that the Indian Army was "Mercenary" and its morale "low."

The Bombay Provincial Muslim Educational conference, which concluded its two day session, adopted a number of resolutions on the Sargent scheme for post-war educational development of India.

A plea to safeguard the interests of Indian Christians in any future constitution was put forward at a meeting of the executive committee of the All-India Council of Indian Christians in Calcutta. Raja Sir Maharaj Singh presided.

27th. The protracted Gandhi-Jinnah talks initiated at the instance of Mahatma Gandhi on September 9, with a view to arriving at a settlement between the Congress and the Muslim League, failed.—At the end of the day's talk Mr. Jinnah in a brief statement said: "I regret to say I have failed in the task of converting Mr. Gandhi. We have therefore released to the Press the correspondence that has passed between us."

With the immersion of images of Goddess Durga in the Hooghly river, the main celebrations of the Puja festivities in Calcutta came to an end.

The India (Miscellaneous Provisions) Bill which made certain minor technical amendments to the Government of India Act was given a second reading in the House of Commons, after a brief explanation by Mr. Amery and an assurance that nothing in the Bill had been the subject of controversy in India.

28th. Mahatma Gandhi said at a Press conference in Bombay: "It is a matter of deep regret that we could not reach an agreement, but there is no cause for disappointment."

Sir A. P. Patro, ex-minister of the Madras Government, inaugurated at the co-operators' Home in the Praja Paksha (people's) Party, under the presidency of Dr. T. S. Siddappa.

Mr. Amery declined in the Commons to say anything about the breakdown of the Gandhi-Jinnah discussions until the situation was cleared.

29th. Mr. V. D. Savarkar, President of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha, in a statement from Bombay, said that the proposal to vivisect India had assumed "a far more dangerous aspect now when the Gandhi-Jinnah talks are adjourned than it had on the day when the talks began." He appealed to all those opposed to the partitioning of India to support the Akhand Hindusthan Leaders' Conference.

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Labour Member, replying to the Municipal address at Rajahmundry, said: "If as a result of the end of the Gandhi-Jinnah talks, Mr. Gandhi now believes that he must revise his ideology, there is a great prospect before the country."

30th. Mr. A. K. Fazlul Huq, the Premier of Bengal, in a statement on the breakdown of the Bombay talks, said: "The time has been when representatives of all sections of Muslim political thought in India should come together and decide the best means of achieving the independence of India and of having their Pakistan also, if indispensably necessary."

Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukerjee, interviewed on the breakdown of the Gandhi-Jinnah talks, said: "Mr. Gandhi called for a rebuff from Mr. Jinnah and he has got it. Mr. Jinnah has nothing to lose from the breakdown of the talks. He must be happy that Mr. Gandhi has at last agreed to the principle of partition of India though he has not accepted all of Mr. Jinnah's terms for giving effect to it."

Mr. Ghulam Muhammad, the Finance Member, presenting the Budget for the Hyderabad State, said: "I have no proposals for levying any additional taxes or for reduction or modification in any of the existing ones."

October 1944

Mahatma Gandhi's 75th. birthday was celebrated at Wardha and other places.

The Sindh Government stopped the annual grant of Rs. 12,000 to the D. J. National College, Hyderabad.

Glowing tributes to the services of Dr. Annie Besant in the cause of Indian nationalism were paid at a public meeting in Madras.

Dr. B. B. Ambedkar, Labour Member to the Government of India strongly criticized the Gandhi-Jinnah talks in Bombay.

Mr. L. S. Amery, Secretary of State for India, in reply to a question in the House of Commons, said: I understand from published reports that the conversation between Mr. Jinnah and Mr. Gandhi broke down over the issue of Pakistan."

Mr. M. A. Jinnah said in Bombay: "There is only one practical, realistic way of resolving Muslim-Hindu differences. This is to divide India into two sovereign parts of Pakistan and Hindustan."

Dr. Radha Kumud Mukherjee, in his presidential address to the Akhand Hindusthan Conference, in New Delhi, made an appeal to all communities to solve their problems by a comprehensive scheme of cultural autonomy.

The Punjab Christian Association Conference made the suggestion to call a round table conference of all important communities for solving the constitutional deadlock.

The India Miscellaneous Provisions Bill, which made minor amendments to the Government of India Act of 1935, was passed into law.

The Punjab Government released six prominent Akali Leaders.

The All-India Akali Conference was held at Lahore, Jathadar Pritham Singh presided. He strongly opposed the Pakistan idea.

The Central Standing Committee of the All India Shia Political Conference met at Lucknow. Mr. Syed Ali Zaheer presided:—The attitude of Mr. Jinnah in regard to the demand of the Sikhs was examined.

Mr. Amery, in reply to a question in the Commons, said: "About 15,000 Congress detainees have been released since their original detention.

The Committee of the Natal Indian Conference unanimously rejected the Presidential Property Regulation Ordinance.

Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri pleaded for a fair stand on the question of undivided India.

Lord Listowel was appointed Parliamentary Under-secretary for India.

1st. Mahatma Gandhi and party returned to Sewagram. The Council of the National Liberal Federation of India, at its meeting at Allahabad, passed, among other, resolutions, one noting with regret the wholly unjustifiable agitation against the Indian Community in Natal by important bodies of Europeans in that province.

2nd. The Sindh Government in the Education Department stopped the annual grant of Rs. 12,000 to the D. J. National College, Hyderabad, affiliated to the University of Bombay for the B. A., and B. Sc., degree courses.

Glowing tributes to the services of Dr. Annie Besant in the cause of Indian Nationalism were paid at a public meeting held in Madras to celebrate the "Founder's Day" of the young Men's Indian Association with Sir S. Varadachariar in the chair.

At a Press Conference in Bombay, Sir John Woodhead, Chairman of the Famine Inquiry Commission said that the work of the Commission was not merely concerned with a post-mortem of the past, but it also took a long term

view of the whole question of famine in India and included such problems as food procurement and diet.

Mahatma Gandhi's birthday celebrations began at Wardha. The Congress flag was unfurled by Prof. Bhansali.

Chaudhury Khaliq-uz-zaman, a member of the Muslim League Working Committee said at Bhopal, "The breakdown of negotiations between Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah has caused deep disappointment throughout the country, There is, however, a ray of hope that they may yet meet again to find a solution."

George Bernard Shaw sent congratulations to Mahatma Gandhi on his 75th birthday.

3rd. Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, in the course of an address on "our culture and Heritage" in Madras, observed: "The keynote of Indian heritage and culture was striving towards unity and amalgamation, and it was not in consonance with their history or traditions to break up India's oneness."

4th. Mr. M. A. Jinnah, President of the All-India Muslim League, at a Press conference in Bombay, strongly criticized Mahatma Gandhi's offer to the Muslim League during the talks in Bombay. He declared that if the League had consented to Mahatma Gandhi's terms, it would have brought in a National Government, "with an overwhelming and solid Hindu majority, which would mean virtual Hindu Raj."

Mr. M. A. Jinnah, answering a question at the Press interview in Bombay, said: It is not true that the Lahore session of the League Council gave me full sanction to negotiate with Gandhiji on the basis of C. R. formula."

Dr. Moonje, in an interview at Bezwada, said: "The Hindu Mahasabha had no quarrels with Dr. Ambedkar. "In fact," he added, "all his demands are conceded by the Sabha. If we had any quarrels it was with Mahatma Gandhi."

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Labour Member to the Government of India, strongly criticized the Gandhi-Jinnah talks, in a statement from Bombay.

5th. Mr. Amery, in the House of Commons, replying to a question on Bombay talks said: "I understand from published reports that the conversation between Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah broke down over the issue of Pakistan, but that both gave expression to the hope that this was not the final end of their effort. Pending further development, there would seem to be no useful opening for intervention on the part of the Government."

The Bengal Legislative Council, after six weeks' recess met to resume consideration of the Agriculture Incometax Bill—the main business for the session, there being 21 adjournments on the agenda.

His Excellency the Governor of Orissa, at a Press Conference, stated that Mr. B. N. Gokhale had been appointed Second Adviser.—He would be in charge, among others, of Post-War Planning, Health and Local Self-Government.

Mr. Amery told the Commons, he could not see any reason for releasing Pandit Nehru and others who had made no response to the Viceroy's invitation of last February to abandon the policy of non-co-operation and obstruction.

6th. In the Bengal Legislative Council, six non-official resolutions were passed without opposition.—By one of the resolutions, moved by Mr. Bankim Chandra Mukherjee (Hindu Nationalist), the House agreed to present an address to the Governor requesting him "to direct the Government of Bengal to take immediate steps", in compliance with the judgment of the High Court regarding the order of supersession of the Howrah Municipality, and also to safeguard the interest of ratepayers of the Municipality in accordance with the provisions of the Bengal Municipal Act.

Dr. Syed Mahmud, member of the Congress Working Committee was released on grounds of health. Dr. Mahmud was arrested on Aug. 9, 1942.

Mr. Krishna Menon, Secretary of the India League, commenting on Mr. Amery's refusal to release Pandit Nehru and other political prisoners, said: Mr. Amery's answer shows that the deadlock is to continue so long as he is in office."

A public meeting of the Muslims of Bombay was held under the auspices of the Bombay Provincial Muslim League.—The meeting while regretting the breakdown of the Gandhi-Jinnah talks for a settlement, fully supported the stand taken by Mr. Jinnah during the talks and expressed its complete confidence in his leadership.

The Working Committee of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha passed a resolution condemning the Rajagopalachari formula and Gandhijee's scheme "as being destructive of the integrity of India and being detrimental to the interest of the Hindus as well as of the country as a whole".

Mr. M. A. Jinnah, in a conversation with a foreign correspondent in Bombay, said: "There is only one practical, realistic way of resolving Muslim-Hindu differences. This is to divide India into sovereign parts of Pakistan and Hindustan".

7th. A Press note issued by the Bombay Government said: "Statements have appeared in the Press that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has been suffering from influenza. This is not correct. Pandit Nehru had an ordinary cold, from which he has recovered, and he is now alert and vigorous and in good health. No fever was recorded and no complaint of fever made".

Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee, in his presidential address to the Akhand Hindustan Conference (in New Delhi) made a plea to all communities to solve their problems by a comprehensive scheme of cultural autonomy, and combine to build up India as a democracy whose power would have to be reckoned with by the Comity of Nations.

The Punjab Christians' Association Conference made the suggestion to call a round-table Conference of representatives of all important communities in India for solving the Constitutional deadlock.

Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherjee, President of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha, presiding over the U. P. Hindu Conference at Gorakhpur, said: "The Hindu Mahasabha unhesitatingly repudiates any scheme of India's partition as a sin and patent untruth which must not admit of any compromise."

8th. The Akhand Hindustan Conference with Dr. Radha Kumud Mookherjee in the chair passed a resolution declaring its faith in the oneness and integrity of India and placing on record its firm conviction that the partition of India would be fatal to the best interests of the country as a whole and to those of every community of India.

The Famine Inquiry Commission arrived in Madras. The Commission's visit to Madras included a tour of Calicut, Cochin, Travancore and Bezwada.

Mr. P. Reid, Chairman of the South India Branch of the European Association, presiding at the annual meeting of the Association in Madras, said: "To those who have India's independence at heart, let me say that they have the good will of every European, but let India prepare herself for independence. It is the responsibility for the well-being of 40,000,000 souls—a responsibility not to be lightly handed over nor cheaply received".

Speaking at a meeting in Madras, Mr. C. Rajagopalachari said that the essential issues emerging from the Gandhi-Jinnah talks were two fold, viz, how to determine the areas wherein Muslims preponderated and how to ascertain the will of the people in such areas.

9th. In the Bengal Legislative Council, Sir Nazimuddin, Chief Minister, explained the position in Bengal in regard to restriction on public meetings.

Dr. T. S. S. Rajan, addressing a public meeting at Trichinopoly expressed the view that all sincere patriots would be bitterly disappointed by the unsatisfactory outcome of the talks between Gandhiji and Mr. Jinnah.

The 14th. Educational week celebration in Madras was inaugurated in Madras, by Professor K. V. Ramaswami Iyengar, who spoke on the Sargent Scheme of Education.

10th. Mr. Srinivas Sastri in a message to the Akhand Hindustan Conference held in New Delhi, said: "There is abundant reason to believe that a large section of Congressmen are opposed to the division of the country but it is not easy to determine their number with accuracy. When we add them to those non-Congressmen similarly opposed, the aggregate will be such as a responsible statesman must respect and hesitate to overrule."

An "Assembly of U. P. Congressmen" was formed at Cawnpore on the first day of the Conference of Released Congressmen, held under the Presidentship of Mr. Sampurnanand.

Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, reviewing the Gandhi-Jinnah talks at a public meeting in Madras, said that the proposals made by Gandhiji contained "a perfectly good and reasonable arrangement" and he was quite hopeful that sooner or later a Hindu-Muslim settlement on that basis would be reached.

11th. The India Miscellaneous Provisions Bill, which made minor amendments to the Government of India Act of 1935, passed its remaining stages in the Commons and was read the third time without discussion. It has now passed both Houses and awaits Royal assent.

The Famine Inquiry Commission heard in Madras, Messrs. A. R. O. Westlake and E. O. Wood, Members of the Board of Revenue and discussed with them extent of the famine in the affected areas in the Ceded districts and also various relief measures undertaken by the Government. There was a general discussion about the provisions of the Famine Code.

Mr. M. M. Gazdar, Home Minister, Sindh, who returned from a tour of the Hur area, said that the Hur trouble might be considered as a closed chapter.

Mrs. V. L. Pandit, while addressing the Representative Assembly of U. P. Congressmen, said: "Gandhiji: is contemplating giving new lead presently to the country."

12th. The Punjab Government passed orders for the release of six prominent Akali leaders, including Sardar Siabar Singh, Sardar Udham Singh Nagokei and Sardar Waryam Singh.

The Bengal Legislative Council passed clause 66 and the Schedule of the Agricultural Income-tax Bill without any amendment.

The Representative Assembly of U. P. Congressmen at Cawnpore, after a full dress debate, lasting nearly eight hours, adopted a resolution, moved by Mr. Sampurnanand, regretting the breakdown of the Gandhi-Jinnah talks. Eabu Purushottam Das Tandon presided.

Mr. Amery told the Commons that six months after the ban on the employment of women underground had been lifted, the Government of India, in accordance with their undertaking, reviewed the position.

13th. In the Bengal Legislative Council, the question of the rights and privileges of Indians in reconquered Burma was raised by a special motion.

The Famine Inquiry Commission, at the conclusion of its sittings (in Madras) held a Press Conference, at which the Chairman and members answered questions put to them.

14th. The two-day session of the Bengal Provincial Radical Democratic Party Conference commenced at Jaynagar Majilpur, about 31 miles from Calcutta. Mr. Amarendranath Chattopadhyaya, M. L. A. (Central) presiding. Delegates from different parts of the province and outside attended.

The All-India Akali Conference opened at Lahore, thousands of Sikhs from the Punjab and other Provinces came to attend the Conference.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah, in a two hours interview to the correspondent of the *Daily Worker* of London, cleared several points about Pakistan.

15th. Jathedar Pritham Singh, President of the All-India Akali Conference in his speech at Lahore, said: "We, Sikhs are opposed to Pakistan which will cut us into two. Mr. Jinnah invites us to Pakistan by promising us safeguards. If safeguards alone can suffice, why, I ask him, does he not agree to stay in Hindustan with safeguards for the Muslims."

A Press Communique from New Delhi said: "H. M. G. in the course of the previous announcement regarding food imports, undertook to give further consideration to India's requirements for the fourth quarter of 1944. This has now been completed and shipping and supply are being arranged for approximately 300,000 tons of wheat and wheat products to be loaded for India in the months of October, November and December."

16th. The Punjab Youth League Conference, under the Chairmanship of Sardar Gurmukh Singh Jhabbal, adopted a resolution that Pakistan, Azad Punjab and Akalistan were equally harmful to the interests of the Sikh Community and that the Youth League was opposed to the vivisection of the country and to any attempt to divide the Sikhs into two parts. The resolution was carried unanimously.

The Central Standing Committee of the All-India Shia Political Conference met at Lucknow, under the Presidentship of Mr. Syed Ali Zabeer, to examine the attitude of Mr. M. A. Jinnah in regard to the demand of the Shias.

The establishment of Utkal University gave a great impetus to higher education in Orissa, and the people of the States and of British Orissa were working side by side for the preservation and advancement of their own culture.

Mr. K. M. Munshi, in a statement from Bombay, said *inter alia*: "The theory that Islam was not only a religion but also a Fatherland was in vogue thirty years ago. This old-world philosophy making the Church and the State indivisible was exploded during and after World War I."

17th. The Madras Philosophical Association was inaugurated by Sir Radha Krishnan, Vice-Chancellor of the Benares University, before a large gathering of citizens and educationists. Dr. A. Lakshmanawami Mudaliar, Vice-Chancellor of the Madras University presided.

The Members of the Famine Enquiry Commission after a busy programme at Calicut left for Ernakulam.

Sir Ardeshar Dalal, Member for Planning and Development, Government of India, held a Press conference at Lahore, which ended abruptly, the Press representatives walking out in protest.

18th. Sardar Mangal Singh in an interview at Lahore said: "The Sikhs are under no circumstances ready to go in for Pakistan or consent to submit to any communal domination. They want to follow the policy of "live and let live" with their Hindu and Muslim brethren as an equally free community in a United Free India."

19th. Mr. L. S. Amery in reply to a question in the House of Commons declared: "About 15,000 Congress detainees have been released since their original detention."

His Highness the Maharaja of Kashmir appointed Mr. M. A. Beg and Wazir Gangaram as his first two popular Ministers.

Mr. L. S. Amery, speaking at a meeting of the East India Association, said: "I can say that the Government of this country only wants to see Indian Industry developing to the fullest. The last thing industrialists of this country have in mind is the idea that the British export industry can best prosper by India being held back in the course of her industrial development."

Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, addressing a public meeting in Madras, urged the country to adopt the Cripps scheme minus the self-determination clause, and uttered a warning that posterity would curse those who started the Pakistan idea.

20th. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, declined to avail himself of the permission granted to Working Committee Members by the Government of India to have interviews with relatives on domestic matters.

The Famine Enquiry Commission which arrived at Trivandrum for the purpose of acquainting themselves with the methods of procurement and the system of State-wide rationing had an informal discussion with the Dewan, Sachivothama Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar.

21st. Srimati Kamaladevi Chattopadhyaya, President of the All-India Women's conference, addressing a mass meeting at Calicut stressed the need for more selfless workers to serve the country.

22nd. A resolution expressing confidence in Mr. Jinnah was passed at a conference (at Lahore) of prominent Muslim League Leaders and Workers of the Punjab, including M. L. A's and presidents and secretaries of the various district and city Leagues in the Province.

Inaugurating a Conference on Post-War Development organized by the Dharwar District Local Board, Mr. M. R. Masani declared that "any plan worth the name must be not only post-war but post-Swaraj."

Dr. G. S. Arundale, President of the Theosophical Society, in a Press interview at Allahabad suggested that Hindus should offer Muslims fifty percent representation at the centre.

23rd. In the Bengal Legislative Council, a walk-out by the members of the opposition excepting two, marked the proceedings when after a week's recess the Agricultural Income-tax Bill was taken up for consideration.

Dr. Syed Mahmud, former Member of the Congress Working Committee, in a statement to the Press set out the circumstances which led to his release from detention. His release followed a letter which he wrote to the Viceroy.— Dr. Mahmud said: "I made it clear in my letter that I was not writing to get my release but my object was something high and different."

Mahatma Gandhi in a statement on Dr. Mahmud's correspondence with the Viceroy said: "Congressmen should read without passion Dr. Mahmud's letter to the Viceroy and his statement to the Press releasing those letters."

Master Tara Singh, the Akali Leader, in a statement said: "The Sikh position has always been that they are prepared to agree to pure unadulterated nationalism throughout India, provided that Muslims and the other minorities also agree."

24th. In the Bengal Legislative Council, the debate on the third reading of the Agricultural Income-tax Bill came to an abrupt end following a closure motion, by a member of the Ministerialist Party. The opposition left the Chamber as a mark of protest. The Bill was passed without any modification.

The Committee of the Natal Indian Congress unanimously rejected the Presidential Property Regulation Ordinance, and asked Prime Minister Smuts to receive a deputation before the 2nd reading of the ordinance.

25th. The Bengal Legislative Council was prorogued. The session occupying over 8 months with 90 working days was the longest in the history of the House.

It was announced that the Central Government appointed a Mica Inquiry Committee to inquire into the immediate as well as the long-term problems of the mica mining industry with Mr. Justice D. E. Reuben, I. C. S., of the Patna High Court, as Chairman.

The Commonwealth Party (independent left wing party founded by Sir Richard Acland) issued the following statement on the policy of the party on India: "If, as the British Government insists, there is no practical difference between Dominion Status and national independence, we are allowing sentiment to conquer sense in refusing to allow independence to Indians. To withhold it until all differences of minorities have been resolved, is equivalent to a direct refusal."

Dr. Radha Kumud Mukherjee, President of the Akhand Bharat Conference, said at Lucknow: "The Akhand Bharat Conference was convened to give expression to the opposition of Hindu and national India to schemes for the partition of India, as a means for solving the communal problem."

26th. The India (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, which made certain minor amendments to the Government of India Act of 1935, became law. Royal assent was signified in the House of Lords by a Royal commission to this and a number of other Bills.

Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, in a statement from Madras, advised Congressmen to broaden the basis of collaborators and "challenge the British Government to carry out H.M.G.'s declaration in Parliament on March 11, 1942 to take steps to further that declared policy at once and not to allow the present regime in India to continue for an indefinite period."

Dr. N. B. Khare, Member, Viceroy's Executive Council, criticized Mahatma Gandhi's statement in which he asked the public "to condone Dr. Syed Mahmud's action and not to import any passion."

Mr. L. S. Amery, replying to an inquiry in the House of Commons, declared: "Despite many calls upon them for other urgent purposes during the past year, H. M. G. have provided shipping for the import of 800,000 tons of foodgrains into India since Oct. 1943, and provision for a further 300,000 tons to the end of the present year has just been announced, with the promise of consideration next month of future requirements."

27th. Mr V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, in the course of an address in Madras, pleaded for a firm stand on the question of undivided India. He also forecast the possibility of the Cripps proposals being offered again.

Mahatma Gandhi in a note entitled "Hints for workers on the constructive Programme" which he sent to the congressmen meeting in Bombay, said: "Its wholesale fulfilment is complete independence."

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Labour Member, Government of India, addressing the plenary labour conference in New Delhi, suggested changes in the constitution of the conference in order to remove organizational weakness discovered during its two years' existence.

A Press note from Bombay said: "The 3rd. meeting of the General Policy Committee (post-war reconstruction) commenced under the Chairmanship of Sir Ardeahir Dalal, Member for Planning and Development, Government of India.

28th. A survey of India's food policy in 1943-44, said: "It is comparatively simple to plan for some definite objective on which there is general agreement. Food lends itself to such planning. Food enters into almost every economic and social problem.

Mahatma Gandhi in a note entitled "Hints for workers on the constructive programme" which he sent to the conference of Congressmen in Bombay, said: "Workers should definitely realise that the constructive programme is the non-violent and truthful way of winning complete independence."

29th. Mr. M. S. Aney, India's Representative in Ceylon, arrived in New Delhi.

Mr. K. S. Gupta gave notice in the Central Assembly of an adjournment motion to discuss "the failure of the Government of India to provide adequate facilities to prevent or check epidemics like Cholera, Malaria (malignant type), sores (fatal in most cases) and dysentery."

Presiding over a public meeting in Madras, Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Aiyar spoke on "The States and the problem of Indian Federation." Sir N. Gopalaswami Iyengar emphasised the point that it was unthinkable to have any kind of federation in India unless the States also came into that scheme.

30th. Four of the five scientists visiting Britain spent at historic places in Yorkshire.

Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, member of the Congress Working Committee, addressing the students of the Osmania University said the duty of the older generation was to teach the younger generation, not merely reverence for the past, but in the words of Napoleon, "to become their own ancestors."

31st. In an editorial on India, the *Manchester Guardian* said: "All agree that there is urgent need of drastic changes in India's social and economic organization. No temporary Government can put through these changes. We must either make it clear that external control, British or international, is to be permanent or we must succeed, at all costs, in compelling India to assume the full responsibility of self-government."

Two public meetings, organized by a joint committee of different organizations, were held in Calcutta and resolutions supporting the main principles of the Hindu Code were passed.

It was officially announced in London that Lord Listowel was appointed parliamentary Under-secretary for India.

The parliamentary under-secretary for India, Lord Munster, was appointed parliamentary under-secretary at the Home office.

A copy of a letter written by Abul Kalam Azad, Congress president, to the then Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow, on February 13, 1943, denying the charges made against the Congress, in the Viceroy's letter to Mahatma Gandhi, was issued to the Press by Dr. Syed Mahmud, a former member of the Congress Working Committee.

November 1944

Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru's 55th. birthday was celebrated in Madras and other places.

H. E. Sir Hawthorn Lewis, Governor of Orissa and the first Chancellor of the Utkal University inaugurated the university of Orissa at Cuttack.

A resolution expressing confidence in Mr. M. A. Jinnah, was passed by the working committee of the Bengal Provincial Muslim League.

Mr. V. D. Savarkar, in a statement said that he was unwilling to work as the President of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha, any longer, on account of failing health.

Mr. C. P. N. Sinha was appointed vice-chancellor of the Patna University.

H. E. the Maharaja of Bikaner announced an important constitutional advance involving more powers to the Bikaner State Legislative Assembly.

H. E. the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir appointed a Cabinet consisting of H. E. the Maharani of Jammu and Kashmir, Major General Rai Bahadur Thakur Janak Singh and Sir B. Narsingh Rau, Prime Minister of the State to deal with the civil administration of the State in his absence.

The Earl of Listowel, under-Secretary for India, said in London that he had intense belief in the right of Indians to choose their own form of Government.

His Excellency the Viceroy prorogued the session of the Legislative Assembly.

Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherjee was nominated by the Gujarat Provincial Hindu Sabha for the presidentship of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha.

1st. H. E. Sir Hawthorn Lewis, Governor of Orissa, and the first Chancellor of the Utkal University, inaugurated the University of Orissa at Cuttack before a large gathering including representatives of both the Province and Orissa States.

The Opening Session of the Central Legislative Assembly, without a division rejected Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan's adjournment motion to discuss "the Governor-General-in-Council's 'failure' to prevent misuse of the National War Front organization by the Punjab Premier for propaganda in favour of a political party.

The general secretary of the Committee of Indian Congress-men in Britain, Mr. A. N. Bose left London for India.

2nd. Dr. Sachchidananda Sinha, Vice-Chancellor of the Patna University, in his address delivered at the first convocation of Utkal University, held at Cuttack, said: "Historical facts establish the martial ardour and high culture of the people of Orissa in ancient days and form a suitable background to their progress and advancement in modern times in various spheres of activities."

The Famine Inquiry Commission, which returned to New Delhi on the conclusion of its visits to Provinces and States, announced that it intended to submit a preliminary report on Bengal to the Government of India, and might also make recommendations on matters relating to the food situation in the country requiring attention in the immediate future.

A resolution expressing confidence in Mr. Jinnah's leadership and supporting the stand taken by him during the talks with Mahatma Gandhi was passed at a meeting of the working committee of the Bengal Provincial Muslim League held under the presidency of Maulana Akram Khan.

A decision to unite the All-India Muslim League to hold its next meeting at Bangalore was taken at an extraordinary meeting of the Bangalore and Coorg Provincial Muslim League Council held at Bangalore.

The Government of India sustained its first defeat of the session when the adjournment motion moved by the Muslim League Party was carried. The subject matter of the motion was the failure of the East Indian Railway to maintain adequate lighting arrangements at Bakhtairpur railway station.

Mr. V. D. Savarkar, President of the Hindu Mahasabha issued the following statement from Bombay: "As the time for the election of the President of the Hindu Mahasabha is drawing close, I think it desirable to remind the Mahasabhita electorate all over India of the request which I made to them in August 1944, that I have decided not to accept the presidentship for the next year. The heavy work involved in discharging my duties as the President for seven years has affected my health.

3rd. In the Central Legislative Assembly, Mr. Lalchand Navlati (Congress) asked: "What are the grounds for the Government's belief that if the arrests of Mr. Gandhi and the Congress leaders had not taken place in August, 1942, the Congress would have negotiated on their own with Japan, in the face of Mr. Gandhi's clear repudiation of such a belief."—Replying, Sir Francis Mudie, Home Member, said: "Government have never had any such belief."

The Central Assembly discussed a non-official resolution moved on behalf of the Muslim League Party requesting the Government not to entertain the Bombay plan for the development of India.

A long term all-India 15 year reconstruction plan and a more detailed plan for the first five years suggested by the Reconstruction Committee of the Viceroy's Council, in their second report on post-war planning, was published from New Delhi.

4th. The Committee appointed by the Bengal Government to inquire into the

provincial administration machinery started work in Calcutta, Sir Archibald Rowlands, late Adviser to the Viceroy on war administration, was the Chairman.

A Press note from New Delhi stated: "The Government of India have imposed the same disabilities on South Africans of non-Indian origin as Indians suffer from in the Union of South Africa."

Maharaja S. C. Nandy of Cossimbazar, inaugurating the All-India Anti-Hindu Code Conference in Benares, uttered a warning that the Draft Hindu Code would result in the final disintegration of the joint family system which had been till now an excellent security plan for Hindu Society in general.

5th. The Australian Government Trade Commissioner in India, Mr. H. R. Gollan, left India for Australia for consultation with the Australian Government on matters relating to post-war trade and the development of reciprocal commercial relations between India and Australia.

Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, addressing a meeting of the Tagore Memorial Debating Society in Madras, strongly criticised the Dumbarton Oaks World Security Plan and put forth proposals for the establishment of permanent peace in the world.

6th. The Central Legislative Assembly without a division passed Dr. N. B. Khare's (Commonwealth Relations Member) motion that the position of Indians in South Africa and East Africa be taken into consideration, with amendments moved by the Congress Party and by Mr. Hoosainbhoj Laljee.—The amendments asked that powers under the Reciprocity Act be applied against South African nationals in India, that the Indian High Commissioner in South Africa be recalled, and that economic sanctions enforced against South Africa and East Africa.

The Government of India approved the release regulations for the Indian Army and Women's Services, India.

7th. The Central Legislative Assembly, by 55 votes to 15, rejected Bhai Paramananda's adjournment motion to discuss the Sindh Government's ban on Chapter 14 of the *Satyarth Prakash*, the sacred book of the Arya Samajists.

Mr. C. P. N. Sinha, provincial leader of the National War Front, was appointed Vice-chancellor of the Patna University for three years.

Support for the draft Hindu Code was accorded at a meeting organized by the girls' section of Ashutosh College, Calcutta.

Mr. W. H. Kirby, Rationing Adviser to the Government of India, interviewed by the A. P. I. in Bombay, said that in the interest of the public, food control measures should continue even after the war.

A demand for the release of Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, who had been the President of the Allahabad Youth League, and other members of the Congress Working Committee was made in a resolution passed by the Allahabad Youth League.

8th. In the Central Legislative Assembly, vigorous criticism of the Government's food administration in the country was made when the food debate was resumed in the Assembly.

Mr. P. J. Griffiths (European Group) said that his group were satisfied with the policy but not with the administration of that policy. In the sphere of the enforcement of its policy, the administration had been lamentably weak.

9th. The Central Legislative Assembly concluded the food debate after passing two amendments to the Food Member's motion that the situation be taken into consideration.

In the Council of State, Mr. Hossain Imam's resolution urging the appointment of a Committee to inquire into the coal situation and report on ways of increasing production including compulsory amalgamations on nationalization, if necessary, was rejected by 23 votes to 7.

In the House of Commons, Mr. Sorenson (Lab) asked the Secretary of State for India whether full considerations had been given to the effect of increased Currency in India due to the expansion of Anglo-American armies and what action was being taken to deal with the economic problem involved.

Mr. Amery replied that the expansion was undoubtedly one of the many contributory factors in increasing the economic strain upon India. The Government of India and H. M. G. had for a long time been engaged in measures to offset this strain.

10th. In the Central Legislative Assembly, the Chair ruled out of order Mr.

Kazmi's adjournment motion to discuss "the surreptitious opening of private letters and thereby interfering with the Civic liberties of the people of India, as exemplified by the opening of a letter addressed to Dr. Katju, ex-Minister, U. P., and by mistake enclosing in it another letter which was intended for some other person."

Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherjee, presiding over the Punjab Hindu Maha Sabha Conference, which opened at Ludhiana declared: "There cannot be any compromise with any fantastic claim for cutting India to pieces either on communal or on provincial considerations."

H. H. the Maharaja of Bikaner, on the occasion of the official celebration of his birthday announced all important Constitutional step forward, involving more power to the Bikaner State Legislative Assembly.

- 11th. At the Press Conference held in Madras, Mr. G. W. Priestly, Adviser to H. E. the Governor of Madras, reviewing the food position in the Province during the fortnight ending October, 31, 1944, stated that arrangements for the introduction of informal rationing in the rural area in the six deficit districts were in hand.

The Punjab Hindu Conference passed a resolution recording its emphatic disapproval of Mr. Rajagopalachari's formula and the standing offer of Mahatma Gandhi to the Muslim League for a settlement on that basis "as it concedes the principles of division of the country.

- 12th. His Excellency the Governor of Sindh appointed Khan Bahadur Mir Ghulam Ali Talpur and Mr. Roger Thomas as Ministers.

- 13th. The adjourned session of the Mysore Representative Assembly was held at Mysore, Pradhana Siromoni Madhava Rao, Dewan President, presiding.

In the Central Legislative Assembly the Home Member, in reply to questions, told the House that Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru and other members of the Congress Working Committee were detained under order issued by the Provincial Governments.

The Central Legislative Assembly passed Sir Aziz-ul Haque's Bill to amend the Indian Patents and Designs Act and his further to amend the Coffee Market Expansion Act, and Mr. J. D. Tyson's Bill further to amend the Delhi Joint Water and Sewage Board Act.

The Council of State rejected by 24 votes to 12, Pandit H. N. Kunzru's resolution recommending to the Governor General-in-Council to appoint an Industrial Commission with a non-official Indian Chairman and a majority of non-official members.

In the Assam Legislative Assembly, a number of adjournment motions were tabled; only one was allowed but discussion of it was postponed.

- 14th. In the Central Legislative Assembly, Sir Jeremy Raisman announced that on all the three points of the Public Debt Bill on which criticism in the House had centred, he was prepared to maintain the existing position.

In the Council of State, initiating the food debate, Mr. B. R. Sen, Director-General of Food, declared that the last 12 months' working of the basic plan gave ~~on~~ment the feeling that both at the Centre and in the Provinces they had now a much clearer idea of the minimum needs of the deficit areas, and they could hope that in no area in the future should they be taken completely by surprise unless there were any unforeseen developments or any unpredictable calamities.

Mahatma Gandhi, replying to a letter from Sardar Durlab Singh, General Secretary of the Central Sikh Youth League, said: "I could never be guilty of blessing anything which is contrary to the national interest. You can certainly have the assurance that the interests of the Nationalist Sikhs, as also of all Nationalists are safe in my hands and also, I presume, in the Congress hands."

- 15th. Under the auspices of the Madras Mahajana Sabha, a public meeting was held in Madras to celebrate Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's 55th birthday.

In the Central Legislative Assembly, the Finance Member's Public Debt Bill with amendments framed in agreement between Government and the opposition was passed.

In the Council of State, replying to the food debate, Sir J. P. Srivastava, Food Member, expressed Government's doubts as to their ability to feed Calcutta as they did the previous year. The demand for rice from other parts of India, especially the south, was great, he said.

16th. The Council of State, which discussed non-official resolutions, agreed to Mr. P. N. Saprú's motion recommending to the Governor-General-in-Council to take steps to protect and safeguard the rights of Indians by bilateral agreements between the Government of India and the Governments of the Dominions, Colonies and Protectorates in which Indians were resident or domiciled and to which in future emigration might be permitted by the Government of India.

In the Central Legislative Assembly, the Home Member, answering a number of questions in the Central Assembly on the detention of Mr. Jai Prakash Narain and Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, informed the House that they were treated as class I security prisoners and their health was excellent. They were not kept in solitary confinement or in underground cells.

17th. The Central Legislative Assembly passed without a division a Congress party motion that an elected committee of the House consisting of not more than 15 members be appointed to consider the several plans for the post-war economic development of India, agricultural and industrial, with instructions to report to the House.

In the Council of State, Mr. B. B. Bannerjee, Secretary, Commonwealth Relations Department, initiating the debate on South Africa, said that the struggle to obtain recognition of the rights of Indians as full citizens would be kept alive and would not stop till the goal was reached.

18th. The Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir, who left the State to visit various war fronts, appointed a cabinet consisting of H. H. the Maharani of Jammu and Kashmir, Major General Rai Bahadur Thakur Jasak Singh and Sir B. Narsingh Rau, Prime Minister of the State, to deal with the civil administration of the State in his absence.

19th. Mr. Srinivasa Sastri, former Agent General of the Government of India in South Africa, speaking on the South African problem in Madras, welcomed the cause adopted by the Government of India and the Legislative Assembly, and said that all should support the Government of India in the proposed action.

Full support to the main principles of the draft Hindu Code was given at the half-yearly meeting of the All-India Women's Conference, in Calcutta.

Sir Tej Bahadur Saprú, at a Press Conference in New Delhi, announced the decision of the Standing Committee of the Non-party Leaders' Conference to appoint a Committee to examine the communal and minorities question.

20th. In the Central Legislative Assembly, the chair disallowed Mr. Govind Deshmukh's adjournment motion to discuss the treatment of passengers at the Dhanushkodi Customs barrier where, he alleged, people were stripped naked for Customs examination.

In the Bengal Legislative Assembly, the main question before the House was the consideration of the destitute persons (Repatriation and Relief) Bill, 1944, as passed by the Council.

The Central Assembly agreed to the Finance Member's motion to circulate his Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to banking companies.

21st. In the Central Legislative Assembly, during question time, the Home Member, replying to Prof. Ranga said that from such calculations as he had been able to make from the figures supplied by the provinces, it appeared that the percentage of releases during the first six months after the promulgation of ordinance No. 3 was over 50. On Oct. 1, the number of persons undergoing imprisonment in connection with the Congress movement was 10,356.

The Council of State adjourned *sine die* after adopting a resolution moved by Sir Jogendra Singh, Member for Agriculture, regarding the constitution of the permanent food and agriculture organizations of the United Nations.

The Bengal Legislative Assembly passed, without much discussion, the Alienation of Agricultural land (temporary provisions) Bill as passed by the Legislative Council and the Murshidabad Bill, 1944.

In the Assam Legislative Assembly, Mr. Gopinath Bardoloi, Leader of the opposition, in the course of a statement on the floor of the Assembly, said: "The outlook of the Party in reference to work in the Legislature remains the same in spite of every kind of repression of the members. They shall continue to take advantage of their position in the Legislature to prevent harm being done by unwise legislation and at the same time, to work for the amelioration of the condition of the people in the countryside."

22nd. In the Bengal Legislative Assembly, statement on the situation arising out

of the strike by the workers of the Bengal Government press was made by the Finance Minister, Mr. T. C. Goswami.

The Earl of Listowel, under-secretary for India, told a Conference of London representatives of Indian Newspapers that he had intense belief in the right of Indians to choose their own form of Government and "decide for themselves whether they will eventually stay inside or go right out of the British Commonwealth."

23rd. The programme of the All-India Khaksar organization in regard to communal unity was discussed at an informal meeting of the Khaksars of Calcutta.

In the Bengal Legislative Assembly, a Bill to amend the Calcutta Improvement Trust Act of 1911 providing for the extension of its operations to the town of Howrah was introduced and referred to a select committee.

The Assam Legislative Assembly discussed Maulavi Abdul Bari Chaudhari's motion for consideration of the foodgrains procurement policy of the Assam Government.

24th. The Education Sub-committee of the Post-War Reconstructions, Bengal, recommended a scheme costing about Rs. 39 crores for introduction of free and compulsory primary education in the province.

The Viceroy prorogued the session of the Legislative Assembly.

25th. Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, in his address to the Convocation of the Nagpur University, made the suggestion that the internal differences regarding the Princes and the Muslims which had been advanced by British propagandists as standing in the way of Britain fulfilling her pledge to India to transfer power might be submitted to an Allied tribunal for arbitration.

Mr. V. D. Savarkar, President of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha left Bombay for Delhi to see the Viceroy.

It was officially announced from New Delhi that the time for submission of comments and representations on the draft Hindu Code was extended up to Dec. 31.

26th. The C-in-C, India, Gen. Auchinleck, set up a Committee, known as the Reorganization Committee, to carry out a preliminary investigation of India's defence requirements after the war, and to make recommendations regarding the size, composition and organization of the future army in India.

The All-India and Ceylon Mayors' Conference, with the Mayor of Calcutta in the chair, at their sitting declared, in a resolution that the aims and objects of the conference were: "To do everything to promote and advance full, free and unhampered civic life of the people, and to remove all restrictions and controls of the full democratic powers of the local self-governing institutions."

Dr. Saifuddin Kitchlaw, a Congress Leader of the Punjab, at a meeting organized by the Civil Liberties Union to demand the release of all political prisoners in the province, made a plea for a united front of all parties.

A dozen resolutions covering various subjects were adopted at the concluding session of the All-India and Ceylon Mayors' Conference in Calcutta.

28th. Sir M. Vieweswaraya, in his presidential address at the first Bengal Provincial Indigenous Manufacturers' Conference in Calcutta, advocated establishment of village group organizations to increase the working power and productivity of the local population, particularly in industries.

Mr. V. D. Savarkar, in answer to Press correspondents in New-Delhi, said: "No big constitutional change is likely till the end of the war. The Government favoured the maintenance of full Central control as long as the war lasted, and not even an agreement between Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah would bring about any change in that attitude."

The Standing Committee of the All-India Women's Conference at its meeting in New-Delhi, passed a resolution deeply regretting the "unfortunate breakdown" of the Gandhi-Jinnah talks and fully endorsed the joint appeals of the two leaders that there should be no bitterness in the country. The resolution appealed to all women to work for the creation of an atmosphere of goodwill and understanding so as to enable the leaders to evolve a common formula for national unity.

The death occurred of Mr. Ram Dayalu Singh, Speaker of the Bihar Assembly at Muzaffarpur.

29th. H. E. Mr. R. G. Casey, Governor of Bengal, at a Press Conference in Calcutta, observed: "My impression is that the discussions brought out the fact

that, although the provinces of North Eastern India are all considerably affected by war-conditions, Bengal (and of course, Assam) is undoubtedly affected, in practically every line of activity, to a considerably greater extent than other provinces or, indeed, probably greater than any other province in India."—H. E. the Governor reviewed the discussions which he had with the other Provincial Governors in Calcutta.—H. E. Sir Hawthorne Lewis, Governor of Orissa, and H. E. Sir Andrew Clow, Governor of Assam were present at the Press Conference.

Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukerjee was nominated by the Gujrat Provincial Hindu Sabha for the presidentship of the annual session of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha.

Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, writing in the *Indian Express* asked Government to constitute a board of arbitration and invite all parties in the country to plead their cases before it to solve India's political problem.

The Hindu Women's Association of Bengal decided to reject the Draft Hindu Code.

30th. Sir J. P. Srivastava, Food Member, at a Press Conference in New Delhi said that from January 1945, Calcutta would cease to be an exclusive charge on the food-grain resources of the Central Government.—Sir J. P. Srivastava announced that the Government of India undertaking to feed Calcutta having been withdrawn, more food-grains would be made available to Cochin and Travancore.

December 1944

The 84th. birthday of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya was celebrated in Allahabad, Benares, Calcutta and in many other places.

H. E. Mr. R. G. Casey, in a statement after a tour of Calcutta's bustee area, said: "I have been horrified by what I have seen."

Mahatma Gandhi decided to take complete rest from December 4 to 31.

The autumn session of the Punjab Legislative Assembly opened at Lahore.

The All-India States' Conference on Education, Medical Relief and Post-War Reconstruction opened with an address by the Chancellor, the Nawab of Bhopal, in New Delhi.

In the Bengal Legislative Assembly, the Bengal Government's jute policy was criticized through a non-official resolution.

Mr. L. S. Amery made a statement in the House of Commons regarding the representations made by the Chamber of Princes to the Viceroy concerning the future development of their territories.

The Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes, the Nawab of Bhopal issued a statement on Mr. Amery's reference in Parliament to the resignations from the Standing Committee.

Mr. Amery stated at the Commons that the authorities in India constantly had under review the cases of persons detained as the result of Congress disturbances of 1942.

Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukerjee, in his presidential address at the All-India Hindu Mahasabha, said: "India's Voice must be heard at the Peace Conference not through hired agents of British Imperialism but through her chosen spokesmen."

At a Diwan of Sikhs in Calcutta, a resolution was adopted according support to the conciliation move sponsored by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru.

Mrs. Sarojini Naidu advised the All-India Students' Federation to close up their ranks and to work unitedly.

The All-India Radical Democratic Party adopted a "draft constitution of free India," prepared by Mr. M. N. Roy.

The All-India Educational Conference commenced at Cawnpore.

The 26th. South Arcot Harijan Conference was held at Chidambaram.

1st. H. E. Mr. R. G. Casey, Governor of Bengal, in a statement after a tour of Calcutta's bustee areas, said: "I have seen something of the way in which hundreds of thousands of the citizens of Calcutta are obliged to live. I have been horrified by what I have seen. Human beings cannot allow other human beings to continue to exist under these conditions."

Mahatma Gandhi issued a statement from Sewagram in which he said: "From Dec. 4 to 31, I have decided rigidly to discontinue all public activities, all interviews for public or private purposes and all correspondence of any nature whatsoever."

2nd. Mr. H. S. Subrawardy, Civil Supplies Minister, Bengal, in a statement on the question of the Central Government's responsibility for feeding Calcutta, said he thought that the position remained unchanged.

The Working Committee of the Bengal Provincial Hindu Mahasabha recommended Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee for the presidentship of the Hindu Mahasabha session at Bilaspur.

A Communique said: "The Special Committee of the Rulers met at New Delhi and took decisions on various questions relating to the setting up of the proposed Public Relations Bureau for the States."

3rd. The 20th. meeting of the Inter-University Board was held at Patna with Dr. Sachchidananda Sinha, Vice-Chancellor of the Patna University, in the chair. Twenty Universities including Ceylon and Rangoon were represented.

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru in a statement to the Press from Allahabad announced the names of persons who intimated their acceptance of membership of the Conciliation Committee.

Mr. Somerset Butler, Special Officer, Department of Food, Government of India, in his report on Government monopoly in regard to procurement of grain, said: "Given the will and determination, a Government monopoly can be introduced successfully, inspite of administrative difficulties and the possible opposition of vested interests."

4th. The autumn session of the Punjab Legislative Assembly opened at Lahore. The Leader of the Congress Party, Chaudhri Mohamad Hassan sought leave of the chair to move a privilege motion to discuss an incident in which a C. I. D. police constable tried to stop Dewan Chamanlal, a member of his party, from entering the Assembly Chamber.—The Premier said that he would make inquiries.

Sardar Shaukat Hyat Khan, former Minister, who was dismissed in April 1944 by the Punjab Governor, released the correspondence which he had with His Excellency the Governor and Premier.

The Standing Committee of the Princes, including the Chancellor, the Nawab of Bhopal resigned. For the first time in its history, the session of the Chamber of Princes was obliged to be postponed indefinitely.

5th. Mr. M. A. Jinnah, in a statement (from New Delhi), on his talks with Sir Ghulam Hidayatullah, Premier of Sindh and Mr. G. M. Sayed, President of the Sind Provincial Muslim League, indicated that an agreement was reached on the question of Mr. Roger Thomas' appointment as a Minister.

The Bengal Legislative Assembly devoted 2 hours to the discussion of a point of order on certain amendments proposed by the Government to the Assembly Procedure Rules.

The formation by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru of a Committee to examine the whole communal question and the problem of minorities was welcomed by the "Times", in a leading article.

Mr. N. G. Raaga, M. L. A., (Central) who had discussions with Mahatma Gandhi at Sevagram regarding Kisan problems, issued to the Press from Madras a report of their talks.

7th. The All-India States' Conference on Education, Medical Relief and Post-war Reconstruction opened with an address by the Chancellor, the Nawab of Bhopal, at New Delhi. He made two declarations on the States' attitude to British Indian plans for post-war development and on the internal administration of the States.

The Bengal Legislative Assembly discussed the Finance Bill, 1944, introduced by Mr. T. C. Goswami, Finance Minister, to extend up to March 31, 1948, the

operation of the enhanced rates regarding entertainments, totalizator and betting taxes and the electricity duty levied under the 1943 Act.

The 4th. session of the Deccan States' Workers' Convention commenced at Sangli under the presidentship of Mr. B. G. Kher, ex-premier of Bombay.

Mr. Roger Thomas, Minister for Agriculture and Post-war Development in Sind resigned his office. His resignation was accepted by the Governor.

Questions relating to medical research and health survey in India were asked in the House of Commons.—Mr. Amery replied: "The Government of India is looking forward to receiving recommendations on these subjects from the Health, Survey and Development Committee under Sir Joseph Blore and have already before them some valuable proposals made by Prof. Hill."

- 8th. In the Punjab Legislative Assembly, uproarious scenes marked the proceedings culminating in a walk-out by the Muslim League Party as a protest against the unwillingness of the leader of the House to agree to the League's suggestions that an adjournment motion, which had been admitted by the speaker, should be taken up either before or after the Jumma prayers and not at 1-30 p. m.

In the Bengal Legislative Assembly, the Bengal Government's jute policy was criticised through a non-official resolution. The resolution urged immediate abolition of the statutory maximum jute price and its replacement by statutory minimum price to be fixed every year in consideration of the prices of staple food crops.

In the Bengal Assembly, Khan Bahadur Muhammed Ali, Parliamentary Secretary to the Chief Minister, informed the House that the action in regard to the arrest, interrogation and transfer out of Bengal of Mr. Sisir Kumar Bose, son of Mr. Sarat Chandra Bose (detention) was taken at the instance of the Government of India. He declined in public interest to furnish any further details.

- 9th. Mr. Habib Ibrahim Rahimutoola, presiding over the first Bombay Provincial Muslim Students' Conference, urged Muslim students to make supreme efforts to qualify themselves as a community to take their rightful place in the new world, which would be the inevitable outcome of the great war.

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, addressing a meeting of the Progressive Club, Allahabad, said that differences and disagreements prevailed in the country, but he did not think them to be unbridgeable. These differences could be accommodated by placing certain internal safeguards in the constitution.

- 10th. The Bombay Provincial Anti-Pakistan Conference which met under the presidentship of Mr. N. C. Kelkar, concluded after adopting a resolution condemning the proposal for territorial division of India as "undemocratic and anti-national and ultimately bound to result in internecine war."

The 84th birthday of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya was celebrated throughout India under the auspices of the All-India Hindu Dharma Seva Sangha.

- 11th. In the Punjab Legislative Assembly, the Speaker ruled out of order an adjournment motion sought to be moved by Raja Gazanfar Ali Khan (Muslim League) to discuss the failure of the Premier and the members of the Cabinet to resign when Captain Shaukat Hyat Khan was dismissed, thereby violating the principle of joint responsibility."

H. E. Mr. R. G. Casey, Governor of Bengal, in his speech at the annual convocation of the Dacca University said: "I believe it is right that we should take pride in our national traditions, not as something dead, not merely as a nostalgic yearning for the things of the past,—but as something living and ready to reassert itself in our future struggles."

A demand for the immediate release of India's democratic leaders was made by 127 prominent Americans in the course of a letter to Lord Halifax, the British Ambassador in Washington.

- 12th. The Mysore Legislative Council which reassembled under the presidency of Mr. D. H. Chadracharis, passed the Mysore Prison (Amendment) Bill and the Mysore Coffee Market Expansion (Amendment) Bill.

In the Bengal Legislative Assembly, the need for applying the guillotine to cope with the growing volume of legislation in the Provincial legislature with reasonable expedition and to prevent the opposition from deliberately obstructing the passage of a Bill, was emphasized by Sir Nazimuddin, Premier, when the debate on his proposal to amend the Assembly procedure rules was resumed.

- 13th. Mr. Amery made a statement in the Commons regarding the representations made by the Chamber of Princes to the Viceroy concerning the future development of their territories.

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, in an interview at Allahabad said: "I am not going

- to ask Gandhiji to appear before me but certainly I am writing to him to send a memorandum on the communal problem."
- 14th. The Bengal Legislative Assembly began consideration of the Legislative Chambers (Members' Emoluments) Amendment Bill, introduced by the Chief Minister, Sir Nazimuddin.
- 15th. Mr. M. A. Jinnah expressed his inability to meet the Sapru Conciliation Committee. He made it clear in the correspondence between him and Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru.
- In the Bengal Legislative Assembly, questions regarding the export of food grains from India and the supply and import of rice into Bengal were asked.
- At the Labour Party Conference in London, delegates carried a resolution on India which called for the release of Indian political prisoners to facilitate negotiations to end the deadlock.
- The Punjab Legislative Assembly adjourned *sine die* after passing three official Bills including the Punjab Legislative Assembly (Allowances of Members) Bill which raised the monthly salary of members from Rs 200 to Rs. 300. The Bill was opposed by the Congress Muslim League parties.
- 16th. Sir Ardeshir Dalal, Member for Planning and Development, Government of India, at a Press Conference in Calcutta discussed the many problems facing post-war India.
- Implicit faith in the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi and undivided loyalty to the Congress High Command were pledged by nearly 400 Congressmen and leaders of the Punjab who met at Ludhiana.
- 17th. The Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes, the Nawab of Bhopal published a statement on Mr. Amery's reference in Parliament to the resignations from the Standing Committee.
- 18th. Sir Homi Mody referring to the political situation in India in his presidential address at the annual general meeting of the Employers' Federation of India at Bombay declared: "Time is against us and that if a solution is delayed too long, irreparable injury might be done to the vital interests of India."
- Allama Mashruqi, the Khaksar leader, sent telegrams to Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah suggesting to them to meet again to arrive at a communal settlement.
- 19th. The Bengal Legislative Assembly was prorogued. The only business before the House on the closing day was the introduction of the Private Forests Bill and the Tanks Improvement (Amendment) Bill.
- Mrs. V. L. Paudit declared in an interview with the *New York Post*: "The desire for independence in India is not the result of the work of any political party or any superimposed propaganda. It is the natural result of world conditions."
- 20th. Mrs. Sarojini Naidu arrived in Calcutta.
- 21st. Mr. Amery stated in the Commons that the authorities in India constantly had under review the cases of persons detained as the result of the Congress disturbances of 1942, and releases were made so far as compatible with essential considerations of security.
- A Government proposal for the formation of an autonomous Transport Board to control and run tramway and motor transport throughout Bengal was discussed with a deputation of the Calcutta Corporation which waited on Sir Nazimuddin, Chief Minister, in connexion with the question of purchase of the tramways undertaking by the Corporation.
- 22nd. The Executive Committee of the Calcutta District Muslim League adopted a resolution condemning the appointment of the "Conciliation Committee" by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru.
- 23rd. Sir Jogendra Singh, Member in charge of Lands, Health and Education, at a meeting of commercial men in Madras, expressed the view that to the merchants the promotion of health and education of the people and development of the resources of the country were of greater importance than political problems."
- The Central Government's monthly accounts for September showed that, excluding periodical adjustments and transactions of Railways and Posts and Telegraphs, expenditure in the first six months of the financial year 1944-45 exceeded revenue by Rs. 82½ crores against Rs 58 crores in the corresponding period of the previous year.
- 24th. Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherjee, in his presidential address to the 26th annual session of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha (at Bilaspur) declared: "India's will must be heard at the Peace Conference, not through hired Indian agents of British Imperialism but through her chosen spokesmen. It is for this

reason that I feel it urgent that there should be a cessation of hostilities among the Indian political parties themselves. It will be an act of supreme statesmanship if to-day there can be a combination of all the nationalist elements in the public life of India for the preparation of an invulnerable opposition to the continuance of the imperialistic designs of Britain."

Sir Ardeshir Dalal, in the course of discussions with officials and non-officials in New Delhi, explained the main lines of the Government of India's industrial development policy.

The 22nd. session of the Prabasi Bangya Sahitya Sammelan (Literary Conference) commenced at Cawnpore under the presidentship of Dr. Radha Kamal Mookherjee.

A resolution according support to the conciliation move sponsored by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, in order to solve the political deadlock, was adopted at a Diwan of Sikhs in Calcutta, in connection with the celebration of the birth anniversary of Guru Govind Singh.

26th. The 33rd All India Ayurvedic Congress was held at Satyanarayanpuram, a Suburb of Bezwada in the presence of a large gathering of delegates from various parts of India. Dr. M. K. Mukherjee presided.

The fundamentals of planning for the development of agriculture in India was dealt with by Sir Manilal B. Nanavati, presiding over the fifth conference of the Indian Society of Agricultural Economics at Naini.

The All-India Women's Conference submitted a memorandum to the Hindu Law Committee on the draft Hindu Code, supporting the Code.

The Hindu Mahasabha adopted the resolutions about the constitution of a Free India and the fundamental rights of citizens as passed by the Subjects Committee—Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherji presided.

Mr. M. N. Roy, in his presidential address to the 2nd conference of the All-India Radical Democratic Party in Calcutta, said: "Political power must be the instrument for reorganizing society so as to free it from the domination of vested interests."

Sir Azizul Haque, Commerce Member of the Government of India, addressing the Rotary club of Calcutta, said that the various control measures instituted by the Government had undoubtedly checked the tendency to high prices and had, in quite a number of cases, definitely brought it down.

28th. Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, addressing the 8th annual session of the All-India Students' Federation in Calcutta, said: "Do not quarrel over slogans. Close up your ranks and work unitedly so that our country may take its proper place in the international federation of the world."

The All-India Radical Democratic Party adopted a "draft constitution of free India," prepared by Mr. M. N. Roy.

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, President of the Non-Party Conciliation Committee which began its work in New Delhi, said: "Our essential duty is to apply our minds to the basis of a constitution, not to its detailed provisions."

A resolution urging the establishment of a peoples' Government was passed at the All-India Radical Democratic Party Conference in Calcutta.

At the Session of the All-India Students' Federation in Calcutta, a resolution was adopted stressing the need for evolving a common outlook as the basis for another meeting between Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah for a Congress-League united front to win power for the Indian people. Prof. Durjati Prasad Mukherjee presided.

The All-India Educational Conference commenced at Cawnpore. Sardar K. M. Panikkar, Prime Minister, Bikaner State, in his presidential address defined the objectives of National Education.

30th. Mr. J. Austin, Adviser to the Governor of Madras, stressed the importance of public archives in the study of history, when he opened the Indian History Congress in Madras. Dr. S. N. Sen, Director of Archives, Government of India presided.

The 26th South Arcot Harijan Conference was held at Omakkalam (Chidambaram). Mr. J. S. Pillai, ex-Mayor of Madras presided.

A manifesto issued by the Radical Democratic Party, appealing to all to join that organization and "help the formation of the people's front to fight the last battles in the struggle for the freedom of the Indian people" was adopted at the concluding session of the party's Conference in Calcutta. The manifesto outlined the party's programme.

India in Home Polity

The last three volumes of the *Indian Annual Register*, those dealing with affairs during the twelve months of 1943 and first six of 1944, have been taken up principally with food scarcity in Bengal and the pestilence that followed it. These caused the death from starvation and from diseases of more than three millions of men, women and children. The same conditions had obtained in certain limited areas of the neighbouring Province of Orissa and the distant areas of Malabar. We have seen an estimate that said that more than 12,000 men women and children had died in Orissa. We know next to nothing of how the people in Malabar, in British Malabar and those areas included in the States of Cochin and Travancore, fared on a ration of 4 or 6 ounces of rice during "non-famine" months and during "famine" months when the quota was $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 2 ounces per head per day. Mr. Namboodiripad in his pamphlet *Food in Kerala* has said that this arrangement just managed to keep the people alive; during the June-August of 1943, there were epidemics which carried away 30,000 people and those that remained, those that survived, live "as an emaciated, undernourished, epidemic-stricken mass of 'humanity, but nevertheless, a survival of living humanity.'" There had been at Kerala a food deficit in local production of about 50 per cent. Previous to the war, started by Japan in December 1941, this deficit used to be met by imports from Burma and Siam. In Bengal this war had created, according to official statistics, a deficit of 10 per cent only. But Kerala somehow managed to escape a greater disaster because her ruling classes had always been conscious of "the desperate position of her food stocks," while Authority in Bengal failed to understand the implications of the deficit food position in the area under its control. The question will naturally be asked—why should there have been careful husbanding of resources in Kerala and absence of it in Bengal? We find it difficult to accept any explanation that suggests that the bureaucracy was more competent in Kerala than it was in Bengal. It is true that no single factor can be held mainly responsible for the scarcity of food in Bengal that had precipitated famine in it. As in other parts of India so in Bengal there had been the deterioration in the material life of the people incidental to British rule, the result of administration and exploitation for about two centuries. In the last three volumes of the *Annual Register* we have attempted to trace the evolution of this deterioration which with all the good will in the world, with all the equipments furnished by modern science, the British bureaucracy has failed to halt or modify. It is a result of that policy, framed at London mainly in the interests of the British people. The people of India are victims of that policy, helpless and unresisting. Not because they did not resent this deterioration. The history of Nationalism in India is a symbol of that resentment and the desire to end it.

But the modern State with its totalitarianism does not leave the units of the "sovereign people" any power of initiative to meet the

The modern
State &
the people

approach of a disaster like what devastated Bengal and Kerala during 1943-'44. The modern State has robbed the people of all ideas of self-help, made them dependent on the measures of the bureaucracy for their weal or woe. This helplessness of the people has become more explicit since the war that Germany started in 1914. Modern science and modern technical developments have made it possible for the State to usurp powers of direction and control of the people's life that could not be imagined in the years that preceded this war. The State now regulates how the citizens should live and move and have his being; it takes charge of him even when he is in his mother's womb and sees to it that he has a decent burial; from birth to death the State has undertaken to dictate the minutæ of his life; to control the distribution of food and cloth to him; look after him in employment and unemployment, in health and sickness; to guide his mating. The sense of individuality of the modern citizen is thus being weakened, and he has come to accept this dispensation as the mark and note of a progressive civilization. In the Soviet Union this development has reached its highest pitch. Even in democratic countries, in the United States for instance, the "New Deal" has demonstrated that private initiative could not pull out the country from the disorganization of the world slump of the early thirties; the State had to step in to find employment for the people, to create for them new avenues of employment. And if as a price for this help the State imperceptively to the people got away with certain of the rights and privileges of the individual citizen, robbed him of certain of the attributes of a free citizen, he does not challenge this usurpation; he appears to have lost the capacity to resist this tendency of things. World War II. of the 20th century has enabled the State to further encroach upon the rights and responsibilities of the individual citizen. The needs of a total war have made these subservient to the demands of a struggle to survive; the needs and necessities of the individual citizen have had to yield place to the over-riding considerations of survival in a war of continents and oceans out of which the world has not emerged during the months, July to December, 1944, with which we have been dealing in the present volume of the *Annual Register*.

This has been a world phenomenon. Even in independent countries, in democratic countries, the individual citizen has had to forego his freedom of initiative, to tolerate restrictions put upon it by the authority of the State. His food and cloth was rationed, his needs of nutrition was chemically met; his hours of work were regulated not in consideration of his individual inclination or requirement but of the need of a State engaged in a life and death struggle. He has had to accept these controls, and is being educated by these to be content with the rationing of his needs and necessities, both in the mental and material plane. He has been learning to appreciate the queue mind and the habits of the queue. This regimentation of body and of mind in the civil population of the different countries of the world, whether belligerent or neutral or indifferent, has become the characteristic of the modern world. All this is being done in the name of the progressive philosophy of life and conduct. Not even the greatest scientist or philosopher dares challenge its validity or effectiveness in the conflicts and competitions of the world as we have

Regimentation of
body and
mind

it to-day. By it the State is being endowed with powers and prerogatives that reduce the individual citizen, whether in the class or mass, to the position of the soldier—"theirs not to reason why, theirs not to make reply, theirs only to do or die." The world has been asked to believe that this phenomenon is a short-lived one; it cannot last beyond the war years; that with the end of the war the rights and privileges of the individual citizen would be restored to him. We do not know on whose behalf this assurance is being given. The men and women who have during the war years controlled the machinery of the State will find it difficult to divest themselves of the powers to control and regulate the life of the commonalty of the world, they will find one excuse or other to retain these powers in the name of the State which will be called upon to handle the difficult problems of peace in a world that has burnt its resources in the fires of war. Re-building a better world from out of the debris of war that has directly ravaged the life of two continents will require the imposition of the same controls that have carried it through war.

In a country circumstanced as India is, with a bureaucracy alien in personnel and alien in spirit, alien to the interests of the people, with such a bureaucracy in control of the Government, the people of India lost all significance in its eyes. Britain was engaged in a war of survival, challenged thereto by the aspiring imperialism of Germany and Japan. The human and natural resources of India could have had no better use than ministering to the needs of her fight. Without consultation with any body in India, with any individual or party in India, with any Legislature in India, India was pushed into both the wars, one started in Europe by Germany in September, 1939, and the other in Asia by Japan in December, 1941. Britain took the responsibility of exploiting India's resources to serve the needs of her wars. For about two years the war in Europe had been remote to us both physically and mentally. The majority of our people refused to ideologically align themselves with the British plan as it was being propagandized through the speeches of her war leaders and the writings of her publicists, not because they had any leanings towards the Nazi doctrines and practices, but because for about two centuries Britain had been practising the Nazi doctrine of the superiority of race. As soon as the war started the feelings and sentiments of Indian people were clearly and unequivocally expressed in the resolutions passed by the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress. The Congress Ministries in 8 out of 11 Provinces of India resigned in protest when the British Government failed to justify its action of dragging India into war without her consent or consulting her convenience or self-interest. The Governor General of India, Lord Linlithgow, failed to convince the leaders of the people of the justice of the action taken by him at the instance of the London Government. The roots of this failure are to be found in the whole history of Indo-British relation. It is true that Gandhiji had tried to take his people along with him beyond the narrowness of the argument that divided India and Britain. It is true that he has been the guide and philosopher of the Congress since 1920. But the leaders of the Congress assembled at the meeting of the Working Committee wrestled for 8 days to reconcile India's self-

respect and self-interest with those of Britain during one of the greatest crises of recent human history. They invited the British Government to reconcile these in the context of this particular war, so as to "make the people of India enthusiastic for war which is not theirs," to quote the words of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru used by him in course of a message sent to the London *News Chronicle*.

There was no satisfactory response to this appeal. And the people in India have remained unreconciled to the cause represented by Britain in this war. The ruling authorities were also acting in the spirit of an "occupation army," trying to keep them down by the show of brute force made immeasurably stronger by the inventions of modern science. As long as the war was confined within Europe they could be a little considerate. But when the German army broke into Caucasus and erupted into the eastern Mediterranean, threatening Egypt and the Red Sea life-line, they had to draw the ring of their repressive machine more tightly round India's rebellious spirit. The situation took a more ominous turn when Japan rode into the Indian Ocean after having got possession of Singapore and the Bay of Bengal. Strategists began to talk of a link-up between German and Japanese forces in the Red Sea area. Eastern India came nearer to the Japanese forces, flushed with easy victory in Malaya and Burma and poised for an attack on Bengal. Thus did this eastern Province of India come within the range of war strategy. But as its politically-minded people had during the last forty years and more made a name for themselves by their nationalist thoughts and activities, their Province came to have in the reports of administrators and the writings of British publicists a new characterization, as "anti-British" in a special sense of the term. The experiences of Burmese collaboration with the Japanese invaders imparted a new meaning to the difficulties of the situation as it will develop if and when Japan made good her threat of invasion of India which had become an arsenal of the Anglo-Saxon Powers in the battle-fields of Asia, in the island fights in eastern Asia. The setting up of the Eastern Supply Council with headquarters in India was an evidence of the importance that India came to occupy in this connection. It happened also that in Bengal were established industries under British auspices—jute mills, factories, mines, tea gardens—that were expected to play a significant part in the war, in fashioning the weapons of war. It happened also that through Bengal and over Bengal passed the life-lines of supply to China. These factors made Bengal a special concern of the strategists of the United Nations. The feelings of its people were resentful, various sections inimically disposed for various reasons. The Burmese had shown that the subject population could not be trusted to play other than a hostile part. It was a natural deduction for the military bureaucracy in India to make that in the event of a Japanese invasion people in Bengal would not be more helpful than the Burmese had been. It was natural for them to feel and to decide that sabotaging in Bengal could be successfully prevented if the food and the cloth supply of the people in the Province could be brought under Government control, and their freedom of movement curtailed. These must have been the inspiring motive behind the measures which came to be associated with the "Denial Policy." Food grains were ordered to be surrendered by the people of the coastal districts at the head of the Bay of Bengal. Government agents

were let loose over the country-side to make purchases on its behalf, the commodities to be removed to safer custody. Boats were ordered to be surrendered creating havoc in the life of a people to whom boats were the means of transport; bicycles only were ordered to be surrendered, and a watch was kept over all vehicular movements in particular areas of the Province. Food, boats and bicycles came thus to occupy a place in the plan of strategy that was being devised for defending Bengal, for foiling the evil designs of the victorious Japanese. Measures for "denying" the enemy really worked toward "denying" these to the people. This is an aspect of the causation of famine that has not received the consideration that was its due from the members of the Famine Commission who were taking evidence during the months of which we are speaking here. They were called upon to hold shortage of food grains and the natural calamity of October 16, 1942, the profiteering and black marketing to be principally responsible for the scarcity that created famine in Bengal.

But why these elements of the problem should have had such a devastating effect in Bengal demands an explanation. The "most brilliant members" of the Indian Civil Service who "Denial Policy" ruled Bengal even though Ministries were protecting was the result them from criticism acted under instructions from the Central bureaucracy when signs and portents of famine were thrust upon their attention in the streets of Calcutta; they were instructed by the Central Food Department to "statistically prove" to the people that there was no deficit in rice; the Minister of Civil Supplies in the Muslim League Ministry, Mr Surhawardy, took it upon himself to propagandize this brief sponsored by Major-General Wood, the Food Secretary in the Government of Lord Linlithgow. But when this falsehood could not be maintained, Mr. Surhawardy could turn round and declare that he did what he did with the laudable object of halting panic which would have worsened matters. He was either ignorant that reasons of strategy had been playing a part in disrupting the economic life of his people, or he was a partner in the game of deception, inspired by the temptations of office to hold back the truth from them. Any way, the deficit position of Bengal in the matter of food grains, the profiteering by traders, the dishonesty and incompetence of officialdom, do not explain the whole phenomenon. As Commander-in-Chief of India Sir Archibald Wavell had advised certain measures the consequences of which he was called upon to face as Lord Wavell, the Governor-General of India. The recognition of this fact can no longer be evaded. It teaches us that in total war food can be made to act as an explosive to the enemy or to people who are regarded as potential enemies. "Anti-British" Bengal belonged to the latter category, and was made to suffer for daring to stand up to the pretensions of the alien bureaucracy. In our innocence we had believed that no State could create conditions of famine. But total war, totalitarian war, the experiences gathered during it, should teach us that human lives whether of thousand or of millions, whether of the military or of the civil population, are as pawns in the game of power politics. And we live to learn. The Bengal famine has shown that the British bureaucracy was confronted with a dire choice in 1942; it had to weigh whether it would be more profitable to "scorch"

the norms and forms of life in Bengal and thus disable its people for mischief in case the Japanese succeeded in invading the Province or withdraw from it without disturbing the normal processes of life. Whether the first or the second method were selected, a successful Japanese invasion would cause dislocation, entailing suffering on the people. If the Japanese could be halted by "denying" them food and transport, the experiment was worth a trial. Wars could not be fought in modern times without causing the civil population sorrow. In weighing these considerations, the bureaucracy elected to adopt the "Denial Policy." The result was famine in Bengal. The measures ordered by New Delhi released over the Province forces of disruption where the official corruptor, the profiteer, and the contractor combined to give a rude shock to the delicate balance in the food position of the Province.

The Muslim League Ministry under Khwaja Sir Nazimuddin added to the confusion of the things by trying to extract the utmost advantage out of this disaster for its members and its political supporters.

Nazimuddin
Ministry &
famine

In the pursuit of its narrow communal policy it thought that under the powers of control secured by the Administration under the Defence of India Rules their political supporters could be granted contracts and placed in the distributive trades of the country. And they used these powers to secure that end. If it could not find experience in these trades among their political supporters, the contracts and agencies could wait disposal while men, women and children were kept awaiting for the food to come. The Woodhead Commission let the Ministry off with mild reproof for this crime, and we make no apology for again reproducing here their words.

"We recognise that the difficulties of recruiting and training the large staff and of acquiring accommodation were real and great, but we were of opinion that avoidable delay did take place. The delay in the recruitment was accentuated at one stage by an endeavour to maintain communal proportions. We consider this thing to have been particularly unfortunate. In an emergency, particularly one affecting the food of the people, administrative action should not be delayed by attempts to observe rules fixing communal ratios."

The quotation naturally suggests a question. Why did the Governor and his advisers in the Indian Civil Service, all of them British, connive at this narrowness and the crudely selfish activities of the Nazimuddin Ministry? Directors of the Civil Supplies Department were, all of them, higher-ups in the Service; they were by the rules of the Service free from interference by the Ministry. During the height of famine a member of this Service, Sir John Rutherford, was Governor of Bengal. Neither did he nor did his official advisers deem it necessary or found it possible to control or modify the rank communalist policy of the Ministry which was in office through the grace of officialdom and the support of the European members of the Bengal Legislature. Their failure or lack of inclination to guide the measures for famine relief in Bengal on right lines could only be traced to the policy of appeasing Muslim communalism which has become a sheet-anchor of British Imperialism. Divide and rule is implicit in every activity of a State that holds an alien people in subjection; it is the law of its being. So has it happened in India all through the period that Britain has been holding political sway over

this country. During the Morley-Minto regime it erupted into view with such crudity that the lesson could not be missed even by the most casual of observers. In Lady Minto's *Diary* recording some of her letters to and from Lord Morley, the then Secretary of State for India, is quoted a letter written by a Simla official to Her Excellency gloating over the success of the Aga Khan Deputation that was promised separate representation in the Legislatures of the country. He gleefully prophesied that the step taken on the occasion would have an influence on Indian affairs for years to come that would be beyond the imagination of the generation of officials that started the mischief. That prophecy has all but fulfilled itself in the plan of disintegration that the Muslim League politicians have sketched. Lionel Curtis of the Round Table Organisation is credited with framing the "Diarchy" that was given shape in the Montagu-Chelmsford constitutional changes. He indicated the way in which the evil of "separate electorate" will try to work itself out.

"India will never attain unity and nationhood as long as communal electorates remain. The longer they remain the more difficult will it be to uproot them, till in the end they will be only eradicated at the cost of a civil war. To enable to attain nationhood is the trust laid on us, and in agreeing to the establishment of communal representation we have been false to that charge."

The year 1944 high-lighted the futility and frustration in India that were the products of the policy followed by the Imperial Government of Britain. The Bengal famine demonstrated that no communal Ministry can solve the problem that touched the every-day life of the people. A new Governor was appointed who belonged neither to the Indian Civil Service nor to the public life of Britain with their particular prepossession and prejudices with regard to Indian politics. Mr. Richard Casey was an Australian public man who chose to play a part in Britain's Imperial affairs by resigning from the position that he held as the Commonwealth representative at Washington. The Australian Prime Minister, Mr. John Curtin, started public controversy with the British Prime Minister on this account. Mr. Casey was appointed Resident Minister in the Middle East to oversee the organization of diplomacy at this centre of many interests that Britain has built up in this region. We cannot say whether he had any duties of co-ordination between diplomats and leaders of United Nations armed forces stationed in it. Why Mr. Winston Churchill chose him in preference to a British diplomat or administrator it is not difficult to understand. He wanted to enlist the services of the ruling classes of the "Dominions" in ruling the "dependent empire." Mr. Curtin might not have appreciated this compliment. Mr. Casey did not belong to his Party. And, perhaps, his affiliations were more with the Churchill school of politics than with the Labour Party in the Australian Commonwealth. Therefore was he unable to bring a new mind to the administration of Bengal, and continued to accord support to the Nazimuddin Ministry which had made such a sorry mess of the campaign against famine. So far as the civil population of the Province were concerned, Mr. Richard Casey proved as good or as disappointing as Sir John Herbert had been. Under his eyes the Ministry of Civil Supplies was allowed to bungle matters as woefully as under his immediate predecessors. The communalism of the Ministry showed no signs of decline, and the general public in Bengal found no reason to

congratulate themselves on a change from an I. O. S. Governor to an Australian public man leading their administration. The manner in which Mr. Casey reacted to the criticism of the famine relief operations in Bengal made by such an esteemed public man as Pandit Hriday Nath Kunzru, President of the Servants of India Society, by Mrs. Vijay Lakshmi Pundit, President of the All-India Women's Conference, showed that it did not take Mr. Casey a long time to imbibe the bureaucratic habit of resenting criticism. His toleration of the Nazimuddin Ministry's way of handling affairs demonstrated that Mr. Casey could not rise above the imperialist policy of encouraging the narrowness of spirit that moved leaders of the Muslim League in the country. It may be that the instrument of instructions issued to him by Mr. Churchill contained directions that Mr. Casey was not to trouble himself with the internal affairs of Bengal, that he would be fulfilling the purposes of his appointment if he just saw that war activities were not hindered in any way, that the pathetic contentment of the masses in Bengal with the existing order of things was not disturbed by "outsiders" like Mr. Kunzru and Mrs. Pundit and that Congress people were kept in safe custody and Hindu Mahasabha agitators were ignored. When Mr. Casey came to Bengal the campaign round about Manipur and Kohima was mounting towards a crisis for the "United Nations," and his appointment had reference to the war efforts in the Province which he was expected to consolidate and keep intact. His success or failure in Bengal would be judged not by his efforts to pull out her people from the social disintegration that famines bring about but by his activities as a "War" Governor. Bengal's nearness to the Burma front imparted an importance to Mr. Casey's regime. The Province illustrated in one of the crises of the British Empire's history the success of the Morley-Minto policy of "Divide and Rule." This must have been one of the reasons why the break-down in her economic life attracted the attention of India to such an extent. She represented in the League Ministry all the forces, personal and impersonal, that were being allowed to work towards weakening the People's Front in India, in disintegrating the unity of feeling and action that was trying to wrest from alien hands the authority of the State in India. Therefore did public men and publicists make Bengal's cause their own. For, Bengal left to the mercy of the communalist and the imperialist would be used as the lever of disruption in India. We know now that the leaders of the Congress interned behind prison walls were perturbed by what they had heard and read of happenings in Bengal indicating that the forces of reaction were having their innings at the expense of the Province's vital interests. They knew that the British bureaucracy would utilize the war to strengthen their stranglehold on the country's life, to kill the hopes for better life that we all entertained. But it appears that they were not prepared for betrayal of the people's cause by the leadership of the Muslim League.

When Gandhiji was released in the second week of May, 1944, he was a sick man. He was confronted with this situation of political frustration and economic break-down in Bengal and other areas in India. With a view to end this deadlock he approached the Governor-General for a meeting and pleading for his permission to meet the

Gandhiji tries to meet Lord Wavell

members of the Working Committee of the Congress, the supreme executive of the organization. Lord Wavell could not see his way to meet Gandhiji personally and granting his request for permission to meet the members of the Congress Working Committee as there were "radical differences in our points of view," and the "public adherence" of Gandhiji to the "Quit India" Resolution afforded no common meeting ground for discussion of the many issues that divided Britain and India. This rebuff did not stop Gandhiji from making an attempt to approach world opinion, explaining to it India's demand for independence, and justifying the August (1942) Resolution of the Congress centred round "Quit India." Mr. Stuart Gelder, special correspondent of the London *Daily Chronicle*, got into touch with him at Panchgani where he was beginning to "rebuild a broken body;" the anxiety of his editor "to help in solving the political deadlock in India" was conveyed to Gandhiji who responded with his usual eagerness to convert the opponent. It appeared that Mr. Gelder had approached Lord Wavell and returned from his mission to him "disappointed." He held three hours discussion with Gandhiji on three consecutive days. Two sets of notes were prepared after discussion. One of these was "intended for publication" after Mr. Gelder had "communicated" to Lord Wavell his impressions of Gandhiji's attitude; the other contained "notes of talks" to be discussed with any one who cared to understand how the mind of Gandhiji had been moving. Mr. Gelder had asked him straight what would he say to Lord Wavell if he met him and discussed politics with him? Gandhiji is reported as promptly saying:

"I will tell him that I sought the interview with a view to helping and not hindering the Allied war effort. But I can do nothing without seeing the members of the Working Committee, for, I believe, that my authority under the August Resolution ended with my imprisonment. It was not revived by my release....."

At this point Gandhiji appeared to have drawn the attention of Mr. Gelder to the fact that he was giving out his individual views, not as a representative man. Mr. Gelder got British distrust and fear over it by saying that everybody, including Lord Wavell, would be interested to know his mind because of his "hold on the masses of India." The discussion appears to have been frank to the point of rudeness. Mr. Gelder asked to know how Gandhiji would influence the members of the Working Committee to underline his call to retreat from the position indicated in the August resolution.

"The Viceroy might feel that as you swear by the August Resolution and by the weapon of Civil Disobedience, your meeting the Working Committee members may only result in their re-investing you with authority to carry on Civil Disobedience in the name of the Congress, and the result will be that when you came out of the interview you will hold the pistol at the Viceroy's head and say, 'Do this or I start civil disobedience.' That would make things worse than they are today."

To this direct charge Gandhiji could only plead that at the back of such a question stood the distrust of the British ruling classes of his "profession" that he was and has always been "a friend of the British". Mr. Gelder appears to have been treated by Gandhiji as a non-official negotiator, and to his declaration that the Gandhiji's retreat from 1942 position

British Government were not likely "to concede the demand for Independence while the war is on," Gandhiji explained how what he would be satisfied with today differed from that demanded in 1942. The economic break-down that was hidden behind war profiteering appears to have influenced him in making this concession. He was convinced that there could be no improvement in the food situation and no end to the sufferings of the people "unless power and responsibility" were transferred from "British to Indian hands." And he defined this transfer as "National Government in full control of civil Administration" The August Resolution had been pitched to a higher purpose. The betrayal by the Churchill Government of Indian hopes raised by the "Atlantic Charter", woven round the "Four Freedoms" preached by President Roosevelt, the ignominious failure of administrators in Malaya and Burma to protect the life, property and honour of the peoples, had created a mood of desperation in India that the Congress under the leadership of Gandhiji had tried to give a shape to in the "Quit India" movement. He had asked the British Government to honourably "quit India", to leave it to God, to anarchy if it came to that. The failure of that movement, the failure of the people to non-violently organize themselves, to prevent the outburst of chaos, their failure to violently wrest the authority of the State from British hands—this experience appears to have brought about this change of front on the part of Gandhiji, or a climb-down if one be tempted to use the word. He frankly indicated his present attitude thus:

"I have no intention of offering Civil Disobedience to-day. I cannot take the country back to 1942. History can never be repeated. Even without the authority of the Congress, if I wanted to do it, I could start Civil Disobedience to-day on the strength of my supposed influence with the masses, but would be doing so merely to embarrass the British Government. This cannot be my object."

In more than one place in the explanatory statement he made to journalists, Indian and foreign, he told that the Gelder interview was really addressed to the powers that be, both here in India and in Britain, that as Lord Wavell had refused to meet him personally, Gandhiji hoped that the special correspondent of a well-known British daily, with his knowledge of Gandhiji's mind, would be able to plead with the British Governor-General with better effect the cause of the freedom of India and the cause of world peace that have become synonymous in his mind. Mr. Gelder also appears to have approached the problem from this larger view. He appears to have appreciated and respected the spirit of the words in which Gandhiji expressed his anxiety. There were many Indian critics who disliked Gandhiji's confession of defeat. But he asked them to enter into "the sufferings not only of the people of India but of those, whether engaged in war or not, of the whole world." But Mr. Gelder belonged not to this class. To British critics of his officiousness, he put the case in the light with which he had approached Gandhiji. He was interested in solving the political deadlock in India, it was true, but he was interested more in world peace with which somehow India's political status has had some relation. This was the main reason for "imposing a strain on a sick man."

"I told Mr. Gandhi that I was anxious for this not only for the sake of India, but for the sake of the peaceful future of my own country and for the future of my children and all English children who, I hope, will grow to adult life in a sauer, happier world."

This point of view did not, however, appeal to the ruling classes of Britain. And the Gelder interview "misfired." The evidence of this came out in the speeches made in the House of Commons in course of which Gandhiji's new move naturally formed a subject of discussion. The impression left in the mind was that those who arrogated to speak in the name of the British people and, perhaps, did give voice to their inner feeling and belief, had persuaded themselves that what the people of India stood mostly in need of at this point of their history was economic re-construction and not political satisfaction. No body in India was deceived by this British pose. Leaders of industrial life in India, men like Mr. J. R. D. Tata and Sir Homi Modi, came out bitter with criticism of this attitude, because they could speak from experience that India's economic interests were systematically sacrificed at the altar of Britain's because the State in India was being run by British rulers who had to consult the convenience and comfort of their own people in preference to those of India's. The history of Indo-British relation during the last one hundred eighty-eight years since Britain secured political power over India has a record of the use of political power to strangle Indian industries and injure them. And the plea of British politicians on behalf of India's economic regeneration under British auspices is one of the major ironies of history, to put the matter mildly. We remember how the *London Times*, the *London Economist* and the *Manchester Guardian* toppled over one another in welcoming the appointment of Sir Archibald Wavell as Governor-General in succession to Lord Linlithgow as opening a new era of economic reconstruction. The humour of the situation will be better appreciated if it be remembered that during Lord Linlithgow's administration, acting under Sir Archibald Wavell's advice as Commander-in-Chief of India, measures were taken that created conditions of famine in Bengal that killed more than three millions of men, women and children. Again, history has often told us that alien rulers often try to silence their conscience and stifle criticism of their actions by holding forth on the virtues of economic well-being as a substitute for political freedom, as a sop to the subject population. Sydney Smith in his *Peter Plymley's Letters* had parodied this pose and exposed its hypocrisy about a hundred years back. British rulers were busy trying to persuade the Irish people that the cry for a Parliament at Dublin was all ineffective. Sydney Smith put this plea in all its absurdity when he said that

"The object of all Government is roast mutton, potatoes, claret, a stout constable and honest justice, a clear high way and a free chapel. What trash to be bawling in the streets about the Green Island, the Isle of the Ocean; the bold anthem go brag. A far better anthem would be Erin go broad and cheese, Erin go cabins that will keep out the rains, Erin go pantaloons without holes in them."

The present Prime Minister of Britain was not unaware how 'Tory Democracy' in his own island had attempted under the leader-

Mr. Churchill's
"Tory Democracy".

ship of Benjamin Disraeli (Lord Beaconsfield) to divert the attention of the other "nation" in Britain, the poor and disenfranchised of the country, from their "wild longings for organic change". In the biography of his father, Lord Randolph Churchill, he had analysed the policy in no complimentary terms—the policy which begins with

"the little peddling Boards of Health which occupy and delight the Local Government Department, comprises Lord Salisbury's plan for the amelioration of the dwellings of the poor, carries with it Lord Carnarvon's ideal of compulsory national insurance, includes Sir Wilfrid Lawson's temperance propaganda, preserves and reclaims commons and open spaces favoured by Mr. Bryce, constructs people's parks, collects and opens to the masses museums and libraries, art galleries, and does not disdain the work-houses of Mr. Jesse Collings".

Lord Wavell's stiff attitude to Mr. Gelder's mission, undertaken at Gandhiji's instance, and the discussion in the House of Commons left

The unalterable
Tory policy

no doubt in the mind that the British authorities were not prepared to share authority with responsible public opinion in India organized on a non-communal platform, to recognize "full independence qualified

during the pendency of the War" as indicated in Gandhiji's discussions with Mr. Gelder—National Government in full control of civil administration that would render all aid and open all facilities to the Allied Powers, such as air bases, railways, ports etc., helping the war effort in all its branches and phases. The Secretary of State for India, Mr. Amery, in replying to questions put by Labour members in the House of Commons on the 13th July, 1944, appeared to suggest that the British Government should wait developments in India till these become "clearer." By that time the Rajagopalachari formula for the settlement of the problem, as it has been raised by the Muslim League, appeared, and the ruling class of Britain wanted to watch how this "move towards a settlement between the two major communities" transformed affairs in India and forced the hands of the Government. The mind of this class was reflected in the question put by Earl Winterton who, perhaps, feared that the Churchill Government might be forced to commit itself in response to Gandhiji's new offer. He asked a question and had his reply.

"Will Mr. Amery give an assurance that in any negotiations to which the Government of India is party, equal rights are given to the Muslim League as to the predominantly Hindu Congress which is unalterably opposed to the views of the Muslim League and the great majority of the Muslims in India?"

"There will be no question of the Government of India exercising one-sided influence on these discussions in any manner."

Another member, Sir Herbert Williams, expressed concern for another element of India's life when he asked: "Will 50 million people, described as untouchables, have some consideration as well as Mr. Gandhi?" Mr. Amery replied:

Of setting community against community

"They do not enter into the present negotiations, if indeed negotiations are in progress." These two questions and the two replies given by Mr. Amery summarize the two problems that under British auspices and with British encouragement have created all the complexities that are supposed to halt the arrival of democratic freedom in India. We have referred to the long history of Anglo-Indian flirtation with the feelings, sentiments and interests of a section of the Muslim community in India. Since the days of Sir Syed Ahmed,

founder of the Aligarh College, the precursor of the Muslim University of today, official policy has been consistent in its support to all that stirred differences between the Hindus and Muslims of India, twisted these differences into permanent factors of communal conflict and competition. It does not require any deep research into the history of Hindu-Muslim relations to come face to face with the fact that Hindu and Muslim societies have differed in certain of the habits of their life and thought; they have agreed to treat these differences with a certain amount of toleration and on this tolerance lay the foundation of a common life. After the first flush of victory the ruling classes amongst the Muslims accepted India as their homeland and their Hindu neighbours as equal partners in the administration of the country. During the many dynastic revolutions that characterized the life of India since the eleventh century of the Christian era, Hindu and Muslim grandees and chieftains have been found co-operating with one another in putting up or pulling down rulers on the thrones of Delhi. During the seven hundred years antecedent to British eruption into India, aspirants to independence, Hindu or Muslim, in the various parts and provinces of India, never failed to recognise the primacy of the emperors of Delhi, to bear fealty to them, however insincere it might have been. In the anarchy of sovereignties that had been a mark and note of mediæval times in Europe and Asia, in almost every continent, this experience of India has been the expression of a deeply-recognized necessity that there must be a central Government to hold the discordant elements in check, to neutralize their chaotic conceits and ambitions. The British rulers being alien to the soil and refusing to identify themselves with the people of India have succeeded in imposing some sort of a centralized administration over the country. But when the classes educated by them refused to remain the standard-bearers of this alien rule, the new rulers tried to disrupt the unity of a common resentment under a common subjugation by setting community against community. One of the earliest of their administrators, Mounstuart Elphinstone, a student of Indian thought and culture and an admirer of these in his own way, set this pattern of rule in India when he recalled for the guidance of his fellow administrators the old Roman motto of "Divide et impera"—"Divide and rule"—which should also be theirs in India.

The difficulties created for the nation-builder in India by this policy, and their efforts to get over these or batter these down, make the history of Indian Nationalism since the days when 77

Since the Birth of the Congress men, speaking different languages, wearing different apparels, living at distances as wide apart as Assam and Sind, the Punjab and the Presidency of Madras, assembled at Bombay in the hall of the Gokuldas Tejpal School to create out of these diversities a unity of purpose for the political redemption of their people. In Volume I of the *Annual Register* of 1936, we have traced the growth and rise of the many forces, personal and impersonal, that made the organisation of this institution inevitable. An Anglo-Indian administrator, the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Province (now the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh), Auckland Colvin, had the insight to recognise that it would have "arrived in the consummation of time." The time of new birth was a narrow question..... "the charm which had held the sleeper bound was to be

broken, and the time for breaking was at hand." So, it happened in 1885. History would bear testimony to the fact that the majority of the British administrators unconsciously to themselves had worked towards bringing this development near realization. But when it did arrive they could not welcome it. Even the highest of them, one of them, the Marquis of Dufferin, the successor of Lord Ripon, scented danger in it, he who had encouraged and inspired Allan Octavian Hume to organize the Indian National Congress. And to halt it he appealed to the narrow conceits of the higher classes amongst the Muslims of India to set their claims as a counterpoise to what they have described as Hindu ambitions for domination. Addressing members of the Mahomedan Central National Association of Calcutta on the eve of his departure from India, he uttered words that revealed the mind of the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy, challenged by Indian Nationalism to justify its ways of rule over India. He had spoken of the Congress as representing a "microscopic minority", of trying to "ride in the chariot of the sun". The farewell address presented by the Association afforded an opportunity to whip up opposition to the demands put forward on behalf of the people. It has to be remembered that the Indian National Congress was not the revolutionary organisation that it has become since 1905. The demands made in its resolutions of those days did not for twenty years rise much above the concern for "peddling Boards of Health" and such like things. But the British bureaucrat was prescient. And he could detect in the petition and protest and prayer of the early years of the Congress the first notes of the full-throated assertion of India's right to political independence. Therefore did he try to set up the 'baffle wall' of communal and sectional interests, therefore did he encourage these to hold up progress for as long a time as possible. Lord Dufferin was one of the cleverest of this tribe. How cleverly did he appeal to the Muslim grandees, to their pride, with a view to enlist their help in consolidating the position of the "external authority" in India!

"In any event, be assured, Gentlemen, that I highly value those marks of sympathy and approbation which you have been pleased to express in regard to the general administration of the country. Descended as you are from those who formerly occupied such a commanding position in India, you are exceptionally able to understand the responsibility attaching to those who rule."

His appeal did not take a long time to bear fruit. Sir Syed Ahmed Khan hastened to show that he and his class in India could not be ignored in the scheme of things that the Congress was trying to build up in India. He did it so crudely that no body could miss its inspiration to have come from Lord Dufferin's words. Or, it may be that both felt themselves bound together in mutual selfishness for the exploitation of India's weakness. Speaking at a meeting of brother grandees at the Kaiser Bagh in Lucknow (1888) he uttered words that were reminiscent of the days when Muslim kings ruled at Delhi.

"We the Mahomedans are those who ruled India for six or seven hundred years. From our hands the Government was taken by the English. Is the Indian Government so foolish as to suppose that in seventy years we have forgotten all our grandeur and all our glory?"

Thus was the conceit stirred into life by the British bureaucrat for his own purposes that has taken shape today in the claim put forth by the

Muslim League for a separate State or States in India to be carved out of blocks of territories where the Muslims happen to find themselves in the majority. In successive volumes of the *Indian Annual Register* since 1936, we have tried to trace the movement of thought in the heart of a section in the Muslim community in India asserting their separateness from their neighbours and dreaming dreams of having this separateness given a distinct place in the future when the British authority will have faded out of India. In the latter part of 1938, from Prof. Abdul Latif, sometime professor of English in the Osmania University of Hyderabad (Deccan), we have had a picture of the country as a section of Muslim public men and publicists would like to have it drawn. Since then the Muslim League has made this scheme its own, and by appealing to the crudest of human feelings and the noblest at the same time it has been able to enlist the support of large bodies of Muslims to its plan of disruption. The protagonists of the index may have thrown overboard the lessons of Indian history in drawing up their ideology and disregarded the fact that Hindus and Muslims overlap themselves so intimately over wide areas of the country that without a vast exchange of population no coherent Muslim State or Hindu State for the matter of that can be formed within the unity that geography has made in this continental country of India. We know that history and geography have many times lost their appeal to human beings, and they have been disregarded in the pursuit of narrow conceits and ambitions. There is sage counsel yet in Muslim society in India that finds no virtue in the cry raised by the Muslim League, but it appears to be lost in the enthusiasm of the community. Venerated leaders like Maulana Hussain Ahmed Madani of Deobund in the United Provinces, a centre of traditional Muslim culture, like Mufti Kifayat Ullah of Delhi, like Khan Abdur Ghaffar Khan of the North-West Frontier Province, to name a few names, are ranged against the unwisdom implicit in the Muslim League cry. But their protests sound like cries in the wilderness.

A section in the leadership of the Indian National Congress represented by Mr. Chakravarti Rajagopalachari, sometime Chief Minister in Madras, appears to have accepted the position that the demands put forward by the Muslim League cannot be rejected with safety to the cause of Nationalism that the Congress claims to represent. When the Cripps Mission came to India with proposals for an Indian Union with right of secession promised to Units, Mr. Rajagopalachari had tried hard to have these accepted. He got defeated, and resigned from the Congress. For about two years he appeared to be ploughing a lonely furrow.

Gandhiji and members of the Working Committee of the Congress were put behind prison bars having registered their opposition to the Cripps Plan and all that it had stood for. Even Mr. Rajagopalachari persuades during their absence when India appeared to be bereft of all leadership, Mr. Rajagopalachari was found making no headway with his propaganda. His contact with the Governor-General, his wooing of the President of the All-

India Muslim League, appeared to have borne no fruit. And politically-minded people in India appeared to rest satisfied with the failure of Mr. Rajagopalachari's attempts to appease the leadership of the League. Mahatma Gandhi was released in the second week of May, 1944. We have described above how he tried to retrieve the position with the help of Mr. Gelder, and how he failed. This happened during certain days in July, 1944. Coincident with the Gandhi-Gelder negotiations, which were carried on in full view of the public, there were certain negotiations that Mr. Rajagopalachari had been carrying on with Mr. Jinnah. These also had failed. And the former regarded that the time was opportune to explain the causes of this failure. The public would not have been troubled if the Madras leader had related the story of his own failure. But they were startled to find that Mr. Rajagopalachari had the endorsement of Mahatma Gandhi to the terms that he had offered to Mr. Jinnah as a "basis for settlement" of the differences that stood between the Congress and the League. This endorsement was received as far back as March, 1943, when Gandhiji had been recovering from the effects of the "capacity fast" for 21 days he had undertaken in the middle of February, 1943. Thus for more than sixteen months Mr. Rajagopalachari had with him this endorsement. How he secured it during the time when Gandhiji was more than ill, we will, perhaps, never know. What new arguments did he advance to persuade Gandhiji to accept a proposal that had been regarded as disastrous to the cause of India's freedom and to her position in the comity of modern nations, we have not been told. The months since Mr. Rajagopalachari published (July, 10, 1944) his "Basis for Settlement" have not shown that even Gandhiji's endorsement has been able to reconcile the general body of politically-minded people in India to this idea of division of their country; it has not added to the number of men and women who are prepared to endorse this deal with the leaders of the League. For sixteen months Mr. Rajagopalachari has had occasion to discuss matters with representatives of various shades of opinion in India to remove the political deadlock. We have yet to know that he told any one of them of this endorsement by Gandhiji of his offer to Mr. Jinnah. This secrecy has not gained him any advantage; it has on the other hand antagonised people who would, perhaps, have given it greater consideration if the thing had been done above board. This secrecy has created an instinctive repulsion against the use of the name of a venerated man for the pursuit of a political deal. And it has to be recorded with regret that this repulsion has been touching Gandhiji's prestige as an elder statesman of India in whose hands the political future of the country could be unhesitatingly left. It has long been felt that Gandhiji has ceased to be an individual, that he cannot endorse or reject any proposal in his individual capacity; that before he did either of these he is expected to take counsel even with his known opponents. In the present instance he did less than this; and when the people's mind was perturbed over the outcome of his "capacity fast", and he was known to be less than his normal self, his counter-signature was given to a plan which the majority in India, not confined to any particular sect or community, regarded as a sacrilege, outraging the

deepest sentiments of hundreds of millions and as hurting the most intimate of their material interests.

These were the feelings that were at the back of the bitterness of the criticism that met the news of Gandhiji's endorsement of the Rajagopalachari formula. Gandhiji could only plead

Rajaji-Jinnah
irresponsibility

that he should be trusted not to consciously tolerate injury to any interest in the country. He did not try to argue his case. Did he ask Rajaji why should

he feel that Mr. Jinnah's was the only interest that deserved consideration in India, who should be the other person, or persons who should be called upon to satisfy or could satisfy all the demands of all the minority interests—communal, racial, social, economic, linguistic—that have been clamouring for satisfaction from every part of India, from many hitherto unheard of corners of the country? Gandhiji tried to simplify the issue by saying that Mr. Jinnah's claim for separate States in India was identical to the demand for the partition of ancestral property by a brother or brothers. How is that brother to be treated or is treated in social life who refuses to consider the interest of his other brothers, major or minor? Mr. Jinnah has never cared to fit his plan of division into the general scheme that concerned all the interests in the country, to reconcile his claims with those of others. For twenty one days from September 9 to September 29 (1944) Gandhiji and Mr. Jinnah held almost daily discussions; they wrote letters to each other, summarising these, seeking clarification on various points. Almost the whole of this correspondence has been reprinted in book form. Nowhere do we find Mr. Jinnah prepared to apply his mind to the solution of the complex problems that have grown out of his particular claim. He appeared to be unconscious that for the satisfaction of his own claim the map of the whole country will have to be re-drawn, that many of the old land-marks will have to be erased and many new ones put up, that vast exchanges of populations will have to be arranged for, wrenching up by the roots many traditions round which the hearts of men and women have woven many patterns of common life. Nowhere did he show that he was ever troubled by thoughts of these complications. He appeared to be satisfied that he had at long last an opportunity to press for the recognition of the "fundamentals" of the Lahore (1940) Resolution of the Muslim League, appeared to be satisfied with his role as negotiator of equal status with Gandhiji, appeared to gloat over the fact that at long last circumstances have forced Gandhiji to come to his house in a suppliant mood.

That we are not far wrong in what we have said as to Mr. Jinnah's indifference to other interests except his own, came out prominently in his reply dated September 17 to a letter from Gandhiji's of September 15. This particular letter occupied the central position in the series; it focussed all the doubts that assailed his mind as Gandhiji came face to face with the complexities raised by Mr. Jinnah's crude presentation of his demands. It is best to reproduce the part of it that is most relevant to the issue.

Gandhi
challenges the
"two nations"
theory

prominently in his reply dated September 17 to a letter from Gandhiji's of September 15. This particular letter occupied the central position in the series; it focussed all the doubts that assailed his mind as

"You must admit that the Resolution (Lahore) itself makes no reference to the 'two nations' theory..I find no parallel in history for a body of converts

and their descendants claiming to be a nation apart from the parent stock. If India was one nation before the advent of Islam, it must remain one in spite of the change of faith of a very large body of her children.

"You seem to have introduced a new test of nationhood. If I accept it I would have to subscribe to many more claims and face an insoluble problem....."

The more important part of the letter was that where Gandhiji addressed 15 questions to be clarified with regard to the "Pakistan" claim. Number 6 and sub-sections of Number 15 and the replies thereto showed how Mr. Jinnah did not recognize any interest but his own that has the right to have a say in making the changes to satisfy the conditions of his demands.

GANDHIJI'S QUESTIONS

(6) Are the constituents in the two Zones to constitute "Independent States," an undefined number in each Zone?

(15) (a) Are the people in the regions falling under the plan to have any voice in the matter of separation and, if so, how is it to be ascertained?

Gandhiji's questions & Mr. Jinnah's replies (c) There are many groups of Muslims who have continuously expressed dissent from the policy of the League. While I am prepared to accept the preponderating influence and position of the League and have approached you for that very reason, is it not our joint duty to remove their doubts and carry them with us by making them feel that they and their supporters have not been practically disenfranchized?

(d) Does not this lead to placing the resolution of the League before the people of the Zones concerned as a whole for acceptance?

MR. JINNAH'S REPLIES

(b) No. They will form units of Pakistan.

15(a) Does not arise by way of clarification.

(c) The Muslim League is the only authoritative and representative organization of Muslim India.

(d) No. See answer (c).

In his negotiations with Gandhiji Mr. Jinnah avoided to present a full picture of the country as it would emerge out of the operation table, out of the process of vivisection. Gandhiji also did not ask him for this in a direct manner. He was already alarmed with Mr. Jinnah's "argument." He knew and Mr. Jinnah knew also that in the "dream" scheme of Pakistan, in the Muslim "Zones", there were elements which by the definition of the Lahore Resolution could not be included in it. To take a concrete case, that of the Punjab. Except in the North and Western districts of the Province, there was no "geographically contiguous units" where "the Muslims are in a majority." The same holds good in the case of Sind. Only in the North-West Frontier Province and in Beluchistan can the "fundamental principles" of the Muslim League Resolution be applied. So far as the "Eastern Zone" is concerned, the distribution of the population of the Hindu and Muslim population, takes away much of the value of the "Eastern Pakistan" of the League enthusiasts. The whole of Burdwan Division and parts of the Rajshahi and Presidency Divisions are continuous areas where the Hindus are in a majority; Calcutta is overwhelmingly Hindu. Except the district of Sylhet the Province of Assam is a Hindu majority area. But the geo-politicians of the Muslim League make no secret of their ambition that the Provinces of Bengal and Assam, as these are at present constituted, should form "Units" of Eastern Pakistan. We would be doing injustice to Mr. Jinnah's cleverness as a politician if we believed

that he was not aware of these difficulties. Therefore did he try to evade the prolongation of the argument when Gandhiji asked him the Question No. 6 in the letter dated September 15 (1944). It is to the same realization that we trace his refusal to accept Mr. Rajagopalachari's "Basis for Settlement" conveyed to him in a letter dated New Delhi, April 8, 1944.

In the last volume of the *Annual Register* (P. 111) we reproduced this document. For facility of ready reference the readers of this study can conveniently turn to P. 129 of the present volume. In clause 6 of this document it is said that "the terms will be binding only in the case of transfer by Britain of full power and responsibility for the governance of India." In persuading Britain to agree to this transfer the Muslim League, according to clause 1 of the document, should endorse "the Indian demand for independence and will co-operate with the Congress in the formation of a Provisional interim government for the transitional period." In clause 2 is to be found the operative part of what is to be done to give "body" to the Muslim League Resolution (1940). A Commission will be appointed for

Rajagopalachari
formula

"Demarcating contiguous districts in the north-west and east of India, wherein the Muslim population is in absolute majority (In the League resolutions the word used was "majority" unqualified). In the areas thus demarcated, a plebiscite of all the inhabitants, held on the basis of adult suffrage or other practicable franchise, shall ultimately decide the issue of separation from Hindusthan....."

We know from a letter dated April 17 (1944) written to Mr. Jinnah by Mr. Rajagopalachari that the former did not "approve of the terms." It appears that the latter had been pressing on the League leader to personally endorse his formula. Mr. Jinnah found himself unable to promise anything more than "place" Mr. Rajagopalachari's formula before the Working Committee of the Muslim League; he wrote that he "could not personally take the responsibility of accepting or rejecting it". This attitude was in contrast to Gandhiji's who accepted the Rajagopalachari formula without consultation with members of the Working Committee of which he claimed to be the "adviser". Thereby he created difficulties for himself and for them also. Writing at the end of 1945, six months after the release of the members of the Congress Committee, after they have had occasion to meet in conclave once or twice, neither the Committee nor individual members of it have given their public support to the Rajagopalachari formula or Gandhiji's endorsement of it; they have avoided any reference to this episode. The Indian Press has interpreted it as an unspoken criticism or condemnation of this appeasement or attempt at appeasement of the dangerous policy of the Muslim League. It is significant also that Gandhiji has not once during these months opened his lips on this topic. He has been maintaining a studied silence that is significant in more senses than one. Since the failure of his negotiations with Mr. Jinnah he appears to have accepted the position that things must be allowed to get worse before they can get better; League crudity and narrowness must be allowed time to work themselves out.

Mr. Jinnah could
not personally
endorse it

Now to revert to the consideration given to the Rajagopalachari formula by the leader of the League and his Working Committee.

This was done at a meeting of the Committee held at Lahore on July 29 (1944). Previous to it Gandhiji had written to Mr. Jinnah on July 17 to meet him whenever the latter chose. The letter expressed the sensitiveness of the writer to the developments of politics in India, to the evil of the estrangement that the policy of the League has been extending over India. The letter was written in Guzerati, the common mother tongue of Gandhiji and Mr. Jinnah. It and the reply to it showed that the former was a sentimentalist and the latter a realist. We share Gandhiji's letter with our readers.

Brother Jinnah,

"Dilkush"
Panchgani, July 17.

There was a day when I could induce you to speak in the mother tongue. Today I take courage to write to you in the same language. I had invited you to meet me while I was in jail. I have not written to you since my release. But today my heart says that I should write to you. We will meet whenever you choose. Don't regard me as the enemy of Islam or of the Muslims of this country. I am the friend and servant of not only yourself but of the whole world. Do not disappoint me.

I am enclosing herewith a translation of this letter in Urdu.

Your Brother
GANDHI

To this letter Mr. Jinnah replied in language that lacked the warmth and cordiality of Gandhiji's letter. The older man should have been warned that he was dealing with a customer who did not allow sentiment or the memory of old relations to stand in the way of pressing for his pound of flesh. This is a new type of leadership to which we in India must get habituated. Mr. Jinnah's reply was as follows.

Mr. Jinnah's
reply

H. B. "Queen Elizabeth"
Srinagar, Kashmir
24th July, 1944.

Dear Mr. GANDHI,

I received your letter dated July 17 here on July 22, and I thank you for it.

I shall be glad to receive you at my house in Bombay on my return which will probably be about the middle of August. By that time I hope that you will have recuperated your health fully and will be returning to Bombay. I would like to say nothing more till we meet.

I am very pleased to read in the Press that you are making very good progress, and I hope that you will soon be all right.

Your sincerely
M. A. Jinnah

This letter is a truer reflection of the spirit of Jinnah politics than any of the elaborate speeches that the League leader makes to his followers either during the annual sessions of the Muslim League or to the twenty or twenty-two of them who meet in their Working Committee.

An old episode
recalled

The speeches are tirades. The one made at the 29th July meeting was a long-drawn caricature of what Gandhiji had said or meant, twisting and misrepresenting him in the pursuit of a policy that can but lead to the creation of a civil war mind in India. Mr. Jinnah referred to Gandhiji's letter of more than a year back,

written on May 4, 1943. A few days previous Mr. Jinnah, in course of his address as President of the annual session of the Muslim League, had twitted Gandhiji about so often approaching the Governor-General, Lord Linlithgow, with various requests with so little satisfaction; he had asked why should not Gandhiji address a letter to him acknowledging his conversion to the idea at the back of the 1940 League resolution, and he almost challenged the Government to dare withhold such a letter. Gandhiji had taken him at his words and addressed a letter which the Government refused to deliver to Mr. Jinnah. When the Press had commented on this in rather a sarcastic manner, Mr. Jinnah turned round and suggested that Gandhiji's real purpose was to get him involved in a quarrel with the Government. In the context of Gandhiji's Panchgani letter (July 17, 1944) there was no necessity to recall this episode except to poison the well of inter-communal relations in India. He gloated over the fact that Gandhiji had so often to seek interviews with Lord Linlithgow and Lord Wavell and to get snubbed for the trouble. And when he asked his followers to draw lessons from the consideration he had received at the hands of the British bureaucracy, he failed to appreciate its significance. Gandhiji's letter was not delivered to Mr. Jinnah but its "substance" was made available to him. And as it did not show any "change" in Gandhiji's "heart", Mr. Jinnah refused to visit Gandhiji in his prison home.

The same spirit of intransigence marked his criticism of the Rajagopalachari formula. He called it as "offering a shadow and a husk, a maimed, mutilated and moth-eaten Pakistan and thus trying to pass off as having met our Pakistan scheme and Muslim demand." He did not care to subject the formula to analysis in the light of the Lahore Resolution. He objected to the procedure of a "plebiscite", suggested as it had no "mention" in the Lahore Resolution; he characterized as "ridiculous" the proposal of "demarkating contiguous districts in the north-west and east of India", as the Lahore Resolution had only made mention of "geographically contiguous units" where the Muslims happened to be in majority. When Mr. Fazlul Huq sponsored this resolution at the open session of the League at Lahore in March, 1940, its framers evidently had not realized the full implications of the proposal they were putting forward, that geographically contiguous units may not sweep into the Muslim League State or States areas where Hindus or Sikhs happen to predominate, as is the case in the Punjab and Sind, or where the Hindus predominate, as is the case in Bengal and Assam. They thought, perhaps, that they would be allowed to walk away with such areas as those happen to be included within the present boundaries of the Provinces. As these are the creation of British policy or want of policy, Mr. Jinnah and his followers believed, perhaps, that the British bureaucracy in India would not be prepared to take the trouble of plebiscites, but as friends and patrons of the Muslim League would try to expedite matters by leaving the territorial divisions as these were on the present map. The Lahore Resolution did not trouble to think or explain how the territorial changes implicit in it could be made to fit in with the condition of other "nations" or "peoples" that inhabit the country. The criticism to which it has been subjected

since then, the Rajagopalachari formula that tried to give some sort of a shape to it, have disturbed the complacency of the League visionaries. They have come to realize that the "principle" on the strength of which they claim to divide the country may be used by other "nations" or "peoples" of India for the advance of their particular interests. Gandhiji's letters written to Mr. Jinnah during the September (1944) negotiation brought this realization home to them. But they were not prepared to accept the logic of their own theory of nationalism. If "religion" be the only corner-stone of a State, the "religion" or "religions" that differed from Islam has and have as much right to claim to build up their State or States on the foundation of the differences in faith and practice that characterized their life and distinguished them from Muslims. The marks and notes of nationalism in the name of which the Muslim League proposes to vivisect the north-western and north-eastern "Zones" of India have within them germs that will dissolve the Punjab and Sind, Bengal and Assam as the Provinces are constituted today. The Muslim League leaders have begun to shy at this prospect. But the forces of disruption and the enmities that they have released over India must seek expression in further estrangement between neighbours whom every other tie in life except religion bind together. The report of the speech, the summary of it, that Mr. Jinnah delivered before members of his Working Committee, show that he has grown aware of the difficulties in the path of his scheme that history and geography, economic relations and common life for centuries have set up. This is the significance of the language of personal abuse and railery that he used on the occasion that took up so large a part of it. Having a bad case to advance and defend, Mr. Jinnah fell to the usual practice of lawyers of abusing his opposite number in the leadership of the country. As we have said before, this spirit will not win him his case; this technique of political warfare can only lay the foundation of warring community life in India. Even separate States will not be able to divide the peoples whom history have brought together. Mr. Jinnah's own life history of nationalism and communalism will be an episode which future generations of Muslims would contemplate with sorrow as the betrayal of a great promise.

We are certain in our belief that Mr. Mohammed Ali Jinnah is what he is in Indian politics, its spoilt child, because since his youth he has been petted and made much of as the rising hope of India's composite Nationalism, as the bridge of reconciliation between Hindus and Muslims in India, as the ambassador of Hindu-Muslim union, as the "Muslim Gokhale". This position acquired so easily has made his way smooth for political life, Hindu politicians doing everything possible to make his way smooth as the fighter against separatist feelings and conceits that lurk in his community's heart. This has developed in him an arrogance that is uncommon with the Indian politician. Since Mr. Jinnah emerged into the leadership of the Muslim League and threw overboard his earlier political affiliations, he has ceased to have to depend on Hindu help for the advancement of his political ambitions. We are prepared to believe that he is incorruptible. But he is ambitious. And as "separate electorates"

Poisoning human
relations in
India

required him to woo the Muslim voters alone, it became easier for him to flower into the most rabid of Muslim politicians in India of recent times. If the franchise arrangements had required that candidates to legislative honours and responsibilities would have to approach every voter in their constituency, irrespective of creedal or colour differentiations, Mr. Jinnah could not have afforded to indulge in ribaldry at the expense of Hindus and of the Indian National Congress that he does at present; the simplest of political instincts would have advised him to keep a decenter tongue in the cheek in his references to the politics and politicians of his neighbouring community. As it is, there is no legal hindrance to his being rabid and arrogant, and Mr. Jinnah would be less than the politician that he is if he ever thought of imposing moral restraint on himself in his political thoughts and activities. His Pakistani demands, good or bad, may from certain points of view be regarded as less harmful than the steady stream of hatred that he and the members of his organization have been directing against the Hindus and other communities, big or small, that are opposed to them ideologically and politically. They do not appear to appreciate that for good or for evil the Muslims of India, Leaguers or non-Leaguers, will have to live side by side with their neighbours of other religious persuasions, and that the evil that they have been spreading at present will live after the present frenzy of unreason and arrogance have died. They appear to forget that the British will not always be here to tip the balance in their favour, that their activities have been sowing seeds of disruption which will sprout into the poison tree under the shadow of which the Hindu and the Muslim of India will have to live whether within common boundaries or without.

Human relations are being poisoned in India, a development which is of far more ominous significance to the future of India than any politics. Distrust of one another's sincerity is abroad; no reliance can be put on the value of words, spoken or written. An episode during the period under discussion threw light on this deterioration in manners. Almost simultaneously with the publication of the Raja-gopalachari formula there appeared in the columns of the *Pioneer*, the Lucknow daily, a statement over the signature of Raja Maheswar Dayal Seth of Kotra in the United Provinces. The statement revealed that sometime in 1942, in September, 1942, Mr. Jinnah had proposed certain terms for the settlement of the political deadlock in India. He has since repudiated the authenticity of the story told by the Raja Sahab who happened to be holding at the time the position of General Secretary of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha. And to the Indian public this repudiation make the story a case of an oath against oath. Mr. Jinnah simply contented himself by saying that he had authorized no deputy of his in the Muslim League to carry on negotiations with Raja Maheswar Dayal Seth, General Secretary of the Hindu Mahasabha. The Raja Sahab, on the other hand, has given such detailed description of the circumstances and the occasion of the negotiations that his statement was accepted at the time as a true version of the affair. The only point on which he continued to observe secrecy was the names of the two "common" friends, both

holding important positions in the Muslim League organization. The cause of this reticence has yet to be explained. Except the two "common" friends none has gained by it—another example of secret diplomacy creating more complications than helping to solve existing ones. Mr. Rajagopalachari securing Gandhiji's endorsement of his formula and wooing so unsuccessfully the leader of the Muslim League, and keeping the whole thing secret for more than fifteen months, even from leaders of public opinion in India who were as anxious as he to help remove the obstacles in the way of building of a united front against the alien State in India—this was another instance of the betrayal of public confidence and trust.

Since this particular statement appeared in the Press, there have been the Gandhi-Jinnah negotiations—a failure of these. In their context the statement of Raja Maheswar Dayal Seth has an importance. We, therefore, share it with our readers. Here is it as it appeared in the *Pioneer*.

Raja Maheswar
Dayal Seth's
statement

The proposals made by Mr. C. Rajagopalachari for a communal settlement with the approval of Mahatma Gandhi are none other than those which Mr. Jinnah himself had proposed, and are in accordance with the famous Pakistan resolution of the Muslim League passed at its Lahore session in 1940.

I may take the public into confidence and state that the Working Committee of the A-1 Hindu Mahasabha in August, 1942, appointed a Special Committee to negotiate with leaders of principal political parties and to mobilise public opinion in support of the national demand. I was then General Secretary of the Hindu Mahasabha and, on behalf of this Committee carried on negotiations with Mr. Jinnah, and through the help of a common friend who holds a very important position in the Muslim League, the following terms were offered by Mr. Jinnah for compromise :

MR. JINNAH'S TERMS

The leader of the Muslim League endorses the national demand for freedom as adumbrated in the resolution of August 30, 1942, of the Working Committee of the A-1 Hindu Mahasabha and expresses the League's readiness to join other parties to fight for and win freedom immediately, provided a settlement is reached with the League guaranteeing certain broad principles. In the event of such a settlement being reached the League will co-operate in the formation of provincial composite governments.

The broad principles to be agreed to are that after the war :

(a) A commission shall be appointed to mark out contiguous areas in the north-west and north-east of India where the Muslim population is in majority.

(N. B.—Mr. Jinnah personally told Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerji, Chairman of the Special Committee, when he met him in September, 1942, that the majority did not actually mean 51 per cent. It should be more, say, 55 per cent.)

(b) In these two areas there shall be a universal plebiscite and if the majority of the population vote in favour of a separate sovereign State such a State shall be formed.

(c) In the event of separation Muslims shall not demand any safeguard for the Muslim minority in Hindustan. It will be open to the two Indias to arrange on a reciprocal basis safeguards for religious minorities in the respective States.

(d) There shall be no corridor between the two Muslim areas in the north-west and north-east of India but the two areas shall constitute one sovereign State.

(e) Indian States shall be left out of consideration.

(f) A government machinery shall be provided for giving due facilities for transfer of population, absolutely on voluntary basis.

So it will be seen that there is practically no change in the proposals made by Rajaji.

Of course, neither I nor the Hindu Mahasabha could accept these proposals as we could not possibly be a party to any proposals for the vivisection of the country in any shape or form. But at the conference held by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru at his place at Allahabad in December, 1942, which was attended among others by Mr. Rajagopalachari, I simply read out the terms offered on behalf of the League for settlement and I gave a copy of it to Mr. Rajagopalachari as well who showed it to

Mahatmaji during his 21 days' fast in March, 1943, and got his approval to the proposals.

Rajaji called me to Delhi, on March 26, 1943, and I again got into touch with Mr. Jinnah through another common friend holding an equally important position in the League but, to my great surprise, Mr. Jinnah was unwilling to accept the terms which he himself had offered in September, 1942.

As Mr. Jinnah has denied that he ever made any such offer, one need not subject it to criticism showing where it is identical with the Rajagopalachari formula and where not. Raja Maheswar Dayal Seth has said that the Hindu Mahasabha refused to be a party to any such disruptive proposal, and this has remained the position of the organization even when Gandhiji endorsed it. We know that Dr. Syama Prasad Mukherjee, President of the Hindu Mahasabha, saw Gandhiji at Sewagram in his *Ashram*, argued the matter with him, and failed to persuade him that his endorsement of the Rajagopalachari formula was harmful to the abiding interests of the people. Gandhiji appears to have made it a question of the prompting of the "inner voice" which could not be disregarded. Against this there could be no argument. The bitterness of controversy, roused by this method of solving the political deadlock in the country is so deplorable that even Gandhiji's leadership has come to be challenged by increasing numbers of men and women among the political-minded people of India. Expression has been given to the feeling that Gandhiji is handicapped by his ideal and practice of non-violence to be applied to affairs of nations; he cannot, therefore, be a safe negotiator with a politician that has had no such handicap. Those who remember the whole process of the rising temper of communal Muslim feeling in the country, how from "separate electorates" as a minority right has evolved the separate State demand of the Muslim League, they have reason to support their contention that the League leadership has been exploiting one concession after another with a view to satisfy their ambitions at the expense of the interests of the whole of India. In such a game Gandhiji can be no match for the shrewd bargainer who is today President of the Muslim League. But the evil effects of concession made by Congress leaders do not end here. Dr. Syama Prasad Mukherjee, presiding over the 26th annual session of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha held at Bilaspur during the last week of December, 1944, expressed the feeling of exasperation of all lovers of India when he said that "Gandhiji's commitment, however, remains" to add to the difficulties of the future course of events; Mr. Jinnah and his League followers will refuse to consider *de novo* the whole problem of India's constitutional requirements; they will refuse to let go the advantages secured under the Rajagopalachari formula with Gandhiji's endorsement to add strength and plausibility to it. The suddenness with which the news of these commitments was thrust on the people has not removed the confusion in their minds, and as the year closed a mood of sullen despair appeared to have settled over India. Instead of being directed against the seat of the disease which was the policy of the British Administration, the mind of the people appeared to be distracted by suspicion of one another's *bona fides*, by resentment with the leadership of Nationalist India as represented in the Indian National Congress with Gandhiji as its guide and philoso-

Gandhiji cannot
ably negotiate
on equal terms

pher. Of course, there were public men and publicists who never let momentary failure to lose their sense of the reality of politics in India, of the evil of the influence of the ruling bureaucracy in encouraging and spreading dissensions amongst India's millions. Dr. Syama Prasad Mukherjee tried to recall his people to this inescapable fact when in course of this speech he exposed the hypocrisy of British administrators calling for a settlement among Indians as a pre-condition of their resigning their "trust" in India.

"Separate electorate based on caste and religion has been the gift of British diplomacy in India. Having itself sown seeds of disruption which have grown now into the monstrous demand of Pakistan, the British Government with apparent innocence asks for united communal front as a condition precedent to fuller political powers."

This is the un-ending argument between India and Britain that can have *finis* written to it only when India attains political freedom and

The minorities
in India

Britain facilitates the process by pulling down with her own hands all the obstacles her administrators have placed in the way. It would be foolish to ignore the fact that in the heart of India's society there are elements that have nursed separatist conceits and ambitions, seeking for opportunities to assert their claims even if this selfishness meant the postponement of the arrival of democracy and freedom. The alien State has allowed these to live under its patronage to be used for the defence of its particular interests and directed against the common interests of India. The majority of our politicians and publicists have been content to ignore the existence of these disrupting tendencies; many of them were ignorant of the presence in the minds of their neighbours of thoughts and ideas that were detrimental to the general good. The alien administrators were driven by the law of their being to find out these centres of narrowness, to keep watch over these and to encourage or discourage these as it suited their policy. No country in the world can be or are free from these elements of disruption; in the heart of every society lurk narrowness of vision, smallness of mind, selfishness of individual or group desires and ambitions. It is the duty of the ruling authorities one in spirit with the people, one in the conception of interests, to control and guide the people, to educate them by precept and practice out of such narrownesses. But the State in India as we have it today, being alien to the spirit of the people and alien to their interests, has never felt it to be its duty to work for the weakening of the elements of separatism. On the other hand, it has done its best and worst to encourage these, to let these gather strength by direct help. The majority of us appear to have had no idea of their number and variety, and of the many shapes they assume. And because of this ignorance we are complacent with regard to the threat that they hold to the peace of the country and to its progress. In our ignorance we think that as these are minorities, their claims should be met as these are met in other countries. This done, we dismiss the difficulties created by them as due either to some original sin in our society or to the policy of the State. We have a certain feeling that if we had cared to devote attention to the problem as its importance deserved we would have been startled to find that minorities are so many in India and their claims are so contradictory that when we have done separately with each one of them, hardly an India remains. In the

anguish of his heart Gandhiji had once written of this peculiar phenomenon in the pages of his weekly, the *Harijan*. The article was entitled—"The Fiction of Majority". A small extract from it will illustrate the point. He asked—

"And who are the minorities? They are religious, political, and social: thus Mussalmans (religious); Depressed Classes (social); Liberals (political); Princes (social), Brahmins (social); Non-Brahmins (social); Lingayats (social); Sikhs (social?); Christians—Protestants and Catholics (religious); Jains (social?); Zemindars (political?). I have a letter from the Secretary of the All-India Shia Conference registering their claim for separate existence.....I have drawn no fanciful picture of the minorities. It is true to life. The Congress has been obliged to deal with every one of the groups I have mentioned. My list is not exhaustive. It is illustrative. It can be increased *ad libitum*".

Gandhiji had at one time regarded claims made by the Muslim League and the vivisection of the country that these would lead to as "sin". The gathering momentum of communal frenzy

The position in
the Punjab

appears to have worked a change in his opinion in this matter. Otherwise he could not have endorsed the Rajagopalachari formula. But this has not brought agreement in the country. The Hindu Mahasabha and institutions with kindred purpose have been bitter in criticism; more so are the many organisations amongst the Sikhs. An all-Party Hindu Conference was held at Lahore on August 13, 1944. All shades of political opinion amongst the Hindus of the Punjab were represented at it. The proceedings of the Conference appear to suggest that the participants did not trouble themselves about the principle or principles involved in the issues raised by the Muslim League demands. They were concerned with the shape of things to be in the area that is known today as the Punjab. Lala Brij Lal, Secretary of the Hindu Vigilant Board, gave a picture of it at this Conference. In terms of economic life the division of the Province on the basis of religion can be understood when we realise that 17 districts will have a Muslim majority, 12 a Hindu-Sikh majority. More of the canal irrigated land would pass into the former. The total of such land was 1,14,57,098 acres: the 17 districts contain 88,80,746 acres; only 25,25,052 remaining for the 12 districts in eastern Punjab. The whole of the Multan and Rawalpindi Divisions and the Lahore Division except the district of Amritsar will go into the scheme of the new State. On the basis of population the picture will be as follows: Of the total population of the Punjab—2,84,18,819—1,62,17,242 are Muslims, 84,44,176 are Hindus and 37,57,401 Sikhs. In the 17 districts, 1,23,63,669 will be Muslims, 28,23,276 will be Hindus, and 16,83,953 Sikhs; in the 12 districts 56,20,800 will be Hindus, 38,53,593 will be Muslims and 20,73,546 will be Sikhs.

These figures show that the position of the Sikhs becomes worse under the Jinnah scheme of partition. They are a minority in the 17 districts; they will be a minority in the 12 districts

The Sikh Revolt

also. This bifurcation of their strength by the Jinnah scheme or by the Rajagopalachari formula is a possibility against which almost all sections of the Sikh community have risen in revolt. In the All-Parties Sikh Conference held at Amritsar on August 22, 1945, their opposition was voiced forth in no uncertain language. Sardar Mohan Singh, Jathedar of Akhal Takhat Sahib, "the most authoritative" of the seats of community life amongst the Sikhs from where "orders"

could be issued to them, presided over the Conference. The first resolution condemned the Rajagopalachari formula and its endorsement by Gandhiji. By another resolution, the demand for a Sikh State with Amritsar, their holy city as its capital, to be carved out in the centre of the Punjab was put forth, if the Jinnah scheme of a separate Muslim State or States were conceded. The Central Akali Dal, an organization that under the leadership of Baba Kharak Singh was invariably opposed to the Akali Party of Master Tara Singh which had organised the Amritsar Conference, was no less against the Rajagopalachari formula, and at a Conference held at Lahore it determined to oppose the Jinnah plan. A conference of the Sikh Communist Party held about a month later at Lahore expressed confidence in Gandhiji's leadership in his attempts to solve the Hindu-Muslim differences. But their being a party in the formative stage did not appear to have had any weight in their community's counsels. And the Sikh position appeared to be one of bitterness by what may be characterized as betrayal by Gandhiji just as more than three years ago, during Sir Stafford Cripps' Mission (March-April, 1942), they had felt towards British policy. In course of a "Draft Declaration" issued in the name of a Sikh All-Parties Committee the feeling of outrage to moral prestige and injury to material interests had been expressed in the following words :

"Ever since the British advent our community has fought for England in every battle-field of the Empire and this is our reward that our position in the Punjab which England promised to hold in trust, and in which we occupied a predominant position, has been finally liquidated."

Gandhiji's acceptance of Mr. Jinnah's demand for the division of the country to accommodate his State or States where the Muslims would be in a majority has revived in their minds their idea of a separate State for the Sikhs. To Sir Stafford Cripps they were reported to have presented a scheme for the division or redistribution of the Punjab districts with a view to make it possible for them to have their desire fulfilled and their fears removed. In that scheme they recalled the present generation to the fact that "the Punjab proper extended up to the banks of the Jhelum", that it was Maharaja Ranjit Singh that added the trans-Jhelum area, the districts of Jhang and Multan, which by their heavy concentration of Muslim population contributed towards making the Muslims the majority community that they are today in the Punjab. This history of a hundred years back appears to suggest that in the Sikh scheme the two districts would have no place in the Punjab of the future. To fully understand the trend of their mind the following from their memorandum to Sir Stafford Cripps is revealing. It shows that as a reaction to Mr. Jinnah's disruptionist tactics, the Sikh could go one better. They were for a State in India, India, one, whole and indivisible. But if Mr. Jinnah is allowed to have his way, the *Panath*, the Sikh religious-nation, must be secure in the possession of its own State. Something more they proposed in their Memorandum. With the elimination of the Jhang and Multan districts from the Punjab the Muslim position in the Province from the Jhelum to Delhi would be that of a minority. Muslims 82,88,000; Sikhs, Hindus and others—93,48,000. From the boundary of Delhi to the river Ravi, the position would be the same. Muslims—45,05,000; Sikhs, Hindus and

Their scheme of
division of the
Punjab

others—76,46,000. If the population of the Sikh States of Patiala, Nabha, Jhind, Kapurthala and Faridkote—26,00,000—are added to these the ratio of the Muslim population is further reduced, they being only 20 per cent in these States.

The facts stated above and the claims built thereon by the Sikh leaders would require the re-drawing of the map not only of the Punjab but of every Province in India. To persuade the people to accept such a major operation in the body politic, the Muslim League politicians have neither the vision nor the sense of reality. They expect to be allowed to walk away with areas that have a majority of Hindus and Sikhs as the case may be on the plea that in the British-constituted Provinces there are some where they happen to be in a majority. They pretend not to understand that as they do not desire to be in a Federal State where the Muslims will happen to be in a minority, so may Hindus, Sikhs and others object to live in a State or States where the Muslims will happen to be in a majority. They have no reasoned reply to this contention of the Sikhs and Hindus in the Punjab, of the Hindus in Bengal, of the 27 to 30 per cent of the Hindus in Sind. This particular scheme has proved that the difficulties inherent in the constitution of States in India on the basis of religion opens out possibilities of division of the country that even the Muslim League enthusiasts have begun to jibe at. This is the reason why Mr. Jinnah tried to dismiss the Rajagopalachari formula as a caricature of their Lahore resolution. Evidently the League leaders and their immediate followers were not prepared that vast areas should be taken out of the Punjab and Bengal leaving their "Pakistan" States in the North-Western and North-Eastern "Zones" of India such truncated affairs. They appeared to have got more perturbed as the various schools of thought and political parties began to analyse the implications of the League resolution.

Of these the Communist Party in India appear to have tried to build up a scheme inspired by the example and experiences of the Bolshevik Party of Russia whose leaders captured political power in the country and organized the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, U. S. S. R., as it is more popularly known. The doctrine of nationality was defined and amplified, and each unit of the many nationalities was secured its autonomy, although these were inhabiting the Union from the Baltic Sea to the Pacific Ocean, occupying almost half the eastern part of the continent of Europe and the whole of the northern half of Asia. A geography of the Soviet Union can give us the following information.

"The U. S. S. R. first came to consist of seven Constituent 'Union Republics' They were Russia, White Russia, Ukraine, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan and a Transcaucasian Federated Soviet Socialist Republic, comprising of Armenia, Georgia, and Ajerbaijan, three 'Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republics. The Autonomous Republics were altogether sixteen in number, and the National Regions seventeen. Within the seven Union Republics were other divisions, Autonomous Areas and National Districts."

This quotation does not, however, indicate the complexities of the problem that the Soviet Union has attempted to solve. The Soviet experi-

Soviet Union and
its experience

ment being only of a period of about 30 years, we can only hope that it has solved for as long a time as is humanly possible the intractable problems raised by diversities of race, colour, religion, culture and economic inequalities—the few mental and material explosives that have been disrupting and re-making human society since immemorial times. We summarize from an article by an Indian author, Dr. Radha Kumud Mukherjee, Head of the Department of History in the University of Lucknow, the relevant facts and ideas of this experiment which will enable our readers to get a background of their own problem as it has been disturbing all their conceptions of democracy and the norms and forms of State life. The U. S. S. R. has begun its life with the declaration which in the words of the present leader of the Communist Party in Russia, M. Stalin, may be expressed as: "The Soviet State is a multi-national State." It comprised a population that was nearer 200 millions than 170 ; it has 180 different nationalities, 157 languages, 11 National Republics and 22 Autonomous Republics. The Union, the Federation, that we have at present has grown by degrees and stages into its "present status as an integral State", beginning with "eleven National Republics" called the "Constituent Union Republics." These came together as "Sovereign States with the full rights of sovereignty retained by each jealously and intact"—including the important right to secede. This right is not, however, allowed as "a general right" to the other States of the Union. It is not granted to any of the 22 Autonomous Republics nor to any of the numerous other autonomous formations—Provinces, National Circuits, National Districts and other racial groups. Even as regards this right Dr. Mukherjee quoted from Stalin's address on the new Soviet constitution made on November 14, 1936, indicating the limiting factors. The following excerpts are relevant to the issue with which our minds are being troubled since the Lahore resolution of the Muslim League (1940) and the Declaration of the Churchill Government made through Sir Stafford Cripps in March, 1942.

".....there is not a single Republic in the U. S. S. R. that wants to secede from the U. S. S. R."

".....none of our Republics would actually raise the question of seceding from the U. S. S. R....."

Particular areas "are surrounded on all sides by Soviet Republics and Regions ; they have nowhere to go if they secede from the U. S. S. R."

".....the nationality which gives name to a given Soviet Republic must constitute a more or less compact majority within that Republic" to be able to assert the right to secede.

".....the Republic must have not too small a population because it would be wrong to assume that a small Soviet Republic with a very small population and a small army can hope to maintain an independent State-existence....."

This realistic approach to the many complexities inherent in their Lahore resolution, the League leaders have never shown any inclination to follow and profit by. Dr. Mukherjee quotes from Stalin's *Kampf* (Struggle) an elucidation of "three groups of circumstances which render the amalgamation of the Soviet Republics into a single confederate State inevitable."

It is a long quotation, but its importance deserves its re-print.

"..... the meagreness of economic resources remaining at the disposal of the Republic after years of war obliges us to combine these meagre resources so as to employ them more rationally."

".....the historically determined natural division of labour, the economic

division of labour, between the various Regions and Republics of our Federation" cannot be ignored.

"For instance, the North supplied the South and East with textiles; the South and East supply the North with cotton, fuel and so forth. The division of labour thus established between the regions cannot be eliminated by a stroke of the pen: it has been created historically by the whole course of economic development of the Federation. And this division of labour which renders the full development of individual Regions impossible so long as the Republics lead separate existence, is obliging our Republics to knit themselves into a single economic unit. Thirdly, there is the fact that the principal means of communication in the Federation which are the nerve and backbone of any possible Union, constitute a single system. It goes without saying that the means of communication cannot be left in a divided State in the hands of, and subordinate to, the interests of the individual Republics; for that would convert the main nerve of economic life—Transport—into a conglomeration of separate parts utilized without regard to a plan. This circumstance also induces the Republics to favour amalgamation into a single State. Finally there is the meagreness of our financial resources.

These quotations indicate the material causes that have forced Soviet leadership to build up a centralized State over an area that covers almost half of Euro-Asia. But men and women do not live by bread alone. They require mental food that is supplied by inherited traditions, vital matters that fall under one or other of the categories—Race, Religion and Language. In the Soviet State the men and women of the many races and creeds, speaking 157 different languages, find satisfaction and self-respect under the scheme of "The Cultural Autonomy of Communities", to use Stalin's expressive words. It secures to them

".....their Native Schools, Courts, Administration and Government bodies recruited principally from among the native peoples. Such an autonomy is inconceivable without the widespread organisation of local schools, without the creation of courts, administrative bodies, organs of Government etc., recruited from among people acquainted with the life and language of the population. But to conduct the schools, the courts, the administration and organs of Government in the native language means precisely putting Soviet autonomy into practice."—(Stalin's *Kampf*, P. 195).

Stalin's presentation of the case, as in the above extract, has to be filled up with more intimate details. Dr. Mukherjee supplies these as follows: Every community will be entitled to the preservation and promotion of those manners, customs or personal laws which give expression to its racial individuality. Similarly, it goes without saying that every community will be free to cultivate and foster its own language and mother tongue which must be used as the medium of instruction for its children. The religious protection of a community is an established right in every civilized state. The problem of religious protection is not confined to communities. It is as much needed within a community by its different sects. The larger a community the greater will be its internal differences in regard to religious views, giving rise to different schools of doctrines and sects, based on different practices calling for their protection. The Muslim League brief would have had a more responsive hearing if it had been prepared with an eye to the totality of Indian life characterized by many differences and diversities that have got to be reconciled by respect and consideration shown to every one of these. As it is, the Indian world is being treated to an exhibition of narrowness in

the League demand, unconcerned with how it can be fit into the general scheme of things. The Communist Party of India has not also tried to show a way in this line. It has contented itself with propagandising its slogan—Congress and League Unite—with a view to presenting a 'united front' against British imperialism. It has asked the Congress to recognize that "Pakistan" represents the freedom urge of the Indian Muslims; it appears to be dimly aware that there are innumerable communities, classes, tribes and groups in India's continental space that are disturbed by the same "urge", and that they have been trying to give voice to it and will in the fullness of time do so in as full-throated a manner as the Muslims have been afforded the opportunity by British policy. The Party has not indicated how these units will be held together if the Muslim League is to have its way.

British administrators may appear to feel that one dissident voice has been enough to halt India's progress towards the full development of democratic freedom in India. The more narrow-visioned among them may rest satisfied with this work. But the more far-seeing have seen to it that there should be other dissidents kept in reserve to be thrust into view as occasion required. We have quoted from Gandhiji's article the number and nature of the minority interests that are clamant for recognition as separate and autonomous units in India's social and constitutional system. The list is illustrative as Gandhiji has said:

British administrators disavow responsibility

to make it exhaustive a few hundred names will have to find a place in it, making a jig-saw maze of the Indian scene. British administrators, so far as we can understand their policy, are not prepared to take a hand in the solving of this difficult problem of inter-communal or inter-group relations in India. This attitude shows that they have remained both in spirit and in action alien to India; by making the "communal problem" a concern of the subject population alone to wrangle about and fight around in which they proposed to maintain an aloof attitude of insincere disinterestedness, they but add to the bitterness of the controversy between India and Britain, strengthening the suspicion of their *bonafide* in Indian affairs and making it as wide as the whole country. Even after six months of Gandhiji's persuasion, Lord Wavell has not found it possible to play a more helpful hand than his predecessor in office. In his letter dated August 15, 1944, His Excellency repeated the Linlithgow apologia, the same insistence on conditions that would "ensure the fulfilment of their (the Government's) duty to safeguard the interests of the racial and religious minorities and the depressed classes and their treaty obligations to the Indian States." Any transitional Government to succeed must be preceded by "agreement in principle."

"between Hindus and Muslims and all important elements as to the method by which the new constitution should be framed. *The agreement is a matter for Indians themselves. (Italics ours).* Until the Indian leaders can come closer together than they are now, I doubt if I myself can do anything to help. Let me remind you that minority problems are not easy. They are real and can be solved only by mutual compromise and tolerance."

One can start a controversy by asking the question—apart from the natural differences that divide class and community in every country

Contribution of other parties to the solution of the problem

in the world, as these do in India, has not State policy in India had something to do to irritate these into new shapes, to make these intractable to human reason as these appear to have done in India? As we do not expect British administrators to own up their responsibility in the matter and repent of it, we do not propose to follow it further in the present study. We have seen how Indian public men, Gandhiji and Mr. Rajagopalachari for instance, have tried to straighten out the tangle twisted ever more by British policy; we have seen how the Communist Party of India have plied their 'prentice hands in it, drawing inspiration from the example of their spiritual home, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Their acceptance of the Muslim League brief does not appear to have in any way softened the rigidity of the attitude of that organization. The "Scheduled Castes" of India, organized in the All-India Depressed Castes Federation, under the leadership of Dr. Bhim Rao Ambedkar, a member of Lord Wavell's Executive Council, have not been more helpful than imitating the heroics of the League leaders, hurling the thunders that have a familiar ring to us. We fully recognize that these castes and tribes have reason on their side when they rebel against the social disabilities of which they have been victims at the hands of Hindu society. We do not know that the State in India now or before has ever tried to take this injustice by the neck and wring the life out of it. Following other ideas of the duties and functions of the State, it had left to society to solve problems like what we know today as untouchability and other kindred injustices to be found in Hindu, Muslim and Christian communities in India. Saints and sages in different parts of India have striven to point out ways through the help of spiritual ministrations. But they have not been able to break through the ideals of social conduct based on the belief in *Karma*, *Kismet* or pre-destination. And more than sixty or seventy millions are there in India who are socially degraded and economically poor. Every community, Hindu, Muslim and Christians, have these outcastes in their midst. The Hindus being in the majority have their story of social degradation more blazoned forth than of their neighbouring communities. Social reformers since Ram Mohun Roy to Mahatma Gandhi have been breaking their heads against the walls that Hindu society has raised between man and man, between class and class, and tribe and tribe. Rebels like Dr. Ambedkar have rung this shame throughout the world. During the last decade or so we have been hearing of Momins and Ansars in Muslim society who have grievances against their higher classes as deeply felt as any that have been uttered by "Scheduled castes" leaders. Hindu and Muslim "outcastes" have begun to assert their claims to recognition in any scheme of political reconstruction that may be undertaken in the country. They have come to feel that in the modern world, saintly life and sage advice do not influence the seat of authority which has departed from society to the State, that it is organized classes or parties that can bend the ruling classes to recognize and reform injustices, social, economic and political. This is the meaning of the words that Dr. Ambedkar uttered when he was addressing his party members of Madras on September 24, 1944. It was during this tour that he

challenged the authority of the Vedas, of the Upanishads, of the Gita to act as guides to human conduct; in speeches made during this tour he challenged the wisdom of social legislators like Manu whose polity was held responsible for the degradation and shame of millions of men and women who have had the misfortune of being born in Hindu society. And it was at this particular meeting that Dr. Ambedkar laid down the platform of his party, claiming a place in the inheritance of Swaraj, a share in the "sovereign power" that appeared to be slipping from British hands.

".....I should like to serve a notice upon them that the Swaraj Government must be a Government in which the Hindus, the Muslims and the Scheduled Castes will be heirs to sovereign power....."

".....We shall never allow a Swaraj Government to come into existence in which we have no place, in which we have no power. We shall do anything to achieve this object. There will be no limit to our sacrifices. There will be no limit to the sanctions that we may use. The constitution must be a tripartite constitution, a constitution in which the Hindus, the Scheduled Castes and the Muslims will have equal place and equal authority. If you want freedom you have to accept these terms. If you don't accept these terms, you will not get your freedom. If you don't get freedom the blame will be entirely on your shoulders not on ours. Make no mistake about this."

Those who for years have had experience of Jinnah politics do not find anything new in the spirit of these words. They have a certain feeling that these brave words would have no application on the people who have in their hands the reins of political power over India. Dr. Ambedkar has shown that it is, easier to bargain with the Indian than with the Britisher. Therefore he and his predecessor in parochial politics, Mr. Mahommed Ali Jinnah, cannot be expected to take part in the struggle for Swaraj; their names will live in history as unconscious instruments of the imperialist policy that thrives on disunity in India. Their strength being derived from British encouragement in its initial stages, they can only play the part of obstructionists. During the months under review they have shown that they have no more helpful a part to play than this. And between British policy of anxious helplessness as exposed by Lord Wavell, and the intransigence of Mr. Jinnah and Dr. Ambedkar, they have managed to produce a deadlock in Indian politics out of which there appears to be no way. Like drowning men catching at any straw the Non-Party Leaders' Conference leapt forward to ease the situation. Its Standing Committee decided to appoint a Committee "to suggest a solution of the communal and political problems" in India. The "basic conception" of the Committee was to lift the discussion of these problems from "the partisan level to the scientific and judicial level." The Rt. Hon'ble Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru is President of this organization, and he was authorized to appoint members of the Committee and announce their names in due course. At a Press Conference (November 19, 1944) he described the genesis of this idea of his and how it had secured from Gandhiji promise of co-operation. As the result proved, this consultation with the latter led to Mr. Jinnah and Dr. Ambedkar non-co-operating with the Committee's work. The former appears to have been ruffled by the fact that Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru had not cared to share his idea with the League leader at the time that he had done with Gandhiji; this discrimination he

resented, and, therefore, did he refuse to co-operate in any way with the Committee set up by the Non-Party Leaders' Conference ; he appeared to treat it as a conspiracy hatched by the opponents of his politics in the guise of impartiality. Sir Tej appeared to have been prepared for some such development. The Hindu Mahasabha also non-co-operated, as well as the Scheduled Castes' Federation. Still did he go ahead with his plan, and enlisted the services of jurists, economists, men of practical affairs who were not bound by any party affiliation. He worked in the belief that as the Committee would try to understand the views of each party, and "act as a sort of Conciliation Board by establishing contact with all parties," the result could not be one-sided. The Committee would be recommending a solution that it thought "good." Gandhiji had advised him that the members of the Committee should not belong to any political party or should not be persons who had committed themselves to any particular views since the failure of his talks with Mr. Jinnah. The constitution of the Committee since announced has tried to fulfil as far as possible this particular condition.

The Standing Committee of the Non-Party Leaders' Conference did also try to focuss public attention on the ways in which the British Government have shown its satisfaction with the existing deadlock in the country. Its war activities were going ahead with the exploitation of India's resources ; vast financial commitments were being made without submitting these to the scrutiny of the legislature ; important decisions were being made with regard to recruitment to the Indian Civil Service and the Indian Police Service ; military officers were being employed to many civilian posts thus introducing a new spirit and technique into the administration of the country. In this statement issued on December 3 (1944) they made a special appeal to members of the Legislatures in the Sec. 93 Provinces where Governors ruled with the help of "Advisers"—the United Provinces, Bihar, Orissa, Central Provinces & Berar, Madras, and Bombay—to resume their duties and thus put a stop to the "irresponsible and autocratic rule of Governors." This they can do by helping to constitute "composite ministries wherever possible". If the majority parties in the Assemblies felt disinclined to form Ministries, they should observe benevolent neutrality if minority parties could coalesce and form "temporary expedient" Ministries. We do not understand what good these Ministries could have done to the people ; they could have only supplied a facade of respectability to the irresponsible authority exercised by the Governor and the permanent officialdom. They would have enabled Mr. Leopold Amery to propagandize the pretence that there were "self-governing" administrations in the Provinces of India. Bengal had a Ministry when famine struck the people, and this Ministry could not do anything more than serve as a screen to the doings of the bureaucracy who in fact though not in law held the reins of power. With this criticism we leave this episode. Neither Lord Wavell nor the majority parties in the Assemblies of the Provinces named above could accept the suggestion of the Conference of Non-Party Leaders.

The failure of this intervention on behalf Indo-British amity by men who belonged to none of the political parties in India, men who

British excuse and
the American
public

have helped British administration and have been recognized as constituting centres of stability and sobriety in the country, the failure of their intervention high-lighted the deep difference that divided the two countries. The only excuse that the British Government could offer was that in the midst of a war of survival they could not think of distracting their attention and energies to a political controversy in which the real contestants were the different elements that made up the Indian population. This excuse the British administrators appeared to have raised into a rationalized policy, which they have succeeded in making acceptable to world opinion, specially to the opinion of the politically-minded people of the United States. They have cleverly used their racial and cultural affinities with the great republic to put across this story of Indian disunity and make it the justification for the continuance of their irresponsible rule over India. That this propaganda is taken with the proverbial pinch of salt by American men and women who are in a position to judge matters in the light of special knowledge became evident by the controversy raised by the Phillips episode. The outburst of feeling occasioned by it makes interesting reading, though owing to the Press censorship the Indian public did not know of the details of the affair.

From what appears in the present volume of the *Annual Register* (P.P. 271-'80) we can piece together the story. Drew Pearson, an

The Johnson
episode of
1942

American publicist, has made a name for himself as a news-hound who can scent out the most well-kept of State secrets. On the 6th. July, 1944, appeared in the columns of the *New York Daily Mirror* in its "syndicated column" entitled "Washington Merry Go Round" disclosures of the causes of the "recall" of Mr. William Phillips, special political adviser to General Eisenhower, Supreme Commander of the Anglo-American forces invading Europe. Drew Pearson suggested that Mr. Phillips had offended the British official world by criticism of British policy in India in course of a letter to President Roosevelt while he was acting as his Special Representative to New Delhi. He is reported to have written this particular in the spring of 1943, sometime in the middle of May, 1943. To understand the significance of this letter, a little background history has to be related of American intervention in Indian affairs. Since the United States got entangled into the war started by Japan, and India became an arsenal of the Anglo-American forces and a base of operations against Japan, the Government and the people of the United States have got interested in Indian affairs; Indian politics as it reacted to British policy and to various international developments became a subject of deep concern to them. It became necessary for them to get authentic pictures of the Indian scene, authentic reports of Indian news and views. The Grady Mission in the early months of 1942 was sent to go through a check-up of the possibilities of the industries of India to serve as the arsenal of the Allied cause in the fight against Japan. The political head of the Mission was Colonel Louis Johnson, President Roosevelt's first Special Representative to New Delhi. He was drawn right into the middle of the Cripps negotiations when these were being wrecked by the military bureaucracy in India unwilling to introduce

Indian public men into the mysteries of their profession. Colonel Johnson tried to build a bridge between the powers-that-be and the distrustful Indian politician. For taking this trouble he was forced to pack up and go, evidently at the direction of his Chief, the President of the United States of America, who could not like the idea of rubbing the British imperialist the wrong way. He vanished from India as quickly as he had come, and we have been waiting to have "the Johnson version of the Cripps mission" with which he threatened the New Delhi bureaucrats, civil and military.

Six or seven months after when the August (1942) Movement had been ruthlessly suppressed and India was "quiet", President

Mr. William Phillips—President Roosevelt's second Personal Representative had been U. S. A. ambassador to Italy. He was almost an Englishman to the manner born. He was about six months in India during which he made it his business to contact every leader of life in India—public men, publicists, industrialists, financiers, soldiers, administrators, and the rulers of Indian States. This enabled him to clarify his own ideas about the settlement of the Indian problem. He must have sent many an epistle on the subject to the President, one of which leaked out and created a sensation when Drew Pearson had it published. It appears that following this disclosure, other American papers began to feature Mr. Phillips' letters. The question has been asked—how came there to be so many leakages in the State Department which is the repository of all correspondence received from all parts of the world from American diplomats and men of affairs who cared to intimate to the Department their experiences of men and matters with a view to indicate the ways that would serve best the particular interests of the ruling classes of the Republic? The Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, is reported to have told in reply to enquiries from the British Embassy that "Mr. Phillips' letter had leaked out through the Under-Secretary, Mr. Sumner Welles." This report of Mr. Hull's giving away a subordinate of his is unbelievable. British anger with regard to Mr. Phillips' report to his President was caused by two criticisms that reflected on British honour and on the loyalty and capacity of the fighting forces recruited in India. These are reproduced from the *New York Journal American*.

"Assuming that India is known as an important base of our future operations against Burma and Japan, it would seem to be of the highest importance that we should have around us a sympathetic India rather than one indifferent and hostile. It would appear that we will have the prime responsibility in the conduct of the war against Japan. There is no evidence that the British intend to do more than give token assistance.

"At present, the Indian people are at war only in the legal sense, as for various reasons the British Government declared India to be in conflict without the formality of consulting Indian leaders or the Indian Legislature. Indians feel they have no voice in the Government and therefore no responsibility in the conduct of the war. They feel that they have nothing to fight for, as they are convinced that the professed war aims of the United Nations do not apply to them. The British Prime Minister in fact has stated that the provisions of the Atlantic Charter are not applicable to India, and it is not unnatural, therefore, that Indian leaders are beginning to wonder whether the Charter is only for the benefit of the white races.

"The present Indian Army is purely mercenary, and only that part of it which is drawn from the martial races has been tried in actual warfare, and these martial

soldiers represent only 33 per cent in the Army. General Stilwell has expressed concern on the situation and in particular in regard to the poor morale of Indian officers.

"The attitude of the general public towards the war is even worse. Lassitude, indifference and bitterness have increased as a result of famine conditions, the growing high cost of living and continued political deadlock. While India is broken politically into various parties and groups, all have one object in common—eventual freedom and independence from British domination."

The report sent by Mr. Phillips to President Roosevelt was true to India's reaction to the present war. The British Government knew it; India's public men and publicists have given it voice on innumerable occasions; non-British observers, even British observers, have felt in India's atmosphere the sting of hostility directed against the cause for which Britain has been fighting. The British bureaucracy had been used to pocketing such criticism, Mr. Phillips' report also, even the "stronger" ones that he was known to have sent to White House, Washington. But when the mildest of them got published in the American Press, and the "Personal Representative" of the leader of the United Nations was found dealing out "anti-British" opinions, and an Under-Secretary of Foreign Affairs in Mr. Roosevelt's Administration was found facilitating their publication in the Press, the matter could not be so lightly treated. And the British bureaucracy both at New Delhi and at London reacted violently against the exposure before all the world by the hands of a near-Englishman and the representative of the greatest Anglo-Saxon Power. Drew Pearson made a colourful story of it.

"In London Mr. Churchill and Mr. Eden (Foreign Minister) put the heat on on the United States Ambassador, Mr. John Winant, and had that official ask Mr. Phillips if he still held the same views. Mr. Phillips said he did more than ever, but was sorry his letter was published, adding 'I hope my other reports, even stronger, will not leak.' Mr. Eden called his Embassy (Washington) to inform the State Department that Mr. Phillips was *persona non grata* in London, observing: India is more important than a thousand Phillips."

The British Ambassador Lord Halifax emphatically denied that Mr. Phillips had been recalled at London's request from his assignment as General Eisenhower's special political adviser; a spokesman of the British Embassy said in answer to an enquiry made in the Senate that it was not true that the British Government had described Mr. Phillips as *persona non grata*. To the confusion of these denials, Senator Chandler of Kentucky made public a telegram on September 3, 1944, which, he said, had been sent by Sir Olaf Caroe, Secretary to the External Department of the Government of India, informing the London India Office that Mr. Phillips could not expect to be welcomed. The telegram was in 'code language'; its presence in Senator Chandler's hands, deciphered, showed that the U. S. A. State Department had its spying arrangements on the inner activities of the British Government. The British Foreign Office also could not afford to be less inquisitive. The public in India were kept ignorant of these goings-on by censorship regretfully used for defence against attacks by "our ally", to use Sir Olaf's words. His telegram, the part of it that Mr. Chandler had got published, ran as follows:

"We feel strongly that the British Embassy should be supported in carrying

Persona non grata
—person not in
good grace

Sir Olaf Caroe's
cable to India
office

this matter further with the State Department. We are doing our best to prevent the entry of newspapers or letters, carrying the text of Mr. Pearson's article (first published on July 25, 1944). We understand that the designation of Mr. Phillips is still the President's personal representative to India. Whether or not he was connected in any way with the leakage of the views he has stated, it would make it impossible for us to do other than regard him as *persona non grata*, and we could not receive him. His views are not what we are entitled to expect from a professedly friendly envoy. The Viceroy has seen this telegram."

Thus ended a controversy between British and American officialdom. The former had its way—Mr. Phillips did not return to India, and the resolution moved in the House of Representatives by the Republican member Colvin Johnson that the British Minister at Washington, Sir Ronald Campbell, and the Government of India's Agent-General in the United States, Sir Giriya Sankar Bajpai, should be declared *persona non grata* to the Government of the United States was not pressed home or encouraged by the Roosevelt Administration. Why the officialdom of the U. S. A. bowed before the storm of anger of their opposite number in Britain, we do not know. But the episode was taken as an opportunity by the British Press to lecture their Anglo-Saxon brothers on the other side of the Atlantic on the beam in their eyes, represented by the Negro problem, on their "colour prejudice" which carried the implication of the superiority of the white-pigmented men and women over those of other colours. But we in India who have had for about two hundred years experience of the conceit of white colour in the life and conduct of the British personnel of the civil and military administration can but be amused spectators of this friendly debate between the two white peoples. During the months the events and developments of which we have been discussing in this study, this conceit of the white-coloured in a country belonging to the British Commonwealth was again brought home to us. About a quarter million of men and women of Indian birth happen to live in the Union of South Africa. How the ancestors of the majority of these people came to be in this land beyond the Indian Ocean has a history of a hundred years only. When in the middle of the 19th century, sugar, tea and other crops, requiring careful tillage, began to be cultivated in Natal, the planters, mostly British, found the indigenous field labourers inefficient for those plantations. On their first attempt to secure labourers from India they were refused by the Government in India. Other countries were approached with the same failure. At last under pressure from the London Government the Government in India agreed to send Indian labourers to South Africa. The first batch of indentured labourers reached Natal in 1860. Their salary was Rs. 7 a month, food, shelter and medical attention being provided. After the terms of 3 years (later extended to 5 years), the labourers could be re-indentured, could become free settlers in South Africa with a plot of land or could return to India. The majority chose to remain as free settlers in the country, though the piece of land was rarely granted, and thus they began to compete with labourers of European birth. When in 1893 Natal was given responsible Government, the opposition to Indian settlers found expression in measures that would discourage Indian settlement in Natal. The parliamentary franchise was taken away from

them in 1896; the municipal franchise in 1924. But these could not deter the increase of the Indian population in Natal where in 1913 they out-numbered the Europeans by 6,000. By the Gandhi-Smuts agreement of 1914 further Indian emigration to South Africa was strictly limited. But even now the Indian population of this State of the Union is only less than 6,000 of the Europeans, 90 per cent of them Britishers. Thus it happens that in a Dominion of Britain discrimination against "fellow members of the Empire" is rampant even today when a war is being fought for democracy and the decencies of civilized life, for equality between man and man, between nation and nation. But we know what a hypocrisy it all is. And this feeling found angry expression in the Central Assembly at New Delhi on November 30 (1944) when Dr. Khare, the Commonwealth Relations member in Lord Wavell's Executive Council, moved that the position of Indians in South Africa and East Africa be taken into consideration. Dr. Khare gave it out that all his colleagues in the Executive Council including the Governor-General shared "in the fullest measure the indignation and resentment which this exhibition of racialism on the part of a fellow-member of the British Commonwealth has created in this country". On behalf of the European Party in the Assembly Sir Frederick James met the South African contention that the position of Indians in the Union was a "domestic concern" with which no outside authority had any right to interfere. As 85 per cent of these were born and bred up in Union territory and have but a sentimental kinship with India, the Prime Minister of South Africa was right in claiming: "Indians are our people; they belong here." But this generous declaration is vitiated by the fact that these men and women are not granted citizenship rights, are put in segregated locations apart from their white neighbours, a mark and stigma of inferiority. This discrimination is in keeping with the policy of the Union that in Church and State there cannot be any equality between the white and the non-white. The insult implicit in it became rabidly apparent when the Natal Provincial Council passed a law limiting the right of Indians to hold property for residential and business purposes to certain areas only. The Government in India has hesitatingly agreed to use the powers of the Reciprocity Act, that is, treating the 125 South African whites found in India as good or as bad as the quarter million Indians are done in South Africa. The demand of the Indian people to impose economic sanctions against men and things South African found no support from the Government in India, as it would have touched on inter-imperial relations, relations between members of the British Dominions and the "Dependent" part of the British Empire. The London Government could not sanction such a family quarrel, and the Government in India subordinate to it could not do it on its own responsibility. This was the meaning of the words that Dr. Khare so often used during the debate on the grievances of South African-born Indians, expressing the helplessness of the Government of which he was the spokesman.

This study of events during the last six months of 1944 may end here with the note that the political subjection of India leaves her

Failures of our past a prey to internal dissensions and a victim to insults in international world. We have seen how a section of the Muslims of India under the guidance of the Muslim League has helped to bring about this shame, how a section of the "Scheduled castes" under the leadership of Dr. Ambedkar has been as unhelpful, without contributing any constructive suggestion to the removal of the deadlock in political developments in the country. We know how British policy has created this intransigence and how it has been exploiting it for the service of its own particular interests. There has been in the heart of Indian society disequilibrium in matters socio-religious and economic. During the six hundred years when Muslim Kings ruled over the country from Delhi, there were attempts made to reconcile the many diversities in thought and conduct that stood in the way of evolving a coherent life in the country. The leadership in this noble endeavour was often taken up by men who were not rulers of States. Kings and emperors distracted by the details of their administrative duties and engrossed in power politics appeared to have never had any comprehensive idea of the problem of social re-organization which the presence of Islam in India created. The Emperor Akbar represented a noble exception who failed in his endeavour to build up a synthesis of the many cults and creeds that had their home in India or had sought and found asylum in her bosom. We do not believe that he was the first or the last of the mediaeval Kings in India who strove towards this great work of social integration. The misfortune of India is that we do not know the history of the measures that sought to heal up the fissures that marked society in India during this period of our country's life. In other countries, in Europe for instance, they did use the power of State to break down dissenters and non-conformists. This was how the Roman Catholic values of life were all but erased from social life in Britain, Holland and Germany; this was how Islam was stamped out of Spain. It would be claiming a special kind of goodness in Indian humanity if we are to claim that in our history no such attempt at suppression or modification was ever made, that Brahmanism or Buddhism did never try this art or Islam did not try it in India.

But it is also an undeniable fact that in the various altitudes of Indian life, high or low, there is a tolerance of differences, an appreciation of different ways of life as leading to its supreme goal—the sublimation of human instincts and the transformation of human desires—that has struck the most cynical of the observers of the drama of human history. It is to this spirit of India that we can trace the fact that so many diversities have survived in her society, have been allowed to survive in India by the many conquerors of many races and creeds and colours that have had their day of power and glory in the country. Historians have told us of this great work. They have also told us that the present difficulties in India, social and political, is traceable to the other fact that Islam has neither been able to submerge the values of life that it found when it first came to India nor have the latter been able to absorb it wholly and transform its unique characteristics. It is this mutual failure that is responsible for

the present controversy that masquerades under the demand for separate States made by the Muslim League, claiming to give voice to the inmost feelings and deep-seated aspirations of the separate "nation" that the Muslims are at present and have always been in this country. Mr. Mohommed Ali Jinnah loves to bring forward an argument to establish his thesis that Muslims constitute a separate "nation" in India. He asserts that the persistence with which his community has been holding fast to the "separate electorate" arrangement during all the mutations of India's constitutional history under British regime proves that the Muslims in India have always regarded themselves as a separate element in the life of this country, they have always felt themselves to be distinct and separate from their neighbours. If there be any validity in this interpretation of the Muslim mind in India, then we are taken back almost to the middle of the 19th century when one of the minstrels of Muslim renaissance in India, Altaf Hossain "Hali," had compared his community to "guests who had outstayed their welcome" and had lamented that they had left "their native homes for India". An Anglo-Indian writer, Theodore Morrison, who was for sometimes Principal of the Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh, the nucleus of the Muslim University of today, in his book entitled—*Imperial Rule in India*—opined that the Muslims did not regard "India as their own country." And in proof of this opinion he quoted the following lines of "Hali" :

"Morning and evening our eyes now behold that which we thought would be the end of thy gracious acceptance."

"Quickly has thou broken all thy promises and pledges, O India! we were told aright that thou wast faithless."

"From every side we hear thee say that the guest is unwelcome who tarries long."

* * * * *

Here we find Muslim separatism in India at its clearest expression. It might have represented the mood of the generation after the failure of the 1857 revolt; it might be the "song of a defeated nation." But the present generation of Muslims have got over that mood of defeatism; and they are speaking of their "homelands" in India

where they happen to be in a majority. They cannot think of the whole of India as their "homeland"; they cannot get over the feeling that the areas where they are in a minority are as much their homeland as of their neighbours of other creeds. The Hindus being more unconsciously than consciously assured of their majority position are not afflicted by this mood. India is their homeland and holy land. Not so with the Muslims. This is in the ultimate analysis the seed-plot of the heated argument that is loud in India today where a section of the Muslims claim to be a separate "nation" which must have a separate State or States of its own. If this interpretation be an approach to truth, then the duty devolves on the leaders of thought among Indian Muslims to re-educate their community into the significance of a new nationalism wherein Hindu, Muslim, Christian, Sikh, Parsi will find fulfilment and realize their particularities in the setting of universal life—(Specially contributed by Sri Suresh Chandra Deb.)

Proceedings of
The Council of State
The Central Legislative Assembly
and
Provincial Conferences

The Council of State

Autumn Session—New Delhi—8th. to 21st. November 1944

ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS DISALLOWED

The Council of State began its Autumn Session in New Delhi on the 8th. November 1944 with Sir *Maneckjee Dadabhoj*, the President, in the chair.

After interpellations, the President disallowed two adjournment motions tabled by *Pandit H. N. Kunzru* and Mr. *Hossain Imam* to discuss HMG's share in the financial responsibility for the explosions in Bombay docks in April last. In the course of the debate that preceded the President's ruling, Sir *Satyendranath Roy*, War Transport Secretary, said that the Government would be prepared to give a day for the consideration of the report on the explosions. But the second report had not yet been published, and he did not think it would be possible to have a debate before the end of the session. The House then adjourned.

PAYMENT AFTER DEMOBILISATION

9th. NOVEMBER :—Sir *David Devadoss* withdrew after discussion his resolution recommending to the Governor-General-in-Council the desirability of withholding one-third of the monthly pay of combatant, non-combatant and other services, including clerical and menial services, and paying after demobilisation such withheld amounts in monthly instalments extending over a period of three years. Sir David estimated on the basis of Mr. Churchill's statement that the war with Japan would continue up to the year 1947 and that demobilisation would take place in 1948. Thereafter, they should have time, say, three years, to adjust themselves to the conditions in which they found themselves after demobilisation. During these three years, he proposed that the demobilised persons be given something to sustain them. Otherwise, Sir David feared, there would be discontent in the country, and they might be convenient material for political agitators. The Government should, therefore, take steps before it was too late. He suggested payment in monthly instalments because if a lump sum payment was made, there was the danger of its being mis-spent.

Sir *Feroz Khan Noon*, Defence Member, said that the basic pay of the Indian soldier was recently raised from Rs. 16 to Rs. 18. The extra two rupees was known as deferred pay: that is, it was not being received by him now, but would be paid at the end of the war. In addition, the Government of India were putting aside a fund for the common benefit of the demobilised men, which at present amounted to Rs. 7 crores. When the soldier got home, with the money which the Government give him he could buy himself a wife (laughter) or a house or enter into a trade. Sir *Feroz* did not consider it a practicable measure to give a small amount of money to the soldier every month. If a third of the pay was withheld the men would not look upon it as if it was so much money saved. They would regard it as a cut in their pay, and future recruitment would be affected. This was, therefore, a grave responsibility on the part of the Government to take. If any soldier wished to save money, he could put his money in the savings bank account or invest it in Defence Savings Certificates. To set aside one-third of his pay would be disastrous for every low-paid man. You simply could not take away Rs. 6 from a man who earned Rs. 18.

COAL SHORTAGE

Mr. *Hossain Imam* next moved a resolution recommending to the Governor-General-in-Council "to appoint a Committee to enquire into the coal situation and report on the means to increase production, including compulsory amalgamations or nationalisation, if necessary." Mr. *Imam* referred to the importance of coal and asked why Government were not giving any statistics in regard to coal output. Quoting from official reports published before 1937, Mr. *Hossain Imam* declared that the number of collieries to-day had been reduced. Coal output in Raniganj and Jharia had fallen from 18.8 to 16.6 million tons. Only 72 out of 385 collieries had a raising of more than five thousand tons per month. If this was compared with the position in other countries one would be surprised to see the number of collieries which were engaged in uneconomic production in this country.

Mr. *P. N. Sapru* said he was in favour of State ownership of the industry. He was against compulsory amalgamations which, he said, would lead to the establishment of monopolistic concerns. Deploring conditions of labour in coal

mines, Mr. Sapru said that the inadequate wages paid was one of the reasons why men welcomed the employment of women underground. As a member of the Health Survey Committee he had occasion to visit some coal mines. Housing conditions of labour were extremely bad. Any society allowing such a state of affairs to exist deserved to be indicted.

Pandit H. N. Kunzru, supporting the resolution, said that one of the main factors responsible for the low production of coal was labour. Miners were paid inadequate wages and their increased earnings in 1943 were not commensurate with the increased cost of living. Miners worked only four or five days a week and their monthly earning could not be calculated on their daily earnings. Housing conditions were bad and medical relief was inadequate. *Pandit Kunzru* urged that mine labour should be treated as skilled labour. Another reason for the low production of coal was that he understood some employers were unwilling to raise more coal because of the Excess Profits Tax which, they considered, was a levy on capital. They thought it would be better to exploit the mines after the war. *Pandit Kunzru* said that the Government should make themselves responsible for the proper consumption, conservation and production of coal. That could be done by the Government taking over the management of coal mines.

Sir A. Ramaswami Mudaliar, Supply Member, agreed that there was room for improvement of labour conditions in the collieries. He wanted, however, to ask the House to consider the prices which coal fetched a few years ago and today. The Government had now fixed the rates for certain qualities of coal from Rs. 9-8-0 to Rs. 10-0-0 per ton as against the average price till 1942 of about Rs. 3 per ton. The needs of the war had brought about a rationalisation of the coal industry and he hoped it would continue even after the war.

Referring to the agreement of the high prices which colliery shares fetched, the Supply Member said that in present days it was not an indication of the relative prosperity of the trade. People had a lot of money and share values went up. In regard to the allegation that production had been slowed down to evade E. P. T., *Sir A. Ramaswami Mudaliar* said that he had inquired into the matter and found no truth in the allegation. On the contrary production of coal had gone up. The Government had given them certain inducements by way of bonus, etc., for stepping up coal production. One of the foremost causes for the low production of coal, he explained, was lack of essential equipment. Till recently the purchase of cutters and other equipment was a matter for private negotiation between the colliery owners and their agents in the United Kingdom. The Government gave them import licences, the Supply Member added, but they did not know if the colliery owners' agents in England were able to get the necessary priority required there for the manufacture of the equipment needed and for their shipment. When the Government came to know of this they took up the matter in December last and made themselves responsible for the import and supply of machinery. A special officer who had been sent to the United States had recently returned with some of the machinery which included certain special cutters. The Government had also recruited a certain number of Americans to train Indians to use those cutters. Other kinds of machinery from U. K. and U. S. A. were probably well on their way here. He pointed out that some of the collieries had not enough safety lamps. The Government had placed an order and they were being despatched by air from the U. K., so that production here should not suffer. Just as fragmentation of agricultural lands had become a problem, fragmentation of collieries also had raised a serious problem. Plans were being considered for the prevention of fragmentation and the Government were taking steps in this regard. The Supply Member maintained that by the steps which the Government took they were able to arrest further deterioration of the coal position, which otherwise would have led to a serious calamity. In regard to the publication of the figures of output of coal, *Sir A. Ramaswami Mudaliar* said it was withheld not for reasons which were supposed to be embarrassing to the Government, but purely because the defence authorities thought publication should be stopped owing to security reasons.

The Government of India were now considering the various aspects of the coal industry. They had already fixed the price of coal at pitsheads. Other control measures which had been taken would, doubtless, improve labour conditions. If a colliery was not playing fair the Government had power to take over management of the colliery. In the post-war period, he said, coal would come to play an important part in the national economy. Its consumption would go up to feed the new industries.

Mr. Imam's resolution was put to the vote and was lost by 23 votes to 7.

SPECIAL TRIBUNALS

Mr. M. N. Dalal, after discussion, withdrew his resolution recommending to the Governor-General-in-Council that all special tribunals for the trial of offences be forthwith transferred from the administrative control of departments of the Government of India and placed under the administrative control of High Courts or at any rate of a neutral department like the Legislative Department. Mr. Dalal said that, according to the principles of English Jurisprudence it was essential not only to give a fair trial to a man but to see that he feels he is getting justice. Ordinary courts were subject to a certain amount of control by a higher court but, said Mr. Dalal, special tribunals were not subject to any control. How could these tribunals be under the control of departments, he asked, which were themselves responsible for prosecutions. The Finance Department should not control the income-tax appellate tribunals and the War Department should not have control over tribunals which heard cases in the prosecution of which they were interested.

RIGHTS OF INDIANS OVERSEAS

Mr. P. N. Saprú moved a resolution recommending to the Governor-General-in-Council to take steps to protect and safeguard the rights of Indians by bilateral agreements between the Government of India and the Governments of the Dominions, colonies and protectorates in which Indians are resident or domiciled and to which in future emigration may be permitted by the Government of India. Mr. P. N. Saprú explained why India, which aspired for joint leadership of Asia along with China, should establish diplomatic relations with all the countries mentioned in the resolution, countries in which Indian nationals lived. "I have excluded South Africa because speaking for myself, South Africans are no better than the Japanese or the Germans" declared Mr. Saprú. He continued: "I consider General Smuts and Dr. Malan just as bad as Hitler or Mussolini and the rest of the gang. If we had our way we would bring them to book. There is no difference between the Germans persecuting the Jew and South Africans persecuting the Indians. There is no question of any agreement or understanding with the South African, until he becomes a reasonable creature, until he comes to learn that the Indian is just like any other human being entitled to rights and privileges." (Cheers). The House then adjourned till the 13th.

INDUSTRIALISATION OF INDIA

13th. NOVEMBER:—The Council rejected to-day, by 24 votes to 12, Pandit H. N. Kunzru's resolution recommending to the Governor-General-in-Council to appoint an Industrial Commission, with a non-official Indian chairman and a majority of non-official members, "to review the existing industrial situation, to recommend measures for the full and rapid industrialisation of the country with the object of raising the general standard of living of the masses and to indicate the lines along which State-ownership and control of industry should be extended. The resolution had been moved by Pandit Kunzru during the last budget session of the Council.

Mr. Hossain Imam moved an amendment that the proposed Commission should devise a scheme for the immediate nationalisation of all the key industries in British India, but later withdrew his amendment.

Mr. M. N. Dalal said that the industrial expansion in India did not favourably compare with the progress made in the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia and other empire countries during the war. He deplored that the Government of India had turned down the Indian industrialists' plea for the starting of heavy industries, such as shipping and aircraft. The Government's policy was such that Indian industries suffered. In the importing of consumer goods, Government had not ascertained the views of Indian manufacturers. The Government appointed an all-White Commission to inquire into the establishment of a Fertiliser industry and more and more foreign experts were imported. Such actions of the Government, Mr. Dalal said, were viewed with apprehension in this country.

Mr. P. N. Saprú said that planning required much control and regimentation of life and only a Government which had its root in this country and was responsible to the people of this country would be able to carry it out. On ideological grounds, he favoured State control and State ownership of industries. However, under the existing conditions and without knowing what the constitutional future of this country would be, he was not prepared to hand over the industries to the control of the present Government, who would be amenable to no other parties except to the authority of His Majesty's Government. Mr. Saprú urged the need

for the collection of proper statistics of our own production and our own needs, before embarking on planning. There should be a small reviewing Commission to go into the working of the present industries and to suggest steps for their improvement.

Mr. V. V. Kalikkar said that if Sir Ardeshir Dalal, Member, Planning and Development, was "free from interference from Whitehall" he would help in the establishment of basic industries. But so far, the industrial policy of the Government was not encouraging. He asked whether the Government had taken any steps for the manufacture of agricultural implements and tractors which were badly needed. He supported the resolution.

Mr. Hossain Imam said that he was not specifying what industries should be nationalised, but left it to the proposed Commission to decide. The aims and objects of the Post-war Reconstruction and Planning Committees were desirable aims but his objection was that they were not executed. The Industrial Committee of the Government appeared to be a private preserve of the industrialists alone. Urging State ownership of industries, Mr. Hossain Imam said that the Railways, Posts and Telegraphs, which were owned and managed by the State had substantially helped the State by contributing over Rs. 66 crores, while the Corporation tax and the E. P. T. of privately managed industries in the country had not totalled Rs. 50 crores for the year 1943. Under the present order, there was no equitable distribution of the nation's wealth.

Raja Bahadur Govindlal S. Motilal said that soon after the last war, an Industrial Commission was appointed, but by the time the Commission reported, other countries were well on the way of industrialisation. Not only for the good of the people but in the interests of the Government also, Mr. Govindlal said, India should be industrialised. But for the Indian textile industry, war efforts would have been hampered and the people in this country would have been without clothes. Referring to State ownership of industries, Mr. Govindlal said he was not opposed to the principle provided the State belonged to Indians and it was amenable to Indian interests; but that was not the case at present.

Sir Ardeshir Dalal, Member, Planning and Development, reiterating Government's intention to foster industries to the largest extent possible, said that there was no question of Government not being in sympathy with the resolution. The war had shown up gaps in our industrial structure, such as lack of certain industrial machinery, machine tools, etc. While he shared general disappointment that the industrial progress of India had not been on the same scale as that of Canada, Australia and other countries during the war, he must point out that substantial progress had been made during the war. The Government, he said, were in fullest accord with the demand that measures should be taken for the complete industrialisation of the country. As to the part which the State should play in the control of industries, it was an important subject, and was engaging the serious attention of the Government. It was not possible, as yet, for the Government to come to any decision on the subject. The Government might have to take over industries which were beyond the resources of private enterprises, such as, essential industries which might not be remunerative. The Fertiliser industry was one such. In respect of important basic industries, a larger measure of control would have to be exercised by the Government in future. In regard to protection of industries, Sir Ardeshir Dalal referred to his previous statement made on the subject in the General Policy Committee recently, that it was Government's intention to liberalise protection and, in order to avoid delay, to set up a permanent Tariff Board.

Sir Ardeshir said that Government consulted the industries concerned before importing consumers goods in this country. It was not Government's intention to hand over the fertiliser industry to the I. C. I. In any scheme of industrialisation, the nationals of the country would have a full share, he said. Opposing the Industrial Commission proposed in the resolution, Sir Ardeshir said that Government had neither the personnel just now for the Commission nor could they wait for a long period for the Commission's report. The last Industrial Commission took two years to report. What was at present wanted was quick and practical recommendations. The Government, Sir Ardeshir pointed out, had already appointed the necessary committees and the various Provincial Governments had been asked to set up reconstruction committees. The Government had also set up over 20 panels for the respective industries. The Government's method was more effective and expeditious, and he urged Pandit Kunzru to withdraw his resolution.

Pandit H. N. Kunzru, replying to the debate, said that his object in moving the resolution was to accelerate the pace of industrialisation and to ensure sufficient

publicity to the steps taken by the Government in this regard. He was sure that Sir Ardesbir Dalal would do his very best to press the Government to industrialise the county and thus raise the standard of living of the people. He was primarily concerned, Pandit Kanzru said, with the actual achievements of the Government and not with their intentions. He wished Sir Ardesbir were in a position to say that certain plans had been completed and their execution would soon start. The first report on Planning, Pandit Kanzru said, enunciated general principles, but laid down no definite plan in regard to any aspect of industrialisation. The Government did not seem to be proceeding with reasonable despatch. During the last eight months, they had not proceeded far beyond the stage reported in the first report on the progress of Planning. In regard to nationalisation of industries, Pandit Kanzru said that he was anxious that certain basic industries should be controlled by the State. The term "basic industries" appeared to have a limited meaning, and according to official interpretation, it meant those industries connected with Defence. His object was wider, and Government had shown by their own example that they could control and manage industries. Concluding, Pandit Kanzru said that the Industrial Commission would be a better agency for the achievement of the objects in view than the methods suggested by the Government.

The resolution was put to vote and was declared lost, 24 voting against and 12 voting for. The Council then adjourned.

DEBATE ON FOOD POSITION

14th. NOVEMBER :—Initiating the food debate to-day, Mr. B. R. Sen, Director-General for Food, declared that the last twelve months' working of the basic plan gave the Government the feeling that, at both the Centre and in the Provinces, they had now a much clearer idea of the minimum needs of the deficit areas and they could hope that in no area, in future, would they be taken completely by surprise unless there were any unforeseen developments or any unpredictable natural calamities. The success of any basic plan, Mr. Sen said, such as the one formulated by the Government of India, must clearly be dependent, very largely, on an adequate system of procurement. The problem of procurement, however, was one which was much bigger than mere extraction of grains for export under the basic plan. Though a few provinces has surpluses of all the major foodgrains, in other cases a province might be surplus in one foodgrain and deficit in all others, or deficit in one and surplus in all others. Again, though a province might be self-sufficient on balance, some of its districts might be surplus and others again deficit, so that inter-district procurement might be of the utmost importance to that province. The essence of the problem was thus not moving of supplies from a surplus province to deficit areas, but of acquiring from the cultivator the maximum amount to be obtained from every part of India. The only completely satisfactory solution of the problem of procurement from the standpoint of principle, according to the Food Grains Policy Committee, therefore, was a central food-grains monopoly, but the problems of organisation and administration involved were so great, that they could not recommend its adoption immediately. During the last twelve months, Mr. Sen said, the most outstanding feature in the field of procurement monopoly had been the steady and progressive development of Government monopoly both in British India and in the Indian States. Most areas had started with comparatively simple schemes and, as experience had been gained, had developed the schemes further and, further towards complete monopoly. Speaking generally, the idea of a Government monopoly for procurement of the entire surplus of the producer had taken a firm root in the provinces and States, and the Government of India were following the policy they had laid down for themselves and exercising a close watch over the system. Referring to the problem of storage, Mr. Sen said that, apart from the new storage accommodation which had been constructed by several provinces on their own initiative, the Food Department had formulated a scheme of construction of storage at various strategic points in the major surplus areas with a view to facilitating procurement and ensuring an even flow of rail movement throughout the year. The capital cost was to be advanced on a fifty-fifty basis by the Provinces and the Centre. The Government of India had undertaken another scheme of construction of storage at the main ports and consuming centres for holding a portion of the Central Government Reserve to be built out of the wheat imports. It was expected that about 140,000 tons of storage accommodation under the scheme would be ready before long. In addition to these new constructions, godowns were also being hired and it was estimated that at certain periods of the year, as much as 300,000 tons of space would be available for hire. In this connection, Mr. Sen pointed out the information in a poster in the Pusa Agri-

cultural Institute which stated: Total annual production of foodgrains and pulses in India 67.5 million tons; total annual wastage, 5 per cent, 3.35 million tons; valued at a flat rate of Rs. 10 per maund, the total annual loss over Rs. 90 crores. The quantity wasted was sufficient to feed seven million persons.

On the question of price control, Mr. Sen said that the Government of India had already set up a Price Advisory Committee consisting of experts who were constantly bringing the level of prices in different foodgrains under their review. The Government of India adhered to the policy that the prices fixed from time to time for the foodgrains should represent a just and reasonable compromise between the interests of the producers and the interests of the consumers. The question arose as to what was to be done with regard to those classes of consumers who found the present level of prices beyond their reach; in other words, to what extent the Government were prepared to pursue the question of subsidy. Mr. Sen said that already several Provincial Governments had adopted schemes of subsidy. In Orissa, for instance, the scheme of subsidised sales was in operation whereby in rural areas families of persons belonging to the landless classes and in urban areas families of persons with an income of less than Rs. 40 per month could purchase rice at a retail rate of four and three-quarter seers per rupee. The question of subsidy however was one of immense complexity, and its financial implications far-reaching. The whole question was now under the examination of the department, and if necessary, would be pursued in an inter-departmental committee consisting of the Economic Adviser and representatives of the Food, Finance, and Education, Health and Lands Department.

Mr. Sen observed that Bengal's supplies for 1945 would be determined on the same basis as the supply for other parts of India. The reasonable needs of the Government of Bengal, he said, would be reviewed in the light of all the relevant facts and allocations would be made, as necessary, from the stocks available for the purpose. Due regard would be had to any special circumstances in Bengal, especially such as might arise from its proximity to the scheme of active operations, as well as to the special need of other parts of India.

Speaking on long-term planning, Mr. Sen said that the food problem in the country was not one of solution of crisis from day to day only. Even in normal times, a large majority of the population of this country did not have a balanced diet, while the supply of protective food for children, pregnant women and nursing mothers of the poorer classes had always been too inadequate. It had not been possible to undertake any long-range planning so far, as Government had all their energies concentrated on preventing local shortages and keeping the country going at least on its pre-war consumption levels; nor did they have, so far, the control over the food distribution machinery so necessary for effecting any permanent improvement in the country's food economy. Now that food rationing had been extended to forty-two million persons and was still being extended, and now that procurement was approaching a monopoly basis in most of the deficit areas, Government thought that the time had come for an assessment of the requirements on a proper nutritional basis, an examination of the existing supplies and prevailing food habits, particularly in the deficit regions, on the basis of those requirements and with special reference to the vulnerable classes, and finally the formulation of a policy that would effectively secure for the people of the country, at least in the post-war period, a decent standard of food supply. For that purpose, Government proposed to appoint immediately a Planning Adviser who would be a wholetime officer working on those problems, collecting and analysing data and formulating preliminary proposals for the evolution of a planned food economy in India.

Rai Bahadur Sri Narain Mahta said that he had received a telegram from the Secretary of the Collieries' Association complaining that the collieries were forced to buy foodgrains at a price higher than the controlled one and again, that the controlled price was higher than the market price. The ruling prices, the Rai Bahadur said, were far beyond the reach of the poor people in the country and the steps taken to prevent and eradicate corruption had proved abortive. The handling of the food problem during the last three years had disclosed a great amount of ineptitude. There did not appear to be a sound and dependable machinery, even to-day, for procurement of foodgrains from surplus areas and for supply to deficit areas. The failure of the Government to subsidise food for the poorer consumers and to eliminate the middleman and the profiteer had made the prices uneconomical for the grower. The Rai Bahadur contrasted the food situation in Great Britain and India and said that Great Britain had built up huge stocks of food long before the idea crossed the mind of the Government of India. Referring to the report of

the Gregory Committee, he said that the Committee had made it clear in 1943 that the Government must procure one and a half million tons of foodstuffs within a year. The Government were, however, able to import only 800,000 tons. The plea put forward was want of shipping space. The Rai Bahadur said that if the Government had taken care to eliminate the import of luxury goods, there should have been enough shipping space available to bring the one and a half million tons of foodstuffs recommended by the Gregory Committee.

The *Maharajudhiraja of Darbhanga* referred to the situation prevailing in North Bihar and particularly in Darbhanga and Purnea districts and said that even according to Government estimates, the rice crop would be below the average in those districts. These were essentially rice-producing and rice-eating regions and had suffered for want of rain during the last rainy season. Towards the end of the season, however, it rained heavily and many rivers were flooded and the paddy crop was severely damaged. Referring to epidemics in North Bihar the speaker said that he had been told that several patients brought to the hospital were cured by feeding alone. Pleading the cause of the growers, he said that the Food Member had cited the steady fall in the prices of rice and wheat as the main proof of the success of the Government policy, but, he asked, if the Food Member had taken into consideration the plight of the growers who had to provide for the necessities of life from the produce of their land. He urged the Government to fix minimum prices, just as they had fixed maximum prices of principal foodgrains and protect cultivators from the unfair demands of other sections of the community who sold their goods and services to cultivators.

The *Maharajkumar of Nashipur* said that the food situation in Bengal was far from satisfactory. He thought Government propaganda only attempted to minimise the evil. The Province was getting deeper and deeper into the depths of misery in the form of economic ruin, deprivation in health, mass destitution and widespread depopulation. He could not understand why the Government had chosen to sell rice at Rs. 16 per maund, while private sellers in the mofussil were offering it for sale at Rs. 10. The Maharajkumar said that huge stocks of rice and other food commodities were being allowed to rot without being distributed to the needy and the hungry at the opportune time. He admitted that some amount of relief had been brought about, but the ruling price of rice was still beyond the reach of a very large percentage of people. The quantity of wheat allowed to each individual, he said, was too meagre and "Ata" was, in most cases, unfit for human consumption.

Pandit Kunzru deplored the lack of information on food and urged that the Government should furnish members of the Legislature with a publication giving adequate information on the production, procurement and distribution of food. The House ought to be informed of the steps taken to import more foodgrains into India, whether transport arrangements were satisfactory, whether the provinces and States were taking steps to popularise wheat and what were the subventions given by the Central Government to the Provinces and the purposes for which these were given. In regard to Malabar and Cochin, Pandit Kunzru said that no concession was being shown to them in respect of rice. Rice rations allowed were inadequate, and the common man had to buy food at market rates even though he could not do so at prevailing rates. This brought him to the question of subsidising the poor man's food. He knew that the financial burden would be serious, but the present state of things was so unsatisfactory that immediate steps should be taken to relieve the sufferings of the poor people. Pandit Kunzru complained of the poor quality of rations supplied. The foodgrains sold contained an appreciable quantity of dust, stones and grit. He referred to an instance in Ajmer where wheat sold, on examination by the U. P. Government Chemical Analyst, was found to contain 10.7 per cent of dirt, 12.3 per cent of barley and 2.5 per cent of other stuffs. Dealing with the import of foodgrains, Pandit Kunzru said that greater pressure should be brought to bear on H. M. G. to send more foodgrains to this country.

Sir Jwala Prasad, the Food Member, intervening explained that already over 6,80,000 tons of foodgrains had been received and a further 95,000 tons were on the high seas bound for India.

Pandit Kunzru asked why no steps had been taken to approach the UNRRA authorities for importing food-grains to India. The Food Department, Pandit Kunzru said, was a more efficient department to-day than it was a year ago and was endeavouring to face the problems in a realistic spirit. But it had to go a long way yet in order to deal with the problems of production, procurement and distribution more effectively. He welcomed the idea of setting up a Planning Section of

the food Department. The food difficulties of India would not end with the conclusion of the war. If more food was to be grown, procured and distributed, it was necessary that the Food Department should be continued for many years to come. Pandit Kunzru said that more jaggery should be produced and transport arrangements should be provided. Adequate steps should be taken to popularise wheat in the rice consuming areas. Referring to the situation in Bengal, Pandit Kunzru asked why Government was lavishing all their attention on that province? It indeed required all assistance last year, but Government should now help the people in the South and particularly those living in the West Coast.

Sir Buta Singh complained that large surpluses of wheat, rice and gram were not immediately purchased and removed from the Punjab. That showed that in practice the Government of India was unable to fulfil their obligations and they failed to take over surpluses. The most noticeable example was that of gram. A large quota of gram was accepted for export in 1944-45 by the Government of India. But necessary despatching instructions were not sent and a number of provinces repudiated their quotas. The result was that the entire exportable surplus from the province was locked up, resulting in the deterioration of valuable food-grain. There was a strong rumour, Sir Buta Singh said, and he wanted the Government of India to deny it, that the Bengal Government was selling in the Punjab railway receipts for gram, which the Bengal Government had stored in the Punjab for being taken to that province, at Rs. 7-12, per maund when the market price of gram in the Punjab was about Rs. 6-4 per maund only. Sir Buta Singh referred to the disparity in prices as between neighbouring provinces. Normally, difference in the prices of wheat and rice between the Punjab and the United Provinces was a few annas per maund, but, now, whereas the prevalent price of wheat in the Punjab was about Rs. 8-4-0 a maund, the price in the United Provinces was Rs. 3 to Rs. 4 higher. "This situation deprives the Punjab grower and trader of his legitimate profits and deprives the U. P. consumer of the opportunity of getting his requirements at a reduced price."

Mr. K. A. Mealing (Bengal Chamber of Commerce) said that there were three main and several subsidiary problems relating to food. They were firstly, the growth and distribution of enough food of all types to stop starvation; secondly, the prevention of the pendulum from swinging to the other extreme and prices falling below production cost; and thirdly, planning for the future of a better diet, both quantitative and qualitative, for the masses of the country. The first difficulty that faced them was, Mr. Mealing said, the lack of correct figures and the utter unreliability of the statistics available. No business, however small, could be run successfully in the absence of reliable figures of output, cost, market value, sales and profit and loss. The Government of India had, with the Provincial Governments perforce, entered the biggest business in the country, and he regretted that he could place no reliance whatsoever in their so-called statistics which they had so far produced. He urged that immediate steps should be taken to rectify the position. With correct statistics, Mr. Mealing said, it should be possible for a definite plan to be evolved, and the co-ordination of the provinces in that plan secured. That plan should decide what was, under present circumstances, a fair and proper price, both to the producer and consumer, which should not be allowed to fluctuate to the detriment of one or the other. He said that if Government were to set up a special section with wide powers and adequate finance for the sole purpose of encouraging the supply of milk and milk products, it should be a great boon to the people. Speaking on the situation in Bengal, Mr. Mealing said that he did know that the Ministry and officials in Bengal were honestly doing their best to improve the food situation in the province. No other province, except Assam, had been so near to or so much affected by the impact of war. He asked the other and more fortunate provinces that had not been through the experience of Bengal and Assam to have some sympathy for the two provinces.

15th. NOVEMBER:—The two-day food debate in the Council ended this afternoon without any votes being taken. This was because there were no amendments by the Opposition to the formal Government motion asking the House to take the food situation into consideration. The President declared the debate closed after the Food Member's reply.

Replying to the debate this afternoon, Sir J. P. Srivastava, Food Member, referred to the suggestion for fixing the minimum price for foodgrains, and said that there was conflict between producers and consumers and the Government were trying to hit the golden mean between the two interests. Sir J. P. Srivastava said that the needs of India had been placed before the British Government and the

London Food Council with all the emphasis the Government of India could command. He thought the future prospects of imports from overseas were bright. Answering points raised by Opposition speakers, he said that Government had in hand a comprehensive scheme for the provision of storage godowns in order to avoid deterioration of foodgrains held in reserve. As to the surcharge imposed by the United Provinces Government on the export of mustard oilseeds and oil from Province to Bengal, he said that the view of the Provincial Government was that, unless the Bengal Government exercised proper control on retail prices, they were not justified in asking the United Provinces Government for removing the surcharge. The Government of India were, however, discussing the question with the two Provincial Governments concerned. On the question of food supplies for Calcutta next year he reiterated his view that it would not be fair to place the entire burden on the Centre.

Mr. B. R. Sen, Director-General of Food made a long statement refuting allegations made in the Assembly last week, that a loss of Rs. 70 lakhs had been incurred as a result of the Central Government purchasing rice from Nepal at a price higher than that arranged by the Bengal Government. He pointed out that the entire loss in the transaction was not more than Rs. 5 lakhs. The Government of India, he said, stepped in because the Maharaja of Nepal preferred that the procurement should be made by an agent of the Central Government rather than by an agent of the Government of Bengal. The price paid was not higher than the price arranged by the Bengal Government.

Sir Jogendra Singh, Member, Education, Health and Lands Department, replied to criticisms levelled against the Grow-More-Food campaign. Giving figures to prove the success of the campaign, Sir Jogendra Singh said that during the pre-war period, the acreage under rice in India was 73.8 million acres. After one year's campaign, the area rose to 75 million acres and last year, 1943-44, the acreage rose to about 30 millions, six and quarter millions more than the pre-war acreage. The total acreage under all the major food crops for the three pre-war years was about 195 millions and as a result of the Grow-more-Food Campaign to-day, it was over 206.3 million acres, and thus there was an increase of six per cent in land under cultivation. Besides, there were areas in the country for which no statistics were yet available. Referring to the disparity in production estimates and procurement figures, Sir Jogendra Singh explained that three-fourth of the population lived in villages and thus the largest consuming population should have some reserves for their own consumption. In regard to protective foods, such as milk, vegetables and meat, Sir Jogendra Singh explained the many schemes which the Government, in co-operation with the Provincial Governments, were now working. The army was producing its own vegetable requirements. Arrangements had been made to procure diesel engines which would be fitted to country craft for the quick transport of fish. Government were making arrangements for the import of dairy machinery and had schemes for the production of more milk. He, however, thought it was extremely unlikely that during war time, Government would be able to meet milk demands. For some years to come they would have to popularise facts. Government, Sir Jogendra Singh added, were attempting to procure about 1,700 tractors for the cultivation of reclaimed waste lands. They had assisted the Provincial Governments and States in the shape of loans and grants for the production of more food and had so far spent over Rs. 5½ crores in this regard. Sir Jogendra emphasised that India was in a position to produce all her food needs, and the Government had worked out a programme which, if carried out in 15 years, promised substantially to increase both the cereal and protective food to the extent needed to meet the requirements of the country. Sir Jogendra Singh added that he did not wish to depend on imports for food. India must produce all the food she required within the country itself. He emphasised the urgent need to find industrial employment for at least 30 per cent of the population so that there could be a balanced economy. At present there was less than one acre for cultivation per head of the population in the country. That land should not only feed him, but feed his cattle as well. The urgent need at present was to improve the physical and mental health of the people so that they could double the present production. He appealed to the Press and the Legislature in India to devote attention to the problem of education and agriculture and to make constructive suggestions for the improvement of the standard of living in the country. Mr. P. N. Saprú said that stronger measures should be taken against anti-social activities such as profiteering and hoarding. Government must bring down the prices of all foods within the reach of the average man. Britain, he said, would not have suc-

ceeded in this war but for the good work of her Ministry of Food. They had vision and foresight and they planned their country's food programmes long before the war.

The President: You refused to co-operate here.

Mr. Sapru replied that they never refused to co-operate. What they refused to do was to co-operate on subordinate terms. So far as India was concerned she was under "one man rule" to-day. The Food Member might delude himself that he controlled the food situation in India. He knew who controlled it and therefore for everything that happened they were entitled to blame the system that allowed the "one man rule".

Mr. Sapru added that if Government had imported in time the one million tons of foodgrains and built up the Central reserve, they could have dealt with the hoarders and profiteers more effectively. Government, he suggested, should inspire confidence in the agriculturist. They should purchase from surplus provinces and pay a fair price to the cultivators and should transport the grains to deficit areas at Government's cost. They should also increase the quantity of rations supplied and improve the quality.

Mr. Hossain Imam, Leader of the Muslim League Party, referred to the Bengal calamity and said that the famine was not God-made but man-made and war-made. He expressed delight at Government's promise of monetary grant. Mentioning the destruction of hundreds of thousands of maunds of foodgrains, *Mr. Hossain Imam* asked the Government to realise that food was not a factory produce, which could be increased or decreased by shifts. He referred to the low prices in Bengal and warned that if the prices fell below a certain level, production would suffer. *Mr. Hossain Imam* castigated the Government for paying more attention to the industrial population and the urban population as against the agricultural population. He demanded that the prices of the articles purchased by the grower should be brought down to the level of those of his own produce. The Muslim League Party leader criticised the U. P. Government's decision to levy a surcharge on mustard seed and stated it was scandalous for the Government of India to connive at it. He also mentioned the rising price of vegetable ghee and said that it was beyond the reach of the average consumer. The speaker referred to India's cattle-wealth and said that India's cattle population was one-third of the whole world but he felt sorry that the quality was poor. He complained that cattle were moved to foreign countries. In conclusion, *Mr. Hossain Imam* expressed the view that he was not in favour of rationing in surplus areas.

Refuting the allegation that in the matter of purchases of Nepal rice, the Government of India brought it at a higher price than had been arranged by the Bengal Government, *Mr. B. R. Sen*, Director-General, Food, made the following statement:—

In April 1943 the Nepal Government placed an embargo on the export of rice and paddy from their territory as in view of the difficult rice situation in north-east India they apprehended depletion of their stocks. In October 1943, H. H. the Maharaja kindly offered to release 1,00,000 tons in terms of rice from the 1944 crop. Bengal's agent, being on the spot, negotiated prices for this offer and the Government of Nepal fixed Rs. 6-8 and Rs. 12 as minimum for paddy and rice respectively with the condition that, the prevailing market rate across the border in Bihar would be fixed if it happened to be higher than the minimum. It had been alleged that the Government of India made purchases at a "higher price than had been arranged by the Bengal Government", resulting in a loss of Rs. 40 lakhs. The statement was incorrect and misleading. The Bengal Government's agent had not arranged to purchase at a certain price. He had only bound the Bengal Government to pay a particular minimum and had further bound them to pay the market price prevailing across the border if that happened to be higher. About the time when Bengal's agent agreed to these terms the prices in Bengal ranged from Rs. 10 to Rs. 15 per maund for paddy and Rs. 20 to Rs. 32 per maund for rice. With the prices in Bengal at this level and Nepal being entitled to ask for the prevailing market rate with no maximum limit, it was evident that Bengal's agent would have procured at a higher rate than that paid by the Government of India's agent. The alleged loss was therefore imaginary. Some stocks purchased by the Government of India's agent were damaged by exposure to rains. It has been alleged that this wastage amounted to about Rs. 30 lakhs and that the Government of India are trying to say that this loss is not to be borne by the agent. So far about 2,500 maunds of damaged paddy have been buried as they were not fit for any purpose and an equal quantity has been disposed of for brewing local beer as it

was not fit for consumption as food. The price of these quantities would not be more than Rs. 40,000. Approximately another 34,000 maunds in terms of rice are also involved in such damage, the price of which would be about Rs. 4,50,500.

Mr. J. M. Gibbons said that even after the war Government would have to continue and probably expand the controls which they had already established over the production procurement and distribution of foodgrains. He urged Government to take steps for the prevention of adulteration of foodstuffs, the continuance of which would cause serious menace to public health. He referred in particular to the extent of adulteration of milk and said, "I am horrified at the degree of adulteration by dishonest traders who are sacrificing the health of the people for their own gains. Government must pay proper attention to this."

Sir N. Gopalaswami Iyengar said that there could be no doubt that the food position to-day was becoming definitely better than what it had been last year this time. However, there was much ground yet to be covered till the ideal of providing the people with an adequate supply of food and an adequate nutritional standard was reached. The achievements of the Food Department so far were laudable and their achievements had been accomplished under difficult conditions. Behind the implementation of their policy, Sir Gopalaswami said, there had not been mobilised that amount of popular support which could be had. That was an unfortunate state of things in this country. Mr. Sen told the House of the attempts made to associate public opinion with the Food Department. Association was not enough. What he wanted was actual co-operation and unless other Departments of the Government of India co-operated in producing an atmosphere in which the co-operation of a body of public workers, who were the only people who could mobilise public support, was given, the large scale food policy of the Government would not yield the result which it might otherwise do. On the subject of fixing prices, Sir Gopalaswami said that prices should be limited to the purchasing power of the people and within those limits the producers should make profits but should not profiteer. He suggested that other Provinces and States might follow the example of Madras in the collection of proper statistics. Sir Gopalaswami pleaded for giving effect to the Foodgrains Policy Committee's report. The food problem must be squarely faced and considerations of finance should not deter the Government. Financial pusillanimity or chicken-heartedness would be unforgivable in a matter of life and death to the people.

Replying to the debate, Sir J. P. Srivastava, the Food Member, thanked the House for the many suggestions the members had made and which would be of extreme help to the Food Department. However, many of the points raised in the debate were local problems which should have been raised with the respective Provincial Governments. He deplored the tendency of introducing politics into the sacred sphere of food. "I agree," the Food Member said, "that if there was a National Government, they would have done probably better. But within our limited sphere, we are trying to do our best. If the National Government is not here, it is not my fault and we must all agree that in the circumstances we find ourselves we cannot leave the starving man alone." As to why the Government of India did not approach the United States and Empire countries direct for their food imports, Sir Jwala Prasad said that they could not do so. India's requirements would be placed before the Food Council in London which was the appropriate body which co-ordinated the surpluses and demands of the Empire countries. There was a Food Council in Washington composed of the United Nations who allocated limited supplies. The London Council approached the Washington Council for foodgrains. Replying to the point as to why the Government of India had not approached the UNRRA, the Food Member said that the House should bear in mind that the UNRRA had no foodgrains. The UNRRA, also would have to go to the Food Council in Washington for its needs. India was already getting allocations direct from Washington and she could not duplicate her demands. It might be that India might be able to get some additional quantities for areas near Burma and Chittagong due to their nearness to the war area and the distress caused in those areas on account of the war but the quantity that might be received would be meagre. Dealing with the situation in Bengal, the Food Member said that Government felt extremely doubtful of their being able to feed Calcutta which they did last year. The demand for rice from other parts of India especially the south, was great. Last year Government undertook to feed Calcutta in order to restore confidence but he did not feel the same treatment should be accorded this year. He was prepared to consider the demands of Calcutta on the same basis as the demands of other parts of India. Sir Jwala Prasad explained the steps taken by the Government for the proper storage of foodgrains and its equitable distribution, in

regard to the fixing of proper prices he had heard two views expressed. There were those who wanted a rise in the prices in the interests of the growers and others who wanted a further lowering of the prices. Government, however, as in the case of wheat, had not yet fixed a minimum price for rice. The price level of rice had not yet come down and Government were watching the trend. When the price registered a sharp fall Government would fix a minimum price. The Council at this stage adjourned.

RIGHTS OF INDIANS OVERSEAS

16th. NOVEMBER :—The Council discussing non-official resolutions to-day, agreed to Mr. P. N. Saprú's resolutions recommending to the Governor-General-in-Council to take steps to protect and safeguard the rights of Indians by bilateral agreements between the Government of India and the Government of the Dominions, Colonies and Protectorates in which Indians were resident or domiciled and to which, in future, emigration might be permitted by the Government of India.

Pandit H. N. Kunzru, supporting the resolution, said that in view of the experience gained in Ceylon and South Africa, His Majesty's Government must be approached to permit India's agents to be appointed in other parts of the Empire as well.

Mr. R. N. Banerjee, Secretary, Commonwealth Relations Department, said that efforts had already been made by the Government of India to bring about bilateral arrangements with countries in the Commonwealth into which our nationals had immigrated. In recent years, agreements had been negotiated with the Government of Burma and the Government of Ceylon. The agreement with Burma encountered the strongest opposition in this country and remained practically a dead letter owing to the Japanese occupation of Burma. In regard to Ceylon, the agreement was still-born as the Lower House refused to extend its endorsement, subject to which it had been negotiated. In spite of the fate of the previous efforts, the Government of India were still exploring the possibility of fresh agreements with those countries—particularly in the light of the close inter-dependence of those countries and India, which had been so vividly and painfully demonstrated by the present war.

Mr. Banerjee referred to the appointment of India's representatives in South Africa, Australia, Ceylon and Burma, and said that, whenever favourable opportunities for a better understanding presented themselves, the Government of India had made the full use of them to consolidate our relations with Commonwealth communities. The method of improving our relations with Commonwealth countries by entering into bilateral arrangements had, however, its limitations. Efforts made to establish closer and direct relations with a number of colonies and protectorates which were now under the direct control of His Majesty's Government had not been successful. Mr. Banerjee said that overtures made by the Government of India to appoint Agents or Representatives in the three Carribean Colonies, in Fiji and in East Africa had not met with a favourable response so far. Bilateral understanding pre-supposed the existence of a bilateral disposition to enter into such understanding. Mr. Saprú's reason for advocating bilateral agreements, he understood, was that it was desirable to enter into direct relations with those countries, particularly, after they had attained a wider measure of self-government. "Events and our experience do not", Mr. Banerjee said, "however, justify such optimism about the willingness of self-governing units of the Commonwealth to enter into bilateral agreements. The House will appreciate my anxiety to avoid any reference to the unpleasant details of this aspect of the history of Indian immigration into the Commonwealth countries. But, during the last two generations, the position of Indians in certain countries has deteriorated in direct proportion to the measure of self-government attained by them. With increasing powers of self-government, some of these countries have deprived our nationals domiciled in them of civil rights which they had already enjoyed." Mr. Banerjee said that he was only drawing attention to them to emphasise that bilateral agreements would not be feasible in the case of several of Commonwealth countries. The Government of India, Mr. Banerjee continued, could not possibly divest themselves of their moral responsibility for the welfare of those Indians, particularly so long as the governments of those countries persisted in denying them the rights of full citizenship. Mr. Banerjee, concluding, said that Mr. Saprú's proposal was in consonance with the policy which the Government of India had already been pursuing, and he assured the House that Government would examine all his suggestions for making a fuller and more extensive use of the method of bilateral understanding.

Mr. P. N. Sapru, replying to the debate said that Government should press upon His Majesty's Government for the appointment of an Indian representative in Jamaica. He regretted that His Majesty's Government had not agreed to our suggestions, but pointed out that it was necessary, in the wider interests of India for her representatives to be in those regions in which her nationals were settled and in which she had interests. Mr. Sapru continued that Indian interests should not suffer and her nationals should have due safeguards in the future constitution of those countries. He, however, warned Indian nationals settled overseas that they should eschew imperialistic outlook and they should not stand in the way of attainment of independence by countries like Malaya, Burma and Ceylon.

The House agreed to the resolution.

ARMY OFFICERS FOR CIVIL POSTS

Mr. V. P. Kalikkar then moved a resolution recommending to the Governor-General-in-Council to drop the scheme of temporary reinforcement of the civil administration by transfer of army officers and to recruit the required personnel for civil administration through the agency of the Federal Public Service Commission. Mr. Kalikkar said that the right type of officers required for the administration could be had "from the open market" and there was no need to recruit army personnel.

Mr. Conran-Smith, Home Secretary, emphasised that the postings were only temporary. They were being posted to the Provincial Governments to hold posts where they were most needed and to which their qualifications were best suited. The Home Secretary said that there was a clamour from the Bengal Government for officers, and those loaned from the army took over duties in the Supply Department or the Indian Police service and relieved the regular members of the Indian Civil Service to go back to their original jobs. The army needed more officers, and it was not correct that they could spare officers. It was only done to meet the insistent demands of the Provincial Governments. In regard to the selection of such officers, Mr. Conran-Smith said that the method of selection was more searching and thorough than ordinary recruiting.

Sir N. Gopalaswami Iyengar said that the Government should have recruited members from the Provincial Services to fill in the posts. The present method of recruitment was unfair to the members of the Provincial Services. There were enough men in the country who could man the posts for which army men were recruited.

Pandit Kunzru said that he was not against the appointment of Indian officers of the army to civilian posts. But as far as possible, candidates for civil post must be chosen from among the civilians, especially at a time when the army was not in a position to spare officers. He, however thought, in the present case, Government were only trying to test public opinion. He was afraid that the military officers would be permanently added to the civil cadre and it was an effort, to a certain extent, to militarise the administration.

Mr. Kalikkar, replying to the debate, said that many persons without any special qualifications were given emergency commissions in the army during the war and he was against recruiting for the civil administration men who had not the requisite qualifications.

The Home Secretary, Mr. Conran-Smith, replying to some of the objections raised in the course of the debate, emphasised the temporary nature of the appointments. He gave the assurance that provincial officers were being used to the fullest extent, but the ability of the Provincial Governments to spare such officers must be taken into account. Mr. Conran-Smith further stated that the officers now recruited could not have any superior claims for permanent posts, and they would be on equal footing with the rest of the officers in the army with requisite educational qualifications for competing for the war reserve posts. He said he was distressed at the raising of the racial issue. It should not be forgotten that it was part of a common effort in the war against a common enemy.

The House rejected the resolution by 20 to 14 votes.

RELIEF OF DISTRESS IN NORTH BIHAR

The Government accepted Mr. Sri Narain Mahtha's resolution recommending immediate and adequate relief to the people of North Bihar, suffering from epidemics and to remove the causes of the recurrence of epidemics after due investigation. The mover said that this was the second time during eleven years that Bihar was faced with a major disaster. Up to the end of the first week of August, he said, 1,96,000 deaths from epidemics were reported. He complained that

the Government had not made suitable arrangements for the treatment of cholera. He demanded that more doctors should be released for relief measures and adequate milk-supply be made.

Sir Jogendra Singh, Member for Health, accepting the resolution, said that he did not wish to minimise the disaster in Bihar. Cholera, he added, had assumed the form of a virulent epidemic this year and the cholera mortality was higher than in any year in the past 30 years except 1918 and 1930. He also referred to the wave of Malaria in certain parts of the province. "The main responsibility for measures to deal with epidemics," said Sir Jogendra Singh, "rested with the Provincial Government. But we had done what we could to assist them." The difficulty of the Provincial Government, he declared, was the lack of personnel. The military authorities had given assistance by lending 22 army doctors. Sir Jogendra Singh described the relief measures of the Bihar Government and the assistance given by the Government of India in respect of the supply of quinine and anti-malaria drugs. He said that cholera could not be eliminated till water-supply and sanitation were vastly improved. In this connection, he referred to the Provincial Government's schemes for the improvements of the rural water-supply and the drainage of water-logged areas. Sir Jogendra referred to the Bhore Committee, which was investigating the problem of health, and said that housing and sanitation were the most important factors in what was known as "social medicine." He hoped that the Government, in co-operation with the provinces, would evolve a public health policy thereby securing better living conditions for the people.

The resolution was passed unanimously. The House then adjourned.

POSITION OF INDIANS IN S. & E. AFRICA

17th. NOVEMBER:—The struggle for obtaining recognition of the rights of Indians as full citizens would be kept alive and would not stop till the goal was reached, declared *Mr. R. N. Banerjee*, Secretary, Commonwealth Relations Department, initiating the debate on South Africa in the Council of State to-day. Mr. Banerjee explained that the Government of India had not spared any efforts to avoid the situation that had arisen in South Africa. The Government had throughout maintained the maximum possible pressure on the Union Government on six occasions and left them in no doubt that unless a satisfactory solution was evolved, we would have no alternative to taking counter-measures. Mr. Banerjee emphasised that this was not the first time that such discriminatory measures had been adopted against Indians. The present was only one of a long series of discriminatory measures though it had the effect of the last straw on the camel's back. "It is true", said Mr. Banerjee, "that South Africa is formally a unit in the British Commonwealth. But, even as such, theirs is virtually an independent Government and the House will realise that such a Government is not likely to be amenable to advice or pressure even from His Majesty's Government in matters affecting the self-interest of the ruling classes. The House is aware that most, if not all, of the discriminatory measures in South Africa apply formally to all Asiatics. There is a sprinkling of Japanese and Chinese nationals in the Union who are also affected by these measures. It is interesting to note that the Governments of these two countries have not so far been able to protect their national measures involving racial discrimination." Referring to the measures taken by the Government, Mr. Banerjee said that the Indian Legislature had passed the Reciprocity Act and all the effective provisions of the Act had been enforced. He spoke of the demand for the recall of the High Commissioner and the severance of trade relations. The Government, he said, had not decided not to resort to these measures. They were considering them most energetically day by day. He asked the House to realise that the decision about the severance of trade relations would be a momentous one. Mr. Banerjee concluded: "That we have made a beginning in the enforcement of retaliatory measures should be some evidence that we can take such other measures as may be open to us. I can repeat the Hon'ble Member's assurance in the Lower House that our inability to make an immediate announcement should not be attributed to any lukewarmness on our part and that no undue delay will occur in taking a decision."

Pandit H. N. Kunzru deplored that the Government of India should have agreed to the Pretoria Agreement. He urged that the Government of India should give notice of termination of the Indo-South African Trade Agreement and impose economic sanctions against that country. Nothing, he said, could be worse than the humiliation imposed upon India by the legislation passed by the Natal Council. Unless the Government of India were prepared to retaliate with all the power

their command, Indians would be treated with contempt in every part of the world. By the imposition of economic sanctions, Pandit Kunzru said, India might suffer, but financial considerations should not be allowed to weigh in the matter of India's self-respect and national honour. He also urged the recall of India's High Commissioner. Whether it would be possible for India to compel South Africa to change her racial policy or not, it was incumbent on India to vindicate her self-respect. India, he said, was not fighting for herself alone, but for the whole of Asia.

Dr. N. B. Khare, Member, Commonwealth Relations, denied that the Government of India were a party to the Pretoria Agreement. No doubt, Government gave their moral support to the Agreement. If the South African Indian Congress came to an agreement with the Union Government, how could the Government of India prevent it? After all, there was some kind of occupational segregation of a voluntary character even in this country, though there was no law against anyone acquiring property anywhere. In big cities, one saw, either by a natural process of selection or convenience or agreement, that people belonging to the same class or profession lived in particular areas. Dr. Khare asserted that there was no delay on the part of the Government of India in taking steps against the South African Government. On the contrary, Government acted promptly as soon as the third reading of the Occupation Order was passed by the Natal Council. "Have you imagined," Dr. Khare asked, "anything so prompt with the Government of India before now?" On Government's part, there never was any lack of vision. If the Government of India had the necessary powers, they would have acted differently. They had, however, taken the necessary steps and were watching the results. "The tragedy of the situation is," Dr. Khare said, "that Indians are allowed to fight for the liberty of every other country in the world, but India can do nothing to better the condition of her own kith and kin." The major part of the African campaign, he said, was borne by Indians who fought to save South Africa. Replying to the criticism that the Government of India should not interfere in the domestic issues of South Africa, Dr. Khare said that if full citizenship rights were given to Indians, then, India would have no cause to interfere. This war, he said, was being fought against Nazism and Fascism and these should be rooted out not only from Italy, Germany and Japan, but from South Africa, or America or India. In regard to economic sanctions, Dr. Khare said that the Government were studying the question. The difficulties of India not getting an adequate supply of warlike bark had been pointed out. He thought we could do without them. "I am not satisfied with mere barking," Dr. Khare concluded, "but I want to bite."

The *Maharajadhiraja of Darbhanga* said that it was true that we were not in a position to retaliate. He asked H. M. G. to take a bold stand and tell General Smuts that, if he persisted in following the policy of racial discrimination, the forces of the rest of the Empire would be arrayed against him to bring him to submission. "If H. M. G. were to justify the South African Government's action", the speaker asked, "can we not legitimately ask what benefits we derive by being within the Empire? What protection do we get by belonging to the British Commonwealth of Nations?"

Sir N. Gopalswami Iyengar said that the European Group had blessed the application of the Reciprocity Act and apparently approved of the suggestion to recall the High Commissioner, but were opposed to imposition of economic sanctions. He said that application of economic sanctions would be prejudicial to European interests and not Indian interests. Sir N. Gopalswami also contended that war efforts would not be impaired and the liberation of Indians from the Japanese occupied territories could be carried out with the resources we have. India, however, was not going to solve the problem until she was independent and able to deal with the South African Government on equal terms.

Mr. P. N. Saprú said that the position of Indians in South Africa raised the fundamental issue of the relationship between white and non-white races of mankind. He wanted to know what the Secretary of State for India had done in the matter. He knew it would not be constitutionally correct for HMG to veto the Natal Council's decision but even then they could do a great deal. He urged that the Government of India should not entertain any South African white national in their departments. The trade agreement with that country should be terminated and economic sanctions should be imposed, he said.

Mr. Hossain Imam asked whether India was getting a fair deal in the British Commonwealth of Nations. Nearly 78 per cent of the population in South Africa were non-Whites and yet they were treated as slaves. He asked why HMG

did not move in the matter. The reason to him appeared obvious. None of the United Nations had clean hands. America had her colour problem. France had her colonials to exploit and India was an example of the British rule. The USSR alone, it appeared to him, had showed justice and equity to other nations.

Mr. Gibson said that the European community fully supported any measures that might be considered fit to be taken in support of Indian claims, but with some qualifications—qualifications which were very largely in the interests of Indians themselves. In a matter in which feeling ran extremely high, it was of great importance that very careful consideration should be given before any steps were actually taken so as to make perfectly sure that such action would not eventually be prejudicial to the very people whom they set out to protect. He thought that no action should be taken which might prejudicially affect the war effort. While agreeing that South Africa was responsible for the situation, he asked the House to remember that, among the objects of the Allied armies was the liberation of countries such as Burma, Malaya and the many Indian prisoners of war in Japanese hands. Subject to those considerations their sympathies were for the Indians in South Africa in their 'struggle for the establishment of full democratic and civic rights.'

Mr. R. N. Banerjee, Secretary, Commonwealth Relations Department, winding up the debate, gave the assurance that Government attached the greatest importance to the sentiments expressed in the House. Explaining the Government of India's point of view towards the Pretoria Agreement, Mr. Banerjee said that it was entered into between the committee of the Natal Indian Congress, as representing four-fifths of the Indian population, and the Union Government. Out of 81 members of the committee only 14, said to be Communists, dissented. The Government of India did not feel called upon to interfere. It was a voluntary agreement and Government did not commit themselves in any way.

Pandit Kunzru asked whether the Government would once more press His Majesty's Government to allow them to apply economic sanctions.

Mr. Banerjee replied that the Government would take a decision on the matter as soon as possible.

Pandit Kunzru asked whether it meant that the Government of India were going to take a decision themselves without reference to his Majesty's Government. Sir Feroz Khan Noon, Defence Member, intervening, explained that in his experience during the last two years, there had not been a single instance in which they had not taken a decision in accordance with their own opinions. Pandit Kunzru's suggestion, he thought, was an insult to the members of the present Government and they could not tell him anything more.

Pandit Kunzru: I am not asking you. I am putting the question to Mr. Banerjee.

Mr. Banerjee replied that some margin of discretion should be left to the Government in the framing of the rules and coming to a decision. He also considered that it might not be in our own interests to divulge them at the present stage. The House adjourned till November 20.

OFFICIAL BILLS PASSED

20th NOVEMBER:—The Council held a brief sitting to-day, at which it passed the Bills temporarily to amend the Indian Patents and Designs Act 1911, the Bill further to amend the Coffee Market Expansion Act, 1942, the Bill further to amend the Delhi Joint Water and Sewage Board Act 1925, and the Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to Government Securities issued by the Central Government and to the management by the Reserve Bank of India of the Public debt of the Central Government. These Bills had been passed by the Legislative Assembly.

The Council then adjourned till the next day, the 21st November when it adjourned *sine die* after adopting a resolution regarding the construction of a permanent food and agriculture organisation of the united nations.

The Central Legislative Assembly

Autumn Session—1st. to 21st. November 1944

MISUSE OF NATIONAL WAR FRONT FUNDS

The Central Legislative Assembly, which commenced its autumn session at New Delhi on the 1st November 1944, rejected without a division *Nawabzada Liaqat Ali's* adjournment motion to discuss "the failure of the Governor-General-in-Council to prevent and stop the misuse of the National War Front organisation by the provincial leader of the Punjab branch, *Malik Khizar Hayat Khan*, who has been utilising the National War Front organisation for propaganda in favour of collection of funds for a political party, the Zamindara League, thereby creating a great deal of hostility among a large section of the people against the National War Front."

Speaking on his motion, the *Nawabzada* explained that according to Lord Lighthgow who inaugurated it, the National War Front was to be non-communal and non-political in the sense that no propaganda in favour of a particular political party was to be conducted from the platform of that organisation and all parties who were willing to strengthen the Home Front were entitled to join that organisation. But unfortunately, now that the war was coming to a close, there were people who were making this organisation into a political party machine. He was sorry that the Government of India had failed in its duty to stop the misuse of this organisation.

Mr. *Ghiasuddin* congratulated the National War Front on winning *Nawabzada Liaqat Ali Khan* as a well-wisher and supporter, (laughter). He pointed out that the Punjab Legislature had given the fullest support to the war effort of the Allies and the Punjab Premier as the servant of the people and of the legislature was bound to carry out the orders of the Legislature. Mr. *Ghiasuddin* contended there was nothing wrong if the Premier of the Punjab, who held more than one public position, received addresses from more than one organisation at one and the same meeting or was presented with purses on behalf of different organisations. The Leader of the Punjab National War Front derived the commendation of the House, declared Mr. *Ghiasuddin*.

Captain Dalpat Singh opposing the motion spoke strongly in support of the Punjab Premier. He attributed the motion to the quarrel between the Unionists and the Muslim League.

Mr. *Nauman* asserted that even if Mr. Churchill used for his Conservative Party in England the funds of any organisation similar to the National War Front he would be condemned.

Moulana Zafarali declared that *Malik Khizar Hayat Khan* was doing immense harm to the war effort for the purposes of the Zamindara League. He said that Rs. 20 lakhs had been collected under the National War Front movement and it was wrong if anything of this was used to strengthen the Unionist Party or the Zamindara League. The Mussalmans of the Punjab were no whit less anxious for the successful prosecution of the war than *Malik Khizar Hayat Khan*. Even Mahatma Gandhi, said *Maulana Zafarali*, had declared himself to be pro-British and wished their victory against the Germans and the Japanese.

Mr. *Lal Chand Navatrai* thought it had not been proved that the money collected for the National War Front had been used for the Zamindara League.

Sir *Sultan Ahmed*, Member for Information and Broadcasting (under whose Department the National War Front came) said there was nothing to show that the Front was not doing its legitimate work, nor was there any evidence of hostility between the people and the Front. With regard to the allegation of misuse of the National War Front for party purposes, Sir *Sultan* said he got in touch with the Punjab Premier who was leader of the Front. *Malik Khizar Hayat Khan* had given the assurance that there was no such misuse at all. No further action was, therefore, taken on the allegations. An unduly violent difference of opinion existed between the Punjab Premier and the Muslim League, Sir *Sultan* went on. He urged, therefore, that the House should consider the question from a disinterested point of view. *Malik Khizar Hayat Khan* had given a categorical denial of the allegations and Sir *Sultan* was happy that the denial had been supported by three members of the House. The National War Front and the Zamindara League had a common aim so far as support to the war effort was concerned, but there were

other things in the Zamindara League which had no place in the National War Front. No funds were collected at the National War Front meetings and the fact that addresses from different organisations were presented at these meetings did not militate against Malik Khizar Hayat Khan acting as the leader of the National War Front or as Premier. The House, Sir Sultan asserted, should not be influenced by party troubles, which unfortunately existed in that province.

Sardar Sant Singh said he would not ask why the Deputy Leaders of the Moslem League Party did not raise question in North-West Frontier, Bengal, Assam or Sind and why the Punjab alone was chosen. The motive behind the motion might be questionable, but, said *Sardar Sant Singh*, on merits the motion was sound and the Government of India should turn its attention to them. *Sardar Sant Singh* took special exception to Civil Servants being used for the purpose of Partisan propaganda and for the collection of party funds. The facts given by the mover were correct; people in the Punjab saw them and knew of them but were not vocal because of Defence of India Rules.

Closure was moved at this stage and the House agreed by 50 votes to 38.

Nawabzada Liaqat Ali Khan, replying to the debate, said he was sorry that members of the House should have thought fit to drag in political quarrels of the League and the Unionist Party. "I have not brought forward this motion because it is a quarrel between the Premier of the Punjab and the Moslem League. Let me assure the leader of the House and other members of the House that the Muslim League, thank God, to-day does not need the support of members of this House to fight its political quarrels with others (cheers). The Moslem League has brought down bigger men than Malik Khizar Hayat Khan." He brought the motion forward because he felt this was a matter which was going to affect the public life and the working of the democratic parliamentary system of Government in this country very seriously. It seemed to be the Government's intention to continue this organisation even after the war. If this organisation was used for such purposes, as he had described, then it would indeed be a sad day for this country.

The motion was put and negatived without a division.

DEBATE ON FOOD POSITION

2nd. NOVEMBER :—*Sir J. P. Srivastava*, Food Member, initiating the Food Debate in the Assembly to-day, announced that 850,000 tons of foodgrains had already been received, 95,000 tons had been shipped and an additional 360,000 tons had been promised for the quarter ending December 31, 1944. "The Government of India are acutely conscious of the need for securing an adequate amount of wheat imports for successfully handling the problem of the country," continued the Food Member, "and I can assure the House that we shall spare no efforts to urge upon H.M.G. the need for their taking appropriate measures for giving us the imports we require." *Sir Jwalaprasad* also informed the House of his proposal to set up in the Food Department a food planning section, the main purpose of which would be to study the whole question of long-range food policy and planned development of food economy in India, so that in post-war India, the people of this country could look forward to having more food, better food and balanced food. The Food Member proceeded: "I claim we have been able to do four things. Firstly, we have secured the recognition of an all-India policy steadily pursued with a common direction and a common aim. In spite of constitutional and other difficulties—to overcome which a good deal of tact and patience was required—we have been able to secure the acceptance of the broad test that those who have must share their supply with those who have not. Secondly, we have controlled prices. Thirdly, we have been able to prevent the occurrence of serious local shortages and improved the stocks of grain in the hands of Governments and administrations all over India. Fourthly—and I attach the greatest importance to this—we have been able to restore confidence in the ability of Government to control the situation. Confidence is perhaps best reflected in prices. The steady downward movement of prices of the principal food grains is to my mind proof positive of the returning confidence." He concluded: "While food has clearly demonstrated the need for central direction, it has, if anything, more clearly demonstrated the economic unity of the country, the interdependence of the provinces and States and the need and capacity for common effort in a common cause. Nothing can be achieved if food is regarded as something which really does not matter or as something which can be made the sport of private or political profit or privilege. We can only succeed if the nation as a whole is determined as if it believes in possibility of success."

Earlier in his speech the Food Member dealt with the situation in the provinces. The end of last year, he said, saw the appearance of perhaps the biggest harvest that Bengal had ever seen. The Government of India undertook to feed Calcutta for a period of 12 months and up-to-date a total quantity of 4,75,000 tons of food-grains had been moved to Calcutta. The Government of Bengal anticipated being able to procure a total of 700,000 tons and the quantity they had so far succeeded in procuring was well in excess of that amount. The food situation as far as rice was concerned was now easy over practically all the areas in Bengal and the subdivisional average of rice prices in the province was to-day in the neighbourhood of Rs. 13 per maund as against the level of Rs. 15 it had reached in the first-half of March 1944. It was the set policy of the Government of India, the Food Member added, to try its best to see that the statutory ration throughout the country did not fall below 1 lb. a day. To-day the number of towns rationed was 460 and the population affected was 42,00,000. This was in addition to the rural areas in places like Travancore, Cochin, Bombay province and now Malabar. The successful execution of rationing, he said, depended upon two factors, viz., the willingness of the surplus administrations to fall into line and the willingness of deficit administrations to accustom their people, if necessary, to the use of food-grains other than those to which they had been normally accustomed. He could see visible signs of progress in both those directions. Dealing with the prospects for the coming year, Sir *Jwala Prasad* said that no indications could be available at the moment of the prospects of the Rabi harvest of 1945 but Government had some information about the Kharif prospect of this year. He believed that while we could not expect a bumper harvest of either rice or millets in any part of the country, taking the country as a whole, the Kharif crops would be about average, perhaps a little less in some areas and a little more in other areas. Even that statement could only be made with great caution, as much would depend upon weather conditions in the next two months. But enough was known to make them emphasise the need for care and caution in the administration of the food policy in the coming 12 months. The silver-lining in the situation was the more optimistic position regarding imports and if that position was maintained he thought we should be able to go through next year without having to face any calamity of a major magnitude. But much would turn upon the efficiency and successful conducting of procurement operations both in the deficit and surplus regions, he continued, and if possible increased willingness of surplus administrations to share in the all-India food burden, the further extension of rationing, the maintenance of price control, the easing of transport conditions, the vigilance of the department and above all the understanding and co-operation of leaders of non-official opinion.

THREE AMENDMENTS MOVED

Three amendments were moved. One running to about 500 words was in the name of Sir *Ziauddin*. It suggested various measures to control the entire production of foodgrains in India, to collect statistics and to associate non-officials in distribution. The second amendment moved by *Haji Esak Sait* criticised the Government's measures and declared, among other things, that co-ordination between surplus and deficit areas was entirely wanting. The third was a Congress party amendment moved by Prof. Ranga, declaring that grain prices in most places were uneconomically low for producers and the failure of the Government to subsidise food consumption of the poorest consumers in towns and villages was hitting hard the producers and consumers.

Prof. Ranga condemned the Government's food policy as inimical to the peasants and favourable to the profiteers. There was a clamour for lowering the prices of foodstuffs and he wished that the same amount of pressure was exerted on the industrialists to lower the prices of their goods and services. He charged the Provincial Governments with profiteering in collusion with the middleman. He strongly criticised the way in which the procurement plan was being carried out by the village officers who wrung foodgrains from the hands of the peasants without regard to whether they produced those foodgrains or not. He declared that the epidemics in Orissa and Bihar and Malabar were due to malnutrition. He urged that steps be taken to eliminate the middleman and to give a fair price to the producer.

Mr. Govind Deshmukh supported the plea that the Government, which gave dearness allowance to its servants, should come to the help of the agriculturist by giving him a subsidy. If we wanted the agriculturist to grow more food we should see that he got better prices. There could be no better inducement to the agriculturist to grow more food than to assure him economic prices, so that he might be

able to pay off his accumulated debt of many years. Mr. *Deshmukh* alleged that the Provincial Governments compulsorily procured foodgrains from the agriculturist at a low price and when the agriculturist himself wanted food, he had to get it from the Government at a higher price. In some areas millets which was the ordinary food of the people had been procured with such thoroughness that the people had to live on groundnut, oil cake and gur.

THE BAKHTIARPUR RY. STATION ACCIDENT

The Assembly next carried, by 50 votes to 49, Mr. *Nauman's* adjournment motion to censure the Government on the E. I. Railway administration's failure to provide lights at Bakhtiarpur junction station resulting in an accident in which nine persons were run over and killed on September 26. Mr. *Nauman* (Moslem League) said he personally went to the station after the accident and made enquiries. He got the evidence of 12 or 13 persons of all communities and all of them said there was no light of any variety on the platform except one in the Assistant Station Master's office. He asserted that was the position not only on that night but it had been the case for some months. People on the platform had not been given any warning of the approach of any up train. Mr. *Nauman* declared that Government had paid no heed to the public demand for an enquiry.

DISCUSSION ON BOMBAY 15 YEARS' PLAN

3rd. NOVEMBER :—The Assembly to-day took up *Sir Ziauddin Ahmad's* resolution recommending to the Governor General-in-Council "not to entertain the programme of fifteen years' plan prepared by the capitalists of India. Discussion on it had not concluded when the House rose for the day. *Sir Ziauddin* said that the plan failed in two important aspects, namely, that it failed to provide for increasing the purchasing power of the masses and for the elimination of unemployment. Quoting *Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru* he said that an essential pre-requisite of planning was complete freedom and independence of the country and the removal of external control. *Sir Ardesbir Dalal* had told the House to-day that the Government of India had accepted the objectives of the 15-year plan. But, asked *Sir Ziauddin*, had he accepted the conditions precedent to such a plan? Referring to the position of rupee to-day *Sir Ziauddin* said that purchasing power of the rupee was five annas and asked what happened to the remaining eleven annas? The plan claimed to treble the income. The Finance Member, *Sir Ziauddin* said, could do it by issuing an Ordinance that wherever there was one rupee it should be treated as three rupees. If the purchasing power was not considered an important factor then the trebling of the income was of no value. The real object should be that the purchasing power of the individual should be increased. If money was a measuring rod then it must have a definite purchasing power. *Sir Ziauddin* proceeded to say that it looked as though industrialists who had got a certain standard of profit during the war wanted to stabilise it after the war. The question of agriculturists who formed 92 percent of the population had not been examined. Land for agriculture was very important as the population of the country was increasing at the rate of five millions per annum and at the end of 15 years the population would have increased by 75 millions. Cottage industries had been neglected, *Sir Ziauddin* continued. He asked whether the big manufacturers would part with 50 per cent of their yarn production for cottage industries. Concluding, *Sir Ziauddin* said: "Our industrialists are not interested in the stabilisation of prices but stabilisation of profits and are not interested in the greater problems in finding employment, or in the development of cottage industries." As regards the object of the plan, they wanted priority for basic industries and to use the sterling balances for the import of heavy machinery.

Mr. T. S. Avinashiingam Chettiar moved an amendment on behalf of the Congress Party recommending to the Governor General-in-Council that an elected committee of the House consisting of not more than 15 members be appointed for the purpose of considering the several plans for post-war economic development of India, agricultural and industrial, with instructions to report to the house. *Mr. Chettiar* declared that any scheme of economic development of the country must be on the basis that it should be administered entirely from the point of view of the masses of this country. The sole aim of the plan should be the raising of their economic status. The people should have greater purchasing power; not more money but more comforts. Planning should not create big industrial establishments which made the rich richer and the poor poorer. Big industrial establishments, such as the automobile, aircraft and railways, must be state-owned and run

from the point of view of the development of the country as a whole and not for profit-making. The development aimed at must be mainly agricultural.

Sir *Vithal Chandavarkar* congratulated the Viceroy on his courage in inviting one of the authors of the Bombay plan to join his Executive Council. It meant in his view that the Government of India were serious and sincere in their effort to promote and prepare a scheme which when a National Government came into office could be put into effect.

Mr. *Nauman*, disputing the suggestion that a strong Centre was needed to carry out economic controls, declared that what success had been achieved in the matter of control was achieved because of the co-operation of provinces in their own interests, and control was defeated by the very section or group of capitalists who were the authors of the Bombay plan, whose interest was not served by control, threw on black marketing and wanted to make hay while the sun shone.

Mr. *Venkatachalam Chetty* thought that the Bombay plan was an answer to the cry that the country was missing the bus because of the absence of constructive planning. The Bombay plan, in his view, had been fully justified by the number of other plans which followed its publication; even Government thought it necessary to appoint one of the authors of the plan as a member for post-war development.

Further debate on the resolution was adjourned till the next non-official day.

PROTECTION OF NEW DELHI MOSQUES

Earlier the Assembly rejected, by 30 votes to 17, Sir *Muhammad Yamin Khan's* resolution asking for proper repair and protection of mosques in New Delhi. The resolution recommended to Government to instruct the department concerned to allot all those bungalows in the compound of which mosques were situated only to Muslim employees of Government, who should be instructed not to obstruct or stop their Muslim servants or visitors from saying prayers in such mosques; and to instruct the New Delhi Municipal Committee that they should give permission, without delay, on presentation of applications by the Muslims for the repair of or restoration to the old position or re-building with some altered designs of mosques situated either in the compound of any Government bungalow or on any place surrounded by Government or Municipal property.

ECONOMIC SANCTIONS AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA

6th. NOVEMBER :—The Assembly to-day passed without a division Dr. *Khare's* motion that the position of Indians in South Africa and East Africa be taken into consideration, with the amendments moved by the Congress Party and by Mr. *Hooseinbhoj Laljee* asking that powers under the Reciprocity Act be applied against South African nationals in India, that the Indian High Commissioner in South Africa be recalled and that economic sanctions be enforced against South Africa and East Africa.

In the course of the debate, *Nawabjada Liaquat Ali Khan*, Deputy Leader of Moslem League Party, and Mr. *Bhulabhai Desai*, Leader of the Congress Party, demanded that in addition to the enforcement of economic sanctions and the recall of the High Commissioner, the Reciprocity Act should be amended so as to remove the provision exempting from the operation of the Act South African nationals who were in the defence services in India.

Dr. *Khare* made it clear, in his reply, that a decision on the amendments would be left entirely to non-official members of the House and the Government would not vote.

In the course of his speech while initiating the debate on the situation in South Africa, Dr. *N. B. Khare*, Commonwealth Relations Member, said : "Let me tell the House at once that the Government of India as a whole, and in this I include all my honourable colleagues and His Excellency the Viceroy, have been as amazed as the House and our countrymen at the Union Government going back on an agreement into which they solemnly entered with the Indian community. The Government of India share on the fullest measure the indignation and resentment which this exhibition of racialism on the part of a fellow member of the British Commonwealth has created in this country."

"Sir, our patience is now completely exhausted and the whole nation is in a mood of desperation. We have already told the Union Government in the plainest and most unequivocal terms, that the Government of India now hold themselves free to take such counter-measures as they can. Had our nationals been really accepted and treated as full citizens of the country of their adoption—towards the

growth and prosperity of which they have made vast contributions—the attitude of the Union Government might have been intelligible. In view, however, of their latest exhibition of callousness, the Government of India cannot possibly divest themselves of their moral responsibility for the welfare of their nationals in this ill-fated country. They, therefore, refuse to be a helpless spectator of the decision of the Union Government to delegate the large and progressive Indian population in Natal to a position of permanent inferiority."

Dr. Khare then referred to Government decision to enforce the Reciprocity Act and mentioned that the question of enforcing economic sanctions was under consideration. Referring to East Africa, Dr. Khare said the present position arising from representations made by the Government of India was, firstly, that the Colonial Governments have agreed that entry of permits will be granted to all 'bona fide' residents in the Colonies even though they may have been absent from the Colonies for more than two years from the date of the enforcement of the regulations, and secondly, that the Secretary of State for Colonies, after consultation with the three Colonial Governments, has now given us the assurance—through the Secretary of State for India—that the regulations in question in all the three Colonies are purely for meeting war-time conditions and not intended to be permanent. He realised that there was public apprehension that these regulations were a prelude to a further attempt at the permanent exclusion of Indians from the Colonies but for the present, there was no reason to question the genuineness of the assurance that the regulations would not be made permanent. He assured the House that the Government would keep a vigilant eye on all future developments and step in to take remedial measures as soon as there were indications that the regulations were being prolonged unduly.

Dr. Khare said his department had taken up with the Colonial Governments hard cases in which permits had been refused and they had been successful in securing permits in certain recent cases.

The Government of India, Dr. Khare added, had urged upon the Colonial Governments that there were no valid reasons why normal residents of the Colonies should even have to submit to the necessity of obtaining permits for returning to their homes or for looking after their interests in the Colonies. The Government had also forwarded to the Secretary of State for India copies of the debates in the Council of State on the subject and had strongly urged that the following action must now be taken by the three Colonial Governments:—(1) all normal residents (including their families and dependents) in the Colonies as well as Indians, possessing vested interests in the Colonies should be immediately exempted from the operation of the regulations irrespective of their periods of absence from the Colonies; (2) Such new personnel as has to emigrate to the Colonies to replace or reinforce the business staff of Indians should be immediately exempted from the operation of the regulations; (3) Even as regards other entirely new entrants the regulations should be withdrawn as soon as possible. In any case the regulations should not be renewed after the expiry of their present term.

"It is suggested in some quarters," said Dr. Khare in conclusion, "that one of the reasons why the British Government went to war against the Boers in South Africa in the early part of this century was the bad treatment they were giving to Indians there and therefore, the British Government should now repudiate the dominion constitution conferred upon South Africa and appoint a Royal Commission to enquire into the maladministration and the injustices done by the South African Government against Indians, Africans and even against Europeans. It is not for me to suggest measures to be taken by H. M. G. They claim to be our trustees and I am bound to say that no trustee in the world can afford for any length of time to look on with supreme indifference while his ward is being insulted and assaulted for the very simple reason that in the very process of natural evolution as time goes on the ward is bound to attain the status of an independent entity himself." (Cheers).

TWO AMENDMENTS

Two amendments were moved to Dr. Khare's motion. Dr. G. V. Deshmukh moved the Congress party amendment asking that the powers under the Reciprocity Acts should be exercised against the nationals of South African Union not being of Indian origin and the Indian High Commissioner in South Africa should be recalled immediately.

Mr. Hossainbhoy Lalljee (unattached) moved an amendment calling upon the Government of India to enforce economic sanctions against South Africa and East Africa and exercise the powers under the Reciprocity Acts.

Dr. *Deshmukh* commending his amendment asked what India's High Commissioner was going to do there. The High Commissioner had been able to achieve absolutely nothing. The High Commissioner had been looked upon in that country as someone who represented a population which could be trampled upon. This course, he (the speaker) suggested, would be good for the honour of India and would show that we were earnest and had no faith either in their Government or in their pledges. The questions raised were painful and shameful. He was not sorry that the South African Government had raised the issue at the present time because it had been raised while the fight for freedom was going on and the position of Indians and that of Asiatic nations in the framework of the so-called Commonwealth of Nations would be settled. At the same time he could not resist a sense of shame at the weak-kneed policy of the Government of India." It was astonishing that the Government of India should have kept such childish and blind faith in the South African Government, Dr. *Deshmukh* suggested the taking of extreme steps and asked whether the Government would be prepared to send Indian troops "to drive some sense into South African whites" in the way that they did to Italians. Even in this war Indians had shed their blood to save South Africa and he was sorry that in spite of the Government having a warrior Viceroy Indians had to suffer humiliations. Indians who enjoyed Parliamentary franchise were deprived of it in 1896 and instead they were given municipal franchise. Even that franchise, Dr. *Deshmukh* said, had been taken away in 1925 and more repressive measures had been taken of late. Field-Marshal Smuts had not had the courtesy even to receive an Indian deputation. Concluding, Dr. *Deshmukh* urged the recall of the Indian High Commissioner and said: "This withdrawal must be accompanied by an aggressive attack, namely economic sanctions. We would wish to send Indian regiments but I know it is not possible".

Sir *Frederick James* (European Group), confining his remarks to South Africa said: "We fully support the powerful remonstrance which the Hon. Member (Dr. *Khare*) has directed to the Union of South Africa. This is not the way to treat an important and valuable minority grown on matters which vitally affect their interests. It is certainly not the way to lay the foundations of racial harmony throughout the Union and Indian reactions in this country are fully justified". Referring to the complaint that it was improper for India to take any interest in the matter but that Indians in Natal should look to the Union for protection, Sir *Frederick* said if that was the case, the Indian community should be granted the municipal and parliamentary franchise, which it once had. "There will never be any racial harmony in the Union so long as important racial groups are excluded from every form of political representation and denied representation even on local bodies. These are fundamental rights and as long as these are denied to Indians in South Africa, there will be trouble. Without representation, to whom can the Indian community in South Africa look if not to India? If they are forced to do this what can India do to help them, except to remonstrate? If that fails, boycott; and if that fails, impose sanctions". No minority problem was solved by sending the minority to Coventry, Sir *Frederick* declared. Referring to the amendments, Sir *Frederick* said the Reciprocity Act had been applied or was in process of application. Recall of the High Commissioner, he said, was justified by the way in which the High Commissioner had been treated in these present measures. His party were not in favour of the imposition of economic sanctions at present, he added. They were not prepared to agree to any measure which might jeopardise any part of the war effort. India and South Africa were supply bases for the United Nations, and imposition of economic sanctions would really mean the opening of economic warfare as between these two great supply bases and would most certainly interfere with the war effort.

Several members called upon Sir *Frederick* to give an instance to show how the effort would be interfered with.

Sir *Frederick* gave the instance of wattle bark imported from South Africa.

Sir *Raza Ali*: That can be replaced.

Sir *Frederick* said he understood the Supply Department made an enquiry into that and found other material could not be used for the purpose. India could not at present give up South Africa wattle bark without serious interference with war production. He suggested that the House should claim fulfilment of the promises made during the Cape Town Agreement.

Sir *Syed Raza Ali*, who spoke on behalf of the Muslim League Party, said that Government's disinclination to recall the High Commissioner from South Africa made it appear that they were willing to swallow the camel but strained at

a great. Action under the Reciprocity Act which included the imposition of economic sanctions was a much more serious step than the recall of the High Commissioner. He paid a tribute to Dr. Khare for his "manly, courageous and lucid statement" and urged that it was their duty not to let their ranks be divided in this issue. The history of our relations with South Africa, he said, was very sad. The Ordinance adopted by the Natal Council, Sir Raza Ali asserted, was the result of the anti-Indian legislation sponsored by the Britishers who formed 95 percent of the white population in Natal. "This is the most unfortunate part of it. This Ordinance which has caused the greatest offence to India a repressive, offensive and objectionable Ordinance—is the result of the endeavours of pure Britishers," Sir Raza Ali said. Our cause was right. Whatever might be the position of Indians in other parts of the British Commonwealth, it looked as though as far as South Africa was concerned that might was right and might was just. The whole issue, Sir Raza Ali said, was a moral issue. "Is it not the duty?" Sir Raza Ali asked, "of all the countries forming the British Commonwealth of Nations to take up Indian's cause?" "I am quite clear that if this matter is allowed to go any further and no compromise is found then this might mean the death-knell of the British Commonwealth of Nations." Referring to Sir Frederick James' remark that the imposition of economic sanctions might impede the war efforts, Sir Raza Ali asked whether Sir James expected Indians to be more loyal to the King than others. "Does he expect us to have greater regard to the solidarity for the Commonwealth of Nations than these English settlers in Natal have," he asked. He was glad that at long last the Government of India applied the Reciprocity Act against South Africa but he was afraid Government were just twelve months too late with their measure. The real point was that the South Africans believed that the Government of India would not support the people of India in their efforts for the removal of their grievances. It was unfortunate that their action was so much delayed. He did not know how long it would take to frame the rules for the imposition of sanctions. "It is a question of India's honour," Sir Raza Ali concluded, "and it is the duty of every Indian to do what he can to vindicate India's honour even if such vindication results in the infliction of injuries on our people in South Africa."

Sir Sultan Ahmad, Leader of the House, intervened unexpectedly and made a forceful speech in reply to some of Sir Frederick James' remarks. Sir Sultan said that one sentence in Sir Frederick's speech would be read with great concern by the people of this country. Sir Frederick had said that India should appeal to the Union Government and the provincial Governments on this issue. "He has not realised," said Sir Sultan, "that this momentous issue is one of sentiment, of honour, of respect and even of principle, affecting four-fifths of His Majesty's subjects. After all, he asks us to appeal to the defendants, to the accused. I submit to the House, it is a most extraordinary request. (hear hear). I wish Sir Frederick would ask H.M.G., his own people in this country, to appeal to their countrymen in South Africa to be reasonable and to be sensible and not to ask us to appeal to them." (cheers).

Sir Frederick James, interrupting, pointed out that the Leader of the House had misunderstood him. He certainly did not recommend to the House to appeal either to the Union Government or to H.M.G. What he did say was that if any words of his in the House reached those quarters they might be reminded of the solemn pledges given in the past which they now disregarded.

Sir Sultan requested Sir Frederick to call a meeting of the European community in the different centres of India and appeal to the South Africans to be reasonable. Referring to Sir Frederick's observation that war efforts would suffer if certain steps were taken by the Government of India, Sir Sultan said, of course, they will suffer but who is responsible for this? (voices: South Africa). If South Africa is responsible, I suggest to H.M.G., to the United Nations, to go to South Africa (a voice: and smash them) and tell them to be reasonable." (renewed cheers), Sir Frederick had said India could not do without wattle bark. "Let me tell him that India can, (cheers) for the simple reason that nine-tenths of the population do not use boots or shoes and the remaining one-tenth can manage, or walk bare-footed. They are prepared for it (more cheers).

Mr. Govind Deshmukh, supporting the two amendments, said that one race wanted to suppress the other; one wished to persecute the other. He thought that it would be useless to appeal to His Majesty's Government. They never listened. They never paid any heed when representations were made. Referring to Sir Frederick James' statement that war effort would suffer, Mr. Deshmukh

asked if the war effort meant that Europeans must be saved even if Indians were to go to dogs. Mr. Deshmukh gave the warning that there was very little chance of peace if the question was not settled amicably and rightly. Mr. Deshmukh said that General Smuts had gone back on the Cape Town Agreement. He suggested that South Africans should be prohibited from travelling in trains as this would produce a great psychological effect.

Sir *Abdul Halim Ghaznavi* said that they were fully satisfied with the attitude of the Government. Sir Sultan Ahmed had told them plainly what they should expect from the Government.

Sardar Sant Singh congratulated Dr. Khare and commended Sir Sultan Ahmed on his "Churchillian speech." *Sardar Sant Singh* said: "Let it not be made to appear that we have retraced the steps we have now taken. The Leader of the House has said that if the war-effort is affected, the responsibility is that of the United Nations and not of India's. Certainly the responsibility is of those who have declared this war against Indians."

Mr. *N. M. Joshi* said that the speeches of Dr. Khare and Sir Sultan Ahmed were "a pleasant surprise" and an "encouraging sign." They showed what a grave situation Field Marshal Smuts had created in India by going back on his plighted word in the Pretoria Agreement.

Mr. *Banerji* strongly favoured the enforcement of economic sanctions. *Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan*, Deputy Leader, Moslem League Party, said: This was not the first time that when questions of vital importance to the people of this country were raised, we had been confronted with the war and the consequences of interference with it. He did not care, he asserted, for the war effort and the Commonwealth of Nations, if his position in that Commonwealth was to be that of a hewer of wood and drawer of water. By Commonwealth the Whites meant that the wealth of the nations was the whites' own common property. (laughter). The application of the Reciprocity Act was good as far as it went. But it was not of much use without the application of economic sanctions. He entirely agreed that unless and until the Government was really earnest about this matter it should not take this action, because if the intention was only to show to the people in this country that the Government of India had done something, then this action would have done incalculable harm to our nationals abroad. "The United Nations have made India their main base of operation in the East. The Government of India should tell H. M. G. it is a fit case for their intervention and if H. M. G. will not put pressure on the Government of South Africa then this Government, if it has any responsibility to the people of this land should tell them that India will not give any help in the prosecution of the war." In the present circumstances, the Nawabzada declared, it was not only futile but degrading to keep a representative of India in South Africa. He would go further and ask for an amendment of the Reciprocity Act so as to remove the exemption given to South African nationals who were members of the armed forces. "I say, I don't want any South African to be in India whether he be in the armed forces or not. A man who belongs to a country which humiliates my countrymen has no right to be in my country or in my army. How can they protect a country whose nationals they are treating in this disgraceful fashion?" He asked the Commonwealth Relations Member to go full speed ahead and he would have the support of every man, woman and child. (cheers).

Mr. *Bhulabhai J. Desai*, Leader of the Congress Party, expressed gratification at the support the resolution received at the hands of the non-official members of the House, "barring the European group, and supported not in half hearted, but full throated language even by the Leader of the House". So far as the Indians overseas were concerned the problem of South Africa had now raised a much larger issue than the issue of the Pegging Act under suspension or the Pretoria Agreement or the manner in which it had now been broken. The issue now raised was what was going to be the position of Asiatics as they were described in the Pegging Act, and particularly the Indians, in the future of the world. That was the way in which he wanted the issue to be considered by the Government of India, unless they were prepared to tell the House which, he said, they would not, that in future whatever happened in this war, whoever won or whoever lost—and he believed the Britisher hoped to win—the position so far as the Indians were concerned was going to remain exactly the same vis-a-vis Britain and vis-a-vis the rest of their colonies. If that was the position which they were going to get, all the eloquent words that were uttered with reference to post-war reconstruction and post-war arrangements had better not be uttered in the House at all. He

referred the fears expressed by Sir Frederick James in regard to economic sanctions and said : "No greater insult could have been offered to the Indians who had made at all events Natal what it was. There were 195,000 domiciled Indians in Natal alone to-day as against 205,000 Europeans." The fifth section of the Reciprocity Act, Mr. Bhulabhai said, should not be made any excuse to tolerate any individual greater freedom here than Indians enjoyed there. After all what was India's contribution in this war. Two million men had been raised and they were good enough to fight so far as the security of this land was concerned.

Dr. Khare, replying to the debate, said he could only claim he had done what he could within his limited powers and resources. "I wish", he added, "that India was in a position to declare war against South Africa here and now. Had it been, I assure the House I would have lost no time in taking an army and being in the forefront of the field myself. On the question of the withdrawal of the High Commissioner, Government had not come to a decision; the question was open. But before an withdrawal took place he would have to think twice. As regards the "Natal Mercury's" observations to which Sardar Sant Singh had referred, Dr. Khare said he would wait and see what reprisals they would take. They might themselves find it necessary to declare our High Commissioner 'persona non-grata'.

Sir Raza Ali : Are you waiting for him to be kicked out ?

He had asked the House to give advice, said Dr. Khare, and he, therefore, proposed to leave the matter of the amendments entirely to the decision of the House, Government would not take part in the voting. The House thereafter, passed the motion with the amendments and adjourned.

GOVT. BAN ON "SATYARATHA PRAKASH"

7th. NOVEMBER :—The *Assembly* rejected by 55 votes to 15 *Bhai Parmanand's* adjournment motion to discuss the Sind Government's ban on chapter 14th. of the "Satyarth Prakash," the sacred book of the Arya Samajists.

Among those who voted for the motion were Sir *Vithal Chandavarkar* Mr. *N. M. Joshi*, (unattached) and four Congress members, namely, Dr. *Deshmukh*, *Raisada Hansraj*, *Lala Sham Lal* and *Chaudhuri Raghubir Narain Singh*. The other members of the Congress Party who were present did not vote.

The chair intervened once or twice in the later stages of the debate to prevent members from straying into a political discussion or references to the merits of the book itself. The chair ruled that the debate should be confined to the strictly legal and constitutional issue of the use of the Defence of India Rules to ban the book and indicated that the motion had been admitted only because the use of the Defence of India Rules was in question and the Government of India might have some concern in the matter. The chair also held that passages from the book could not be quoted in the house nor reference made to Pakistan and kindred issues.

Bhai Parmanand, moving the motion, said his object was not to raise any political issue, but to demonstrate that the Defence of India Rules were misused. It had not been established that the book had endangered public safety, order or peace in any way. The book dealt with religious matters. The object of the book was not to abuse anybody, it was a mere criticism of various religions. It had been in the market for the last 77 years. An Urdu translation appeared in 1940 and there was controversy about it, but nothing serious had occurred. Even before that there had been controversy about the book. It was considered by the Arya Samajists a sacred book and it was not proper for the Sind Government to ban portions of it.

Khan Bahadur Piracha considered it unfortunate that the motion should have been brought before the House. The allegation had been made in the country that the 14th chapter was not originally part of the book but that it had been added later by one of the author's followers. (A voice. Who told you that ?) The language used in the chapter was most shameful and offensive. When he read the book his blood boiled and he realised how disturbances arose out of such writings. He asked why the Central Government had not stirred all this time, although there had been a strong demand for banning the book. The Sind Government, he declared, deserved the appreciation of Muslims in the country. (Mr. A. M. Dams: No.) He appealed to other ministries to take up the matter and follow the Sind Ministry's lead.

Mr. Lalchand Navairaj said the question was whether the Defence of India Act could be applied and whether an order under it in this case was legal. The

Defence of India Rules, declared Mr. Navalrai, did not apply to religious matters. The book was neither likely to assist the enemy, nor was it a prejudicial report nor confidential information, the publication of which would under the rules be prohibited. He declared that unless the Government of India expressed their disagreement with the Sind Ministry other ministries would follow the previous speaker's advice and ban the book in their territory too. He knew how the Sind Government was acting; it had established virtual Pakistan in the Province.

The chair intervened and remarked that references to Pakistan were not permissible.

Sir Vithal Chandavarkar, speaking in a purely personal capacity, asked if the Sind Government or any Provincial Government was entitled to take action against a book, which had been there for over 60 years and had nothing to do with the war and could that action be taken under a measure enacted for the purpose of maintaining law and order with special reference to the conduct of the war. If the Government of India felt there was something objectionable in the chapter the unilateral action of the Sind Government would not carry them far. If the book was obnoxious, then it was for the Government of India to ban it all over India. Government should go further and appoint a committee to scrutinise all the ancient books and see whether there was anything in them, which offended public morality or public policy as we understood them today. (laughter). The scriptures of all religions contained passages which offended modern ideas of morals and public conduct. As far as he saw at present the Sind Government was unjustified in its order and he therefore, supported the motion.

Mr. Ananga Mohan Dam, strongly supporting the motion, declared that the book was a commentary and general criticism but was not scurrilous. After all it must be remembered all religious books had a certain amount of violent condemnation of certain points of view. The Bible, for instance, attacked Scribes and Pharisees. Were we to ban the Bible? Books of criticism had a certain freedom of expression. The Koran said a lot of things against infidels. On the other hand, *Sir Syed Ahmed Khan* had written in strong terms against certain portions of the Koran (Voices, No. no.). The Sind Government, he declared, had passed their order under the inspiration of the Muslim League's resolutions. He asked why the Sind Government should not go to a court of law before banning the book.

Sardar Sant Singh observed that the real issue was what was the Government of India to do in a matter like this where a Provincial Government used powers given to them under the Defence of India rules in a manner which was prejudicial to a large section of the people. Incidentally he deprecated the Home Member's statement, that the action was presumably taken under Defence of India Rule 41. The House expected that the Government Member should have made enquiries and found out exactly under what section the action had been taken. As regards the question what the Government of India should do, *Sardar Sant Singh* said, after reviewing the work of the rules, the Government of India could instruct Governors to see that the minorities were protected under the safeguards provided for the purpose. Further if the Provincial Governments did not agree with the Government of India's view of the rule in question, then it should be amended and powers under it should be vested in the Government of India. *Sardar Sant Singh* declared that the peace in Sind would be disturbed not by the book but by the action taken against the book: if any one had invited disturbance it was the Sind Government and early action should be taken by the Government of India to prevent it. He strongly criticised the attitude of the Congress Party on the motion, "I do not approve of their action in spiriting themselves away when the time comes to show their love of democracy and freedom. They have fled away because they are afraid of displeasing the Muslim League. This neutrality ought to be condemned." In a democracy one should have the courage to stand by one's convictions.

Nawab Siddiq Ali Khan said that the chapter in question was very offensive and provocative. He would read some passages in order to show how the chapter would disturb peace and order in Sind.

The chair indicated that the point for debate was not the character of the book and, therefore, passages could not be read.

Nawab Siddiq Ali said the Sind Government deserved thanks (Mr. Navalrai; condemnation) for taking action against the book and thereby following the resolution passed by the Moslem League at its Karachi session. He said there was a precedent for such action. In the Central Provinces the late Dr. Raghavendra Rao ordered the prosecution of a poet who wrote poems against the Prophet. As a

result of the prosecution the composer was fined and copies of his book were forfeited.

The Home Member, *Sir Francis Mudie*, opposing the motion said the action that the Central Government was being condemned for was the action of the Sind Government, and it was not clear from the speeches in the House what the Government of India should do if they examined the matter and came to the conclusion that the Sind Government's action was illegal. The Sind Government's action was presumably under the Defence of India Rule 41; it banned the printing and publication of a fresh edition of the *Satyartha Prakash*. The Sind Government did not take action under the Criminal Procedure Code, and there was no question of stopping the circulation of the book.

The Home Member thought that the mover had raised a provincial question to the all-India level and the whole debate could only do harm. He concluded by making it clear that unless an extraordinary change in circumstances occurred, there was not the least chance of the Government of India following *Sir Vithal Chandavarkar's* advice and banning the book all over India.

Closure was then applied to the debate and the House divided to reject the motion by 55 votes to 15.

FACTORIES ACT AMEND. BILL

Earlier the House agreed to *Dr. Ambedkar's* motion to refer to the Select Committee his bill further to amend the Factories Act, so as to give workers in perennial factories the benefit, after a year's service, of at least six consecutive holidays with pay.

CULTIVATION OF RICE

The Assembly took up *Mr. J. D. Tyson's* motion for reference to the Select Committee of his bill to provide for the creation of a fund to be expanded by a committee for the improvement and development of the cultivation and marketing of rice. The debates on it had not concluded when the House adjourned.

DEBATE ON THE FOOD SITUATION

8th, NOVEMBER:—When the Food Debate was resumed in the Assembly to-day *Mr. P. J. Griffiths* (European Group), in a vigorous speech said his purpose was, first, to give sober and careful consideration to the Government's food policy; secondly, to examine and appraise the administration of that policy, and, thirdly, to suggest changes which, in the European group's view, were required both in policy and administration. His group, he observed, were satisfied with the policy but not with the administration of that policy. In the sphere of enforcement of its policy, the administration had been lamentably weak. The biggest task now was to do something to strengthen the food administration both in the Centre and in the provinces in every way possible. If that meant getting in more people then those people must be got in; if they could not be got from elsewhere, then they should be got from the army. Indian and British officers should be brought in to strengthen the administration. Contrasting the relative efficiency of the food administration in England and in India, *Mr. Griffiths* referred to his experience during his last visit to England. Two things which impressed him there were the success achieved in bringing about complete equality of sacrifice and efficiency in small matters of food administration. He reached the railway station nearest his home at 9-30 in the morning and by 5 minutes past ten he had secured his ration card, clothes coupon, etc. As against that, it took his servant in India three weeks, a series of visits to the rationing authority and three personal letters from himself before he could get his ration card. *Mr. Griffiths* vigorously criticised both the administration and public apathy in India. In this country we had had a long period of hesitation, confusion and vacillation and another period of trial and error which meant death to many people, whereas in Britain the food policy had been thought out, the staff selected and machinery kept ready before the onset of war. It was the Foodgrains Policy Committee that laid the foundation of a rational and coherent food policy and his group associated itself with that policy. His group opposed the removal of regional control.

Mr. T. C. Avinashilingam Chettiar (Congress) moved a lengthy amendment advocating revision of prices fixed for paddy and other foodgrains and suggesting measures to prevent corruption and reduce middlemen's profits and steps of a permanent character such as new irrigation schemes, manufacture of fertilisers, etc.

Mr. A. C. Datta dealt with Bengal and said that people were still dying of starvation there; figures were being published daily of deaths in Calcutta. The

only difference was that in 1942 people died as it were, on the spot, while this year they were dying inch by inch. Mr. Datta referred to the high price of vegetables, milk, fish, ghee. He severely condemned "wastage" of food in the various parts of the country.

Mr. Satyanarayan Sinha, describing the conditions in Bihar, stated that for the last two years, some people in his province were living on sweet potatoes, which, he said, only animals ate in normal times. People were dying of malaria and cholera like flies. Medical experts were unanimously of opinion that this was due to malnutrition. Epidemics in Central Bihar were still playing havoc. More than two lakhs had died in North Bihar. Hundreds of villages had been depopulated and hundreds of families had been wiped out completely.

Sir A. H. Ghuznavi said that shortage was not restricted to foodgrains only but extended to other foodstuffs such as meat, vegetables, milk and poultry. Sir Abdul Halim said that the presence of large numbers of American troops in the province had added to the difficulty. Their agents came to the markets with instructions to buy up vegetables at any price. While he admitted the situation in regard to foodgrains had improved, he maintained that foodgrains alone were not sufficient. During the last famine they saw people dying on the streets. Now there were deaths in many houses due to lack of protein. The devaluation of the rupee in general had played havoc in Bengal, according to the Calcutta Corporation Executive Health Officer.

Mrs. Renuka Ray said that she recently toured the interior of Bengal. In many villages she found men, women and children utterly destitute. Many families in the villages sold their daughters to get food. Malnutrition was taking a heavy toll.

Mr. K. S. Gupta stated that in Orissa, the Government were exporting rice in large quantities. In his own constituency, there were some places where the ration was five tolas of rice per head per day. In Vizag when cholera broke out medical experts conferred and said that it was due to the rice supplied. The rice was stopped, and cholera also disappeared. Concluding, Mr. Gupta said that Mahatma Gandhi had suggested a splendid solution of the food problem in his letters to the Viceroy. The Congress leaders should be released so that they might help in solving the food difficulties.

Mr. K. C. Neogy thought that the Food Member's speech was perhaps intended to be sent to the India Office, as the basis for one of those self-righteous speeches of Mr. Amery, that assure the world that all is well with India. According to calculations, 8½ lakhs of people lost their lives from sheer hunger in Bengal last year. The Governor was good enough to refer to the epidemic situation. He said that malaria had unfortunately reappeared in epidemic form. At least 40 per cent of the people in the province were stricken by this disease. The Food Member had stated, he added, that the Food Committee of the Executive Committees were considering various matters relating to food "at a very high level." (laughter). The level, remarked Mr. Neogy, might be so high as not to enable the Hon. Member to realise the miseries of the lowly. The quality of the foodstuffs was worse even than last year. People were accustomed to a fair proportion of stone chips in rice. He should ask the Food Member to explain the vitamin value of pebbles (laughter). Bad food, he declared, was being rammed down our throats with the help of Defence of India Rules; because these Rules had been held to supersede the municipal rules under which the municipal health authorities were empowered to examine foodstuffs supplied to the people.

Mr. Azhar Ali quoting from the "Indian Information," said that at a conference in Delhi, presided over by the Food Member himself, it was reported that the controversy centred round the questions of quality of foodgrains in the deficit areas. He had himself seen that they were unfit for human consumption. But when one tried to find out the reason for all this, the Central Government shifted the responsibility to the provincial Government and the provincial Government to the Central Government.

AMENDMENTS TO FOOD DEBATE

9th NOVEMBER :—The Assembly to-day concluded the Food Debate after passing two amendments to the Food Member's motion that the situation be taken into consideration.

One was by Mr. Sathar Essak Sait declaring that co-ordination of procurement and distribution between surplus and deficit areas is entirely wanting; that transport is not adequate and timely; that prices are beyond the means of the mass of the poor in the country; that steps taken by Government for exercising

vigilance over eradication of corruption among those engaged by Government in the matter of the execution of food work are poor and ineffective.

The House passed the amendment by 61 votes to 45, the Congress, the Moslem League and Nationalists voting together in favour of it.

The other amendment was in the name of *Prof. Ranga* and it expressed the opinion that grain prices in most places are uneconomically low for producers and that the failure of Government to subsidise food consumption of the poorest consumers both in towns and villages is hitting hard both the producers and consumers of food. The House passed this amendment by 58 to 46 votes.

Of the remaining three amendments one was withdrawn and the other two were declared lost without a division.

The Assembly to-day dispensed with the question hour and decided to sit for half an hour longer than usual in order to complete the debate on the food situation.

Mr. Sathar Sait spoke of the sufferings in Malabar and said that part of the country did not get the same publicity as Bengal received and, therefore, the people there suffered silently.

Mr. J. D. Tyson, Education, Health and Lands Secretary, gave figures to refute the criticism that the grow-more-food campaign had been a complete failure. The average area under rice in India in the three pre-war years was 73.8 million acres. After one year of the grow-more-food campaign the area increased to 75 million and last year it was practically 80 million acres. The pre-war average of the area under all foodgrains was 195 million acres; after one year of the grow-more-food campaign it was 204.5 million acres and last year it was 206.3 million acres.

Mr. E. C. Gwilt—"What is the increase in population?"

Mr. Tyson—"I am not responsible for the increase in population" (loud laughter).

Mr. Abdul Qaiyum quoted figures to suggest that there had actually been a decrease in the production of rice compared to 1930-31, when the quantity was something like 32 million tons as against the 30.5 million tons which *Mr. Tyson* had given for last year.

Several official members: Does your figure include Burma?

Mr. Qaiyum replied that even if it included Burma, it would not make a great deal of difference (voices: It will). The black market could, in his view, be suppressed if the Government of India took up monopoly purchase of foodgrains direct from big landowners and eliminated the middleman. By refusing to adopt this expedient the Government of India were aiding and abetting black markets. It should not be beyond the power of the Government of India, he declared, to set up a special investigation department to track down corrupt officials or the middleman who corrupt those officials. He called upon the Government to find out whether there were any state lands which could be cultivated and what crops could be grown there.

Mr. C. P. Lawson (European group) thought it fair to say that the criticism levelled at the Food Department was largely levelled at the provincial administrations.

Sir Cowanji Jehangir strongly pleaded for equality of food ration for all people in surplus as well as in deficit provinces.

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao, Director, Food Statistics, in a maiden speech, gave the assurance that the Food Department would investigate any complaint if details were given. (*Mr. Lalchand Navalrai*: I made a complaint to the Food Member but never got a reply). *Mr. Rao* went on to declare that the principle of subsidy to the cultivator, which had been suggested by some of the previous speakers, was under Government's active consideration. He explained why it was not possible for Government to come to a quick decision on this question.

Dr. P. N. Banerji, Leader of the Nationalist Party, complained against the Food Member's commission to make adequate reference to the Bengal famine which was one of the greatest calamities in India. A heavy toll of life had been taken by the famine and now disease was taking an equally heavy toll; medicine was unavailable. Price control in Bengal had become a joke and the quality of foodgrains supplied had deteriorated greatly. He asked for greater financial assistance to Bengal and pleaded that normal trade channels should be utilised and the administration raised to a higher standard of efficiency.

Nawabzada Liaquat Ali Khan, Deputy Leader, Moslem League Party, asserted that the responsibility for the food situation in India was that of the British.

people. All the key posts in the administration were controlled not by the Indian members of the Executive Council but by members of the steel frame." It is true that in that steel frame we do find some men made of Tata Steel (laughter) but it is British steel which is ruling this country; and so if there is any defect in the administration of food in this country the blame lies entirely on the British people and the British Government."

Mr. *Bhulabhai Desai*, Leader of the Congress Party, criticised the Government for bringing forward a "most neutral and non-committal motion. "When an important question came up before the House relating to food, the Member-in-charge said that the question might be taken into consideration, as if it was not part of their responsibility to state what their policy was. Hence it was that in future he commended to the House that they would demand that whenever the Government put forward a proposal, it should be in terms affirmative and it should be in terms definite, and it should be in terms in which one was able to say to what extent there was an alternative to that policy. Referring to what Mr. *Bhulabhai* called "the immediate background of this situation", he said that during the last year there had been a famine of an unprecedented character in the country. It had now been followed by epidemics, which were not just merely an aftermath of that famine alone but the aftermath of the actual under-nutrition of the country during the last century. "If there had been in this country," Mr. *Bhulabhai* said, among the men who really represent the country you would not find the spectacle that you find today. You cannot blame if the machinery goes into the condition into which it has gone now and hence it is that the whole system of Government in this country has got to be overhauled. We have said it so often in the past. I do not say it on any political ground whatever nor on any racial ground. We are saying it on one and one ground alone—that as long as you do not have an administration in this country which responds to the people and to which the people respond, you may be quite certain you will never be able to tackle the problem that has come before this House and you cannot solve one iota of it."

The Food Member, Sir *Jwalaprashad Srivastava*, replying to the debate said he would follow the principle that truth must be told and faults must be owned. I am happy to say that although bouquets and cocoanuts have both been thrown at me, nobody has thrown rotten eggs (laughter and a voice: they are five annas each)—I was going to say because eggs have become too expensive." (more laughter). (A voice: thanks to you). He could not say that the charges made against him had stunned him or dazed him, but he claimed that his speech made at the beginning of the debate held the field: he had not heard one definite criticism of the policy which he enunciated in that speech (ironical laughter from Congress and Moslem League benches). There had been a great deal of criticism on details, but the policy remained unassailed and he was happy that the House as a whole recognised that the policy followed by Government was right. (A voice: You are wrong). He was sorry to say that politics had been imported into this debate (more laughter). He himself had kept food away from politics.

After opposing all the amendments in their present form, but expressing general agreement with some of the points contained in them, the Food Member thanked non-official members for the suggestions made in the course of the debate. The Government, he said, would examine them, "Our main object is one," he said, "Food for all. Whatever Government may be in power, it cannot have any other objective. Without the support of the chosen representatives of the people, my Department can achieve nothing worthwhile. With your help, nothing is impossible. Let that task be not marred by political rivalry." (cheers).

After passing the motion with the two amendments, the House adjourned.

SWAGOTRA MARRIAGES AMONG HINDUS

10th. NOVEMBER :—A 2-hour speech by Dr. *V. Deshmukh* enlivened the debate in the Assembly to-day on the Bill brought forward by his brother Mr. *Govind Deshmukh* to remove the existing prohibition on marriages in Hindu society between persons of the same Gotra (spiritual ancestry). Dr. *Deshmukh* argued with sustained vigour in favour of the proposed reform by reference to eugenics as well as to what he regarded the true spirit of Hinduism. He had not concluded when the House rose for the day. He will continue his speech when the debate is resumed in the next session.

The motion before the House was that the Bill be referred to a select committee. Mr. *Govind Deshmukh*, moving the motion, said his Bill had been pending

for a long time. At first he was assured that the principle of the Bill would be embodied in the codified Hindu Law and later that it would be included in the revised code which, at present, was in circulation. He however was not prepared to wait indefinitely.

Mr. Sri *Prakasa* supporting the Bill emphasised its necessity in the present-day India. A particular system might have been good at a particular stage and in course of time it became part of religion. Prohibition of Swagotra marriages was one of these pseudo-religious injunctions which were unsuited to modern times. Under it parents were finding it more and more difficult to marry off their children and the time had come for the legislature to intervene. It was time not only to remove this but also other harmful customs including the present practice among some sections of the Hindu community permitting marriage with such close relatives as maternal uncle's daughter and so on.

Mr. *Rangiah Naidu* strongly urged that Hindu society should move with the times and fresh laws should be enacted to make Hindu society strong and virile.

Dr. *Deshmukh* criticised leading women's associations which, on measures for marriage or other reform affecting them, invariably went first to lawyers to obtain legal opinion on them before deciding what attitude to adopt. Lawyers, declared Mr. *Deshmukh*, were far from creative in their profession and outlook, (many voices : no no) and therefore, looked at every reform from the point of view of whether it came within the frame-work of existing law and they generally advised women that if they accepted piecemeal reforms, it would stand in the way of getting larger rights. Though collectively these women's associations might oppose Bills like the one before the House, individually these women leaders admitted they were in favour of them. People of the same Gotra might be found in places as far apart as Madras and the United Provinces : yet they could not marry. In his view Gotra could not be interpreted to mean that the families bearing one Gotra were the direct descendants by blood of the Rishi. Most of the Rishis were Brahmacharis (bachelors) and so the only source in which the present-day families could be said to be the descendants of those Rishis was that they were descendants of the disciples of the same Rishi. That, said Dr. *Deshmukh*, did not involve blood relationship and, therefore marriages among them were no offence even against the religious injunction. From the eugenics standpoint, there was nothing to prove that inbreeding and marriages of blood relatives were harmful. Darwin was born of parents who were intimately related by blood both on the mother's and the father's side. The Bedouin Arabs, even in the present-day and the royal dynasties of Egypt in ancient times married very close relatives and no race deterioration had taken place as a result of it. The Bill, however, did not go so far as to permit marriages of this kind. It was very limited in scope. Dr. *Deshmukh* refused to accept the suggestion that those who wanted to contract marriages which were not permitted by Hindu religion as understood now had the alternative of marrying under the Civil Marriage Act. "I am a Hindu and am proud to be a Hindu, and why should anybody ask me to go out of the Hindu fold and marry under some other law ? I am not going to detach myself from the Hindu fold ; I want to dig my toes in and reform, rejuvenate and purify Hindu society. That is my sacred duty". (cheers)

Earlier the House passed Mr. *M. A. Kazmi's* Bill to amend the Criminal Procedure Code as reported by the Select Committee. The main amendment proposed in the Bill relates to the grant of bail and it empowers the court convicting a person accused of a bailable offence to release him on bail for the period requisite to enable him, in a case where an appeal lies to make his application to the appellate court. The Assembly then adjourned till Monday.

OFFICIAL BILLS PASSED

18th. NOVEMBER :—The Assembly to-day passed *Sir Azizul Haque's* Bill temporarily to amend the Indian Patents and Designs Act and his Bill further to amend the Coffee Market Expansion Act and Mr. *J. D. Tyson's* Bill further to amend the Delhi Joint Water and Sewage Board Act.

The Finance Member, *Sir Jeremy Raisman's* Bill, to consolidate and amend the law relating to Government securities issued by the Central Government and to the management by the Reserve Bank of India of the public debt of the Central Government as reported by the Select Committee, was under discussion when the House adjourned.

PUBLIC DEBT BILL

14th. NOVEMBER :—The Finance Member, *Sir Jeremy Raisman*, announced in the Assembly to-day that on all the three points of the Public Debt Bill, on which

criticism in the House had centred, he was prepared to maintain the existing position. That meant, he said, that on the first point, namely, receiving notices of trust, no change would be made. The present position was that as provided in the Bill no notice of any trust in respect of any Government security shall be receivable by the Central Government; nor shall the Central Government be bound by any such notice even though expressly given, nor shall the Central Government be regarded as a trustee in respect of any Government security. As regards the other two points, namely, first recognition by the bank of no title to the Government security other than that of the executor or administrator of a deceased sole holder and the holder of a succession certificate; and second, the twelve-year limitation of the Central Government's liability in respect of Government securities, the Finance Member signified his readiness to reintroduce the position as it actually existed at present. He sought permission to let further consideration of the Bill stand over so as to enable him to consider the drafts put forward by members and produce an amendment which would be acceptable to the House. The Assembly agreed to the proposal.

NATIONALISATION OF INSURANCE

Nationalisation of Insurance was urged by Prof. Ranga and supported by Mr. A. Chettiar, Mr. Hussainbhai Lalji and Mr. Manu Subedar in the course of the debate on Sir Aziz-ul-Haque's motion to refer his insurance Act Amendment Bill to a Select Committee. The House eventually rejected without a division Mr. Krishnamachari's motion to circulate the bill and passed Sir Aziz-ul-Haque's motion.

During the debate Mr. Krishnamachari said his motion was a dilatory one. He wanted circulation, because otherwise it might have to be amended again and again in the light of public criticism. He generally welcomed many of the provisions of the bill. Sir Vithal Chandavarkar pointed out that insurance interests were quite satisfied with the bill and insurance experts had told him that there should be no delay in passing the bill. Prof. Ranga pointed out that the State even now was running a postal insurance scheme for its employees and was actually running it more efficiently than private insurance companies; its expense ratio was the lowest about 10 per cent as compared to some 20 per cent for the most efficiently run private insurance company. Prof. Ranga remarked it was true that only a Swaraj Government could give the best satisfaction: but even the present government was preparing schemes in anticipation of the advent of a Swaraj Government and he suggested it should give thought to this subject also. He referred to the fact that the various insurance companies were concentrated mainly in the big cities, with the result that the large sums collected as premium from all corners of the country were used only in these cities and were denied to the provinces from which they were collected and where they were urgently required for development. This evil, he suggested, could only be cured by making insurance a State enterprise. He referred to the Mysore State where he indicated State insurance was working well. Mr. Avinashilingam Chettiar supported the circulation motion. Sir Aziz-ul-Haque replying said his objective was quite the same as Prof. Ranga's but he would hesitate to take steps to nationalise insurance till a National Government was established. It was no use saying that he and other members of the present Government of India did not represent the people and at the same time asking him to take steps to nationalise insurance. He was not expressing any views on the question whether he represented the people or not. In any case, he suggested, no legislature could look too far forward; if it could deal with problems or today and the next few years that should suffice. He agreed that insurance should cover a wider field, and include crops, cattle, sickness, old age, etc. but these not for the immediate present. It was not his intention to rush the bill through or to delay it unduly. The Commerce Member proceeded. He proposed that the Select Committee should not meet earlier than January next year and in the meantime he would circulate the bill to members of the insurance advisory committee and place their views before the Select Committee and also the views of important All-India Insurance Associations. Thereafter if the Select Committee concluded its labours, he would take the bill up in the next session.

Mr. Krishnamachari's motion for circulation was negatived and Sir Aziz-ul-Haque's motion was passed.

CULTIVATION OF RICE

The House took up further debate on the Health and Lands Secretary, Mr. Tyson's motion to refer to a select committee his Bill for the creation of a fund to

be expended by a committee constituted for the improvement and development of the cultivation production and marketing of rice and rice products.

Prof. Ranga, continuing his speech from the last day of the debate, criticised Government on its failure to make any provision for contribution from the Central Government or provincial Governments towards the funds. He objected to placing the whole burden of the contribution on the grower. He protested against this increase in the financial burdens of the peasants. The interests of commerce and industry, it was Government's practice to provide funds themselves, but not in the case of research in the interest of agriculture. The proposed excise duty of six annas a ton was to be levied from the rice mill owners but in actual practice he was sure it would be passed on to the grower and the consumer; and it was possible that Government might increase the duty in the future. He criticised the composition of the proposed committee and asked why the Associated Chambers of Commerce would get a seat. European interests, he knew, had rice mills in Burma but not in India. He pleaded for a non-official President for the committee. Prof. Ranga said there was a body of public opinion in the country which was opposed to the House proceeding with the Bill. Mrs. Radhabai Subbarayan opposed the Bill and asked the House to reject it; but if the House felt this suggestion to be too drastic, then it should circulate the Bill. The Bill, in her view, did not suggest the correct method of encouraging research in rice. At the present moment when the country was going through a food crisis, Government's duty, she said, was to give all attention and energy to the supply of food and other necessities of life.

Mr. Essak Saif that the country should have an opportunity of expressing its views on this important matter since everybody was interested in producing more rice, better rice and to produce rice more easily. He was therefore, in favour of circulating the Bill. He had not concluded when the Assembly adjourned.

PUBLIC DEBT BILL

15th. NOVEMBER :—The Assembly to-day passed the *Finance Member's* public Debt Bill with amendments framed by agreement between the Government and the Opposition. The first such amendment was moved by Mr. Krishnamachari as a proviso to clause seven which lays down that the executors or administrators of a deceased sole holder of a Government security and the holder of a succession certificate shall be the only persons who may be recognised by the bank as having any title to the Government security. The proposed proviso was to the effect "that nothing in this section shall bar the recognition by the bank of the manager or the sole surviving male member of a Hindu undivided family governed by the Mitakshara law as having a title to a Government security, when the security appears to the bank to stand in the name of a deceased member of the family and an application is made by such manager or sole surviving member for recognition of his title and is supported by a certificate signed by such authority and after such enquiry as may be prescribed to the effect that the deceased belonged to a Hindu undivided family governed by the Mitakshara law, that the Government security formed part of the joint property of the family and that the applicant is the managing or sole surviving male member of the family."

An explanation added to the proviso laid down that the expression "Hindu undivided family governed by the Mitakshara law shall, for the purposes of this section, be deemed to include a Malabar Tarwad.

The amendment was intended to continue the existing concession given to the member of a joint Hindu family governed by the Mitakshara law with regard to the recognition of his title to a Government security.

In the course of the debate on the amendment, Mr. Chapman-Mortimer registered a mild protest that Government and Congress always made some arrangement over our heads and we were supposed to agree to it (laughter). He added that he did not want to oppose the amendment but to draw attention to the fact that he received notice of it only last night. The chair asked if anybody objected to the amendment being moved. Sir Cowasji Jehangir suggested, that in order to waive the standing order requiring sufficient notice of amendments, the permission of the House be taken by a vote. The chair held no vote was necessary and that since no objection had been taken the amendment could be discussed. Eventually the amendment was passed.

An amendment was also accepted to clause nine which provides summary procedure on the death of a holder of Government securities not exceeding Rs. 5,000 face value. The clause as it stands gives power to the bank to determine who is the person entitled to a security or securities, if within six months of the

death of the original holder, probate of his will or letters of administration of his estate or a succession certificate is not produced to the bank. The amendment seeks to add a further provision that the bank could so determine the title of proof to the satisfaction of the bank that proceedings have been instituted to obtain a probate or letters of administration or a succession certificate is not furnished.

The House passed Mr *Sri Prakasa's* amendment providing that "where no shorter period of limitation is fixed by any law for the time being in force, the liability of the Central Government in respect of any interest payment due on a Government security shall terminate on the expiry of six years from the date on which the amount due by way of interest became payable."

After Mr. *Sri Prakasa's* amendment, a few consequential amendments were accepted.

The *Finance Member*, moving the third reading, took the opportunity to pay a tribute to the work of the late Sir James Taylor, who, he said, did most of the spade work underlying this useful and necessary measure. Mr. *Azar Ali* associated himself with the tribute to Sir James. The House passed the bill as amended.

RICE FUND BILL

During the resumed debate on Mr. *Tyson's* motion to refer the Rice Fund Bill to a select committee, Mr. *Tyson* announced that he was prepared to accept Mr. *Esaak Sait's* amendment that the bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting public opinion thereon by February 28, 1945. Speakers on the bill today were Mr. *Esaak Sait*, Sir *Jogendra Singh*, Mr. *Sami Venkatachalam Chettiar*, Mr. *T. T. Krishnamachari*, Mr. *Hussainbhai Laljee*, Mr. *Abdul Qayyum*, Mr. *Govind Deshmukh*, Mr. *Azar Ali*, and Mr. *Akhil Chandra Datta*. Further debate was adjourned till tomorrow.

Earlier the House agreed to refer to a select committee a draft amendment proposed by Mr. *Esaak Sait* for the addition of a new standing order of the Assembly to provide that a standing committee shall be constituted separately for every department of the Government of India to advise on the activities of the department concerned. Sir *Sultan Ahmed* made it clear that Government would not oppose reference to a select committee but would oppose the amendment in the select committee. The Assembly adjourned.

OFFICIAL BILLS PASSED

16th. NOVEMBER :—The Assembly agreed to the circulation of two official bills, namely, Mr. *J. D. Tyson's* bill to create a rice research fund and a committee to administer the fund, and Dr. *Ambedkar's* bill to amend the Payments of Wages Act.

The *Finance Member* introduced a bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to banking companies. The Statement of Objects and Reasons explains that the need has been felt for some time for separate legislation for the regulation of banking in India. This need has become the more insistent on account of the considerable development of banking in recent years, especially the rapid growth of banking resources and of the number of banks and branches.

The main features of the Bill are : a simple definition of banking with the object of limiting the scope of the legislation to institutions in which the funds are deposited primarily to ensure their safety and ready with-drawability ; prescription of minimum capital standards ; prohibitions of trading with a view to eliminating non-banking risks ; inclusion in the scope of the legislation of banks incorporated or registered outside British India ; provision of an expeditious procedure for liquidation ; inspection of the books and accounts of a bank by the Reserve Bank when necessary ; empowering the Central Government to take action against banks conducting their affairs in a manner detrimental to the interests of the depositors ; and prescription of a special form of balance-sheet and conferring of powers on the Reserve Bank to call for periodical returns. The Assembly adjourned.

POST-WAR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

17th. NOVEMBER :—The Assembly to-day passed without a division a Congress Party motion that an elected committee of the House consisting of not more than 15 members be appointed for the purpose of considering the several plans for post-war economic development of India, agricultural and industrial, with instructions to report to the House. The motion had been moved by Mr. *Avinashilingam Chettiar* as an amendment to Sir *Ziauddin Ahmed's* original resolution opposing the Bombay Plan.

An exciting situation developed before the House voted on the amendment and passed it. Towards the close of the debate Mr. *Bhulabhai Desai*, Leader of the Opposition, spoke in support of the amendment. After him the Supply Member, *Sir A. Ramaswami Mudaliar* got up where-upon there were cries from the opposition benches asking for closure of the debate. The Government challenged a division on the closure motion but the House passed the motion by 55 votes to 46. The Congress, Moslem League and some members of the Nationalist Party combining to vote for it.

During the voting there were hurried consultations among members on Government and opposition benches and much turning over of the rules of procedure to see whether a Government member could speak after closure had been applied. *Sir Ziauddin Ahmed*, mover of the original motion, was replying to the debate when Mr. *Bajoris*, on a point of order, asked if closure could be applied to the debate without hearing the Government Member on the issue before the House. As it was, no one knew what the attitude of the Government was to the motion or to the amendment or the views expressed during the debate. The *President* indicated that there did not appear to be any rule under which in the case of a resolution a Government speaker could be called upon to speak at any particular stage of the debate. Mr. *Abdul Qaiyum*, Deputy Leader of the Congress Party, explained that before the Leader of the Opposition stood up, he (Mr. *Qaiyum*) had spoken to the Planning and Development Member and understood that *Sir Ardesbir Dalal* would speak after Mr. *Bhulabhai Desai*. But actually the Supply Member got up instead of *Sir Ardesbir* (several voices: Why didn't the Supply Member get up earlier in the debate).

Eventually, after *Sir Ziauddin's* reply, Mr. *Krishnamachari's* amendment and Mr. *A. N. Chattopadhyaya's* amendment were negatived and Mr. *Chettiar's* amendment was passed. The House adjourned till Monday.

LAW RELATING TO BANKING COMPANIES

20th. NOVEMBER :—The Assembly to-day agreed to the *Finance Member's* motion to circulate his bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to banking companies.

During the debate on the Banking Bill, the *Finance Member* moving circulation, gave an account of the efforts made from time to time to frame comprehensive banking legislation and said the present Bill represented an earnest effort on the part of the Government to ensure, in so far as it could be done by legislation, the protection of the depositor and the growth of banking in India on sound lines. Mr. *A. C. Datta* while generally supporting the bill complained that it gave not only too many powers to the Reserve Bank but gave it control as well as certain advantages without any corresponding advantages to other banks. Deposits to be made by rural banks to the Reserve Bank, he suggested, should be in promissory notes and not in cash. Mr. *Avinashilingam Chettiar* asked for a more elaborate definition of banking and said that banks taking short term deposits should be debarred from giving long term loans. Mr. *T. T. Krishnamochari* made detailed comments on the bill and said that the supreme position which the Imperial Bank enjoyed by virtue of its having once been the Government's central bank was no longer justified. He urged that the Imperial Bank Act should be repealed and the bank brought within the scope of the present bill. Mr. *Abdul Ghani* welcomed the bill but cautioned that care should be taken to see that small banks did not suffer under this legislation. Mr. *Sami Venkatachalam Chettiar* suggested that banking legislation should be liberal enough to help the growth of four different types of banks, namely, industrial banks, agricultural banks, commercial banks and banks for small borrowers. The bill, in his view, looked more like a policy measure meant to penalise small banks if they failed to conform to the rules. He favoured nationalisation of banking. Mr. *Mohammed Nauman* was against the Imperial Bank enjoying a monopoly of agency for the Reserve Bank. Mr. *Chapman Mortimer* (European group) stressing the importance of the bill said that sound banking needed firstly good banking law and secondly good bankers and while no law could produce good bankers, he was hopeful that the bill would go some way to ensure that good banking law was established in this country. Prof. *Ranga* urged that banking should be socialised in the same way as he had suggested in connection with insurance. He opposed what he described as the attempt made in the bill to check the growth of joint stock banks. The *Finance Member* expressed gratification at the measure of support given to the bill. He made it clear that he could not be expected to bring forward

a measure for the complete nationalisation of banks in India, such as had been suggested by some speakers.

The Finance Member's motion was passed.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL ORGANISATION

Mr. J. D. Tyson moved a resolution accepting the constitution of the permanent food and agriculture organisation of the United Nations. The objects of the proposed body, he said, were to raise the level of nutrition among the peoples of the world, to secure improvements in the efficient production and distribution of all foodgrains and agricultural products, to better the conditions of the rural population and thus contribute to the expanding world economy and promotion of research. By joining that organisation, Mr. Tyson said, we would accept the liability to contribute to the budget of the conference. The budget for the first year was about two and a half million dollars and India's share had been fixed at 4.25 per cent which came to about Rs. 3,00,000 a year.

Two amendments were moved to the resolution, one by Mr. K. C. Neogy which supported the resolution on the understanding that the Central Government would implement the recommendations of the organisation in regard to all important questions of policy subject to the approval of the legislature and the other by Mr. N. G. Ranga which wanted the proposed organisation worked for the interests of agricultural producers no less than those of the consumers.

21st NOVEMBER:—In the course of the resumed debate on Mr. Tyson's motion, Mr. Ananga Mohan Das said that India expected good results from the proposed International Food and Agriculture organisation and India, in consideration of the vastness of her territory and her importance, should contribute more than the four per cent, allotted to her. Why, he asked, was U. S. A. expected to contribute 25 per cent, as against India's 4 per cent? Mr. B. Das said that the experience of international bodies during the last 20 years had been disappointing. Mr. K. C. Neogy moving his amendment, thought that from a report of the proceedings of the Hot Springs conference that the Atlantic Charter was sought to be applied to India, but among the articles of that Charter so to be applied was the one giving access to raw materials of the world. He could not but feel alarmed therefore, at the possibility of India's unexplored resources, particularly mineral, being exploited by other nations of the world. Mr. Ramrattan Gupta urged that India's representatives at international gatherings should be real representatives and the Government should take the House into confidence in selecting them. He thought it was because the delegation to the Bretton Woods conference, for instance, did not have the confidence of the country they could not get a seat for India on the Executive. Mr. Abdul Qaiyum supported the motion but asked that the suggestion made from the Congress benches should be conveyed to the international organisation. He suggested that organisation should consider the credentials of a Government like that of India, which had allowed chronic malnutrition, famine and destitution, illiteracy, absence of medical relief to prevail in the country while the officers of the Government were busy issuing ordinances, laying down how much the tailoring charge of coats and trousers should be. Mr. Qaiyum demanded that foreign Governments should not be allowed to buy raw materials cheaply in the Indian market. Mr. N. H. Joshi insisted that India's representatives in these conferences should be entirely Indian, selected not on racial grounds because the inclusion of Europeans was often misunderstood by other countries to mean that the European was there to dominate over the Indian. Prof. N. G. Ranga feared that the main object of the proposed body might be to produce enough food for western consumers; but he, nevertheless, favoured India's participation in all international conferences not because he hoped to gain much thereby but would be able to see what the others were up to. Mr. Lalchand Navarai asked what was the value of joining an organisation like this and what had other nations done to help India in the present situation. Mr. Nauman complained that the Government had avoided selecting any Muslim representative to international organisations; there was, he felt, some sinister purpose in this.

Closure was moved by Government; there was a tie 40 voting on either side; and the Chair gave its casting vote in favour of the "status quo" and the debate was, accordingly, continued.

Mr. Govind Deshmukh asked that we should not bind ourselves to pay our contribution for four years but on a yearly basis so that we should have an opportunity once a year to examine what was going on. Dr. P. N. Banerji hoped that the Government of India would insist on India being represented on the Execu-

tive Committee of the organisation. He did not object to the initial contribution of Rs. three lakhs but asked that future contributions should not be heavy. Mr. Tyson replying to the debate referred to the demand made by some speakers that India should insist on having representation on the Executive Committee. How he asked, could we insist on it as a condition of our joining: under the constitution, the executive committee would be elected by the Governing Body of the conference and we would have on the conference the same voting power as any other member of the nation and we must try to get representation by the exercise of that vote and by influencing our friends. To insist on a seat as a condition for joining would be tantamount to refusing to join. As regards financial liability, he gave the assurance that the contribution to the organisation would be a voted expenditure and it would be in the budget or would come as a supplementary grant: in any case it would come up before the House. As for the suggestion that there was an ulterior motive in fixing India's share at a low figure, Mr. Tyson explained that the assessment of contribution was fixed very largely on the basis of ability to pay and he mentioned that Canada, for instance had been assessed at 2.6 per cent. and France at 5.69 per cent. In any case, voting did not go by contribution and even if we paid 35 per cent, it might remove suspicions but would not give any more voting power. He opposed Mr. Neogy's amendment and declared that no Government could bind itself in advance to carry out all the recommendations of an outside body on which we had only one vote, subject only to the approval of the legislature. The recommendations were addressed to a group of nations and would be only partially suitable to India's conditions; further we might have to consult the provinces because the greater part of the recommendations would lie in the provincial field.

Mr. Neogy intervening said he wanted the Central Government to set the example in the areas under their authority.

Mr. Tyson reiterated that consultation with the provinces would be necessary. He gave the assurance that the legislature would be kept informed of the developments in the organisation. He was prepared to accept Prof. Ranga's amendment. Both the amendments were put to vote and carried and the resolution, as amended, was carried. The House then adjourned *sine die*

Laws Passed in 1944

Provincial Acts passed by Legislatures, Governors' Acts, Bills introduced by Provincial Governments and Ordinances promulgated by Governors.

Title of Act or Bill and date of Assent or Introduction in Italics.

Government of Bengal

The Bengal Finance (Sales Tax) Amendment Act, 1944 (Bengal Act I of 1944) (28-8-1944) :—To amend the Bengal Finance (Sales Tax) Act, 1941, in order to raise the rate of tax leviable under the said Act from one quarter to one half of an anna; but at the same time provision has been made to exempt from tax "the poor man's cloth".

The Bengal Non-agricultural Tenancy (Temporary Provisions) Extending Act 1944 (Bengal Act II of 1944) (27-5-1944) :—To extend the operation of the Bengal Non-agricultural Tenancy (Temporary Provisions) Act, 1940, for one year more from May 29, 1944, pending the introduction of permanent and more comprehensive legislation on the subject.

The Bengal Orphanages and Widows' Homes Act, 1944 (Bengal Act III of 1944) (23-6-1944) :—To provide for the better control and supervision of orphanages and widows' homes and marriage bureaux in Bengal.

The Bengal Secondary Education Bill, 1944 (Introduced in the Legislative Assembly) :—To provide for the regulation, control and development of secondary education.

The Bengal Diseases of Animals Bill, 1944 (Introduced in the Legislative Council) :—To provide for the prevention of contagious diseases amongst animals in Bengal.

The Coroners and Criminal Procedure (Bengal Amendment) Bill, 1944, (Introduced in the Legislative Council) :—To amend the Coroners Act, 1871 and the code of Criminal Procedure, 1898, in order to dispense with the inquiry to be held by the Coroner or by a Police Officer in cases of deaths caused by enemy action unless the Provincial Government so directs.

The Hindu Women's Rights to Property (Bengal Agricultural Land) Bill, 1944, (Introduced in the Legislative Council) :—To extend the operation of the Hindu Women's Rights to Property Act, 1937, to agricultural land in Bengal, with retrospective effect, in order to give widows the full measure of the benefit which the framers of the Act contemplated, and to protect transactions already

entered into on the faith of the Act with certain savings.

The Bengal Destitute Persons (Repatriation and Relief) Bill, 1944, (Introduced in the Legislative Council) :—To make special provision for dealing with persons wandering about in a destitute condition as a result of the prevailing economic distress.

The Bengal Alienation of Agricultural Land (Temporary Provisions) Bill, 1944, (Introduced in the Leg. Council) :—To provide for the restoration to 'raiyats' and 'under-raiyats' of agricultural lands alienated by them during the year 1943 as a result of the prevailing economic distress.

The Bengal Embankment (Amendment) Bill 1944, (Introduced in the Legislative Council) :—To further amend the Bengal Embankment Act, 1882, so as to give Collectors power to have necessary repairs done to a private embankment where considered necessary without taking charge of its future maintenance and to recover the cost thereof from the people benefited by the work.

Government of the Punjab.

The Punjab Maternity Benefit Act 1943, (15-11-1943) :—To regulate the employment of women in factories for certain periods before and after confinement and to provide for the payment of maternity benefit to them.

The Punjab Urban, Immovable Property Tax (Second Amendment) Act, 1943, (15-11-1943) :—To make clear that it is not necessary for assessing authority under Section 18 of the Act to call for a return when the current valuation list is to be amended.

The Punjab Tobacco Vend Fees (Amendment) Act 1943, (17-11-1943) :—To effect certain amendments in the Act which have become necessary as a result of the imposition of a central excise duty on tobacco.

The Sugarcane (Punjab Amendment) Act 1943, (26-11-1943) :—To amend the Indian Sugarcane Act, 1934, in its application to the Punjab with a view to protecting the growers of sugarcane to provide for the better organisation of cane supplies to sugar factories and to prevent unhealthy competition between them.

The Punjab Trade Employees (Amendment) Act, 1943. (6-1-1944):—To remove certain difficulties brought to light in the working of the Punjab Trade Employees Act, 1940, by amending the Act, so as to empower the employer to take overtime work from his employees subject to certain restrictions and by omitting sections 11 and 14 (2) which empower an employer to impose fine and require notice from the employee before quitting service, respectively.

The Punjab Court of Wards (Amendment) Act, 1944. (11-4-1944):—To make it obligatory for a decree holder to file a certificate of his having notified his claim under section 26, in order to continue a suit or renews or institute execution proceedings against a ward and to make it clear that no suit or execution proceedings shall be maintainable to set aside or modify the order of a Deputy Commissioner fixing a date for payment of a claim or regulating the order in which claims are to be paid.

The Epidemic Diseases Punjab (Amendment) Act, 1944. (11-4-1944):—To empower a Deputy Commissioner to issue regulations as to medical inspection and disinfecting water supplies etc. in a district threatened with an outbreak of epidemic disease.

The Punjab Land Preservation (Chos) (Amendment) Act, 1944. (11-4-1944):—To apply the principles of the Land Preservation (Chos) Act II of 1900, to the whole Province and to empower the Government to require land owners to take positive measures necessary to arrest erosion, failing which the Government shall have the power of executing those works themselves.

The General Sales Tax (Amendment) Act, 1944. (11-4-1944):—To remove certain minor discrepancies and defects in the text of the Act of 1941, which have come to light in the course of its administration.

The Punjab Pre-emption (Amendment) Act, 1944. (16-5-1944):—To add a new section to the Act to restore the status quo in the case of pre-emption suits wherein the vendee seeks to improve his position by means of a voluntary acquisition of right of property made after the institution of the suit.

The Colonization of Government Lands (Punjab) (Amendment) Act, 1944. (27-5-1944):—(i) To amend section 27 of the Act so that in future in the absence of any provision to the contrary in the relevant statement of conditions nothing in section 24, 25 and 26 shall apply to a scheduled tenancy.

(ii) Imposition of certain restrictions

on the rights of alienation in respect of and rule of succession to certain proprietary rights acquired by a female.

Government Bills pending before the Punjab Legislative Assembly.

The Punjab District Boards Bill:—To repeal the District Boards Act, 1883. The proposed Bill gives full liberty to the Boards to elect non-official Chairmen, and extends their life to five years. A provision has also been made for prompt discharge of executive duties by the Executive authority.

The Punjab Electricity Duty Bill:—To levy a duty on electrical energy consumed for lights and fans and other appliances.

The Punjab Alienation of Land (Amendment) Bill:—To remove number of defects which have been revealed in the actual working of the Punjab Alienation of Land Act, 1900, and of making a number of consequential amendments which were not carried out when the amending Acts of 1938 and 1940 were passed.

The Punjab Agricultural Produce Markets Amendment) Bill:—To remedy certain defects and to make other suitable provisions which have been found to be necessary in the light of experience.

The Acquisition of Land (Punjab Amendment) Bill:—To exempt compensation awarded under the Land Acquisition Act from attachment.

The Punjab Cotton Ginning and Pressing Factories Bill:—To provide for the licensing of ginning and pressing factories in order to eradicate the malpractices of mixing, watering, adulteration with seed etc., prevailing among certain cotton producers.

Government of Orissa

The Hindu Women's Rights to Property (Extension to Agricultural land in Orissa) Act, 1944 (8-4-1944):—To give the Hindu women in the province of Orissa the same rights in respect of agricultural land as they enjoy under the Hindu Women's Rights to Property Act, 1937, in respect of other property.

The Bihar and Orissa Motor Vehicles Taxation (Orissa Second Amendment) Act, 1944 (8-4-1944):—To exempt from taxation the road rollers and plants owned by the local and public authorities in North Orissa.

The Orissa Legislative Assembly Members' Salaries and Allowances (Amendment) Act, 1944 (26-4-1944):—To increase the salaries of M.L.A.'s from Rs. 75 to Rs. 100 a month and daily allowance from Rs. 2-8 to Rs. 10 during

the continuance of war and six months thereafter.

The Central Provinces Tenancy (Orissa Amendment) Act, 1944 (26-4-1944) :—Construction of the period of one month laid down in section 85 (2) of the Central Provinces Tenancy Act, 1903, to mean a period of one month from the date of service of the notice on the tenant for ejection on account of arrears of rent.

The Orissa Hindu Religious Endowments (Amendment) Act, 1944 (3-5-1944) :—To give the Commissioner of Hindu Religious Endowments power to modify or cancel schemes concerning certain endowments in North Orissa just in the same way as he can modify or cancel a scheme settled by himself under the Orissa Hindu Religious Endowments (Amendment) Act, 1939.

The Madras Estates land (Orissa Amendment) Act, 1944 (26-4-1944) :—To extend the period prescribed U S 172 of Madras Estates land Act, 1908, for filing applications for revision of records of rights from two to four years and to provide a special commission to hear revision application after they have been heard by the Revenue Commissioner.

The Orissa Legislative Assembly, Salaries and Allowance (Temporary Repeal) Act, 1944 (27-7-1944) :—To stop payment of salaries and allowances to Speaker, Deputy Speaker and members of the Assembly for so long as Proclamation under Section 93 of the Government of India Act, 1935, remains in force.

Government of Assam

The Assam Hindu women's rights to property (Extension to Agricultural Land) Act, 1944 (7-12-1944) :—To extend the operation of the Hindu Women's Rights to Property Act, 1937, and the Hindu Women's Rights to Property (Amendment) Act, 1938, to agricultural land in the Province of Assam in order to give better rights to women in respect of agricultural land.

The Assam Debt Conciliation (Amendment) Act, 1944 (9-12-1944) :—To Amend the Assam Debt Conciliation Act, 1936 in order to make it possible to enforce agreements on the heirs of debtors and also to enforce attendance of creditors before Debt Conciliation Boards.

The Assam Maternity Benefit Act, 1944 (Act I of 1944) (14-1-1944) :—To regulate and to provide for maternity benefits to women workers in certain classes of employment.

The Assam Nurses', Midwives' and Health Visitors' Registration Act, 1944 (Act II of 1944) (27-3-1944) :—To provide for the registration and better training of

nurses, midwives and health visitors in Assam.

The Assam Finance Act, 1944 (Act III of 1944) (30-3-1944) :—To fix the rates at which agricultural income shall be taxed under the Assam Agricultural Income-Tax Act, 1939.

The Assam Local Board Elections (Emergency Provisions) Act, 1944 (Act IV of 1944) (30-3-1944) :—To provide for the postponement of Local Board Elections.

The Assam Municipal (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Act V of 1944) (6-4-1944) :—Further to Amend the Assam Municipal Act, 1923, in order to empower Municipal Boards to issue licenses for short-term cinema shows, dramatic performances circuses, variety shows etc.

The Assam Motor Vehicles Taxation (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Act VI of 1944) (6-4-1944) :—Further to amend the Assam Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1936, in order to exempt the extra weight of the Producer Gas Plant fitted to a motor vehicle from taxation and to reduce the tax for vehicles propelled by this form of fuel by 50 per cent.

The Assam Dadas Act, 1944 (Act VII of 1944) (8-4-1944) :—To gather information about, and settle claims in respect of dadas or advances to cultivators on crops.

Government of Sind

The Bombay Finance (Sind Second Amendment) Act, No. XXVII of 1943 (19-8-1943) :—To rectify with retrospective effect, the omission in Sind Act II of 1943 which provided for the levy of duty on energy consumed for lights and fans in respect of industrial undertakings but omitted to levy duty on energy consumed for industrial power and also domestic power.

The City of Karachi Municipal (Amendment) Act, No. I of 1944 (25-3-44) :—To restrict the power of the Corporation to alter names of streets and public places vested in the Corporation.

The Bombay Local Fund Audit (Sind Amendment) Act, No. II of 1944 (25-3-44) :—To remove certain practical difficulties which the Audit Department had experienced in working the Bombay Local Fund Audit Act, 1930.

The Bombay Local Boards (Sind Amendment) Act, No. III of 1944 (25-3-44) :—To widen the franchise for the local board elections and bring it into line with the franchise prescribed for the Assembly elections in the territorial constituencies.

The Bombay Finance (Sind Amendment) Act, No. IV of 1944 (25-3-44) :—To

discontinue the levy of duty on electricity consumed for industrial purposes.

The Sind Police Rifles Force (Amendment) Act, No. V of 1944 (28-3-44) :—To make certain acts not specifically mentioned in the Act punishable and to make certain offences cognizable.

The Sind Medical Act, No. VI of 1944 (28-3-44) :—To constitute a separate medical Council for Sind and to provide for the registration of medical practitioners.

The Bombay District Police (Sind Amendment) Act, No. VII of 1944 (30-3-44) :—To provide for the appointment of the Principal of the Central Constables (Recruits) Training Schools established in the Province and invest him with power to punish officers subordinate to him.

The Bombay Co-operative Societies (Sind Amendment) Act, No. VIII of 1944 (30-3-44) :—To provide that the dispute between a society and a surety of an officer, etc. of the society shall also be decided by arbitration.

The Sind Shops and Establishments (Amendment) Act, No. IX of 1944 (1-4-44) :—To vest Provincial Government with power to appoint a Chief Inspector and to make some minor amendments.

The Sind Suppression of Hur Outrages (Amendment) Act, No. X of 1944 (7-4-44) :—To extend the life of the Act by one year.

The City of Karachi Municipal (Amendment) Act, No. XI of 1944 (5-4-1944) :—To discontinue for the period of war the publication of quarterly accounts of the corporation in the official Gazette with a view to effect economy in paper.

The Bombay Town Planning (Sind Amendment) Act, No. XII of 1944 (8-4-44) :—To remedy certain defects in the Bombay Town Planning Act, 1915, which came to notice in the working of the Act.

The Sind Dett Leti (Amendment) Act, No. XIII of 1944 :—To remove certain defects which came to notice in the working of the Act.

The Sind Money-Lenders Act, No. XIV 1944 (Assented to by the Governor-General on 27-5-44) :—To regulate the transaction of money-lending in the province and to provide for the registration of money-lenders.

The Hakim and Vaidyas Act, No. XV of 1944 (Assented to by the Governor-General on 5-7-44) :—To raise the standard of practice in Indian systems of medicine in the province by giving Hakims and Vaides necessary training on modern lines and thereby raising their status.

The Bombay Municipal Boroughs (Sind Amendment) Act, No. XVI of 1944 (21-8-44) :—To abolish the system of joint

electorate introduced by Sind Act XV of 1940.

The Bombay Local Boards and Bombay Municipal Boroughs (Sind Amendment) Act, No. XVII of 1944 (21-8-44) :—To amend the Municipal Act in order to provide that only such persons as actually possess the appropriate qualifications under the Assembly franchise on the date with reference to the Municipal or local Board roll is prepared should be included in the rolls.

The Karachi Small Causes Court (Amendment) Act, No. XVIII of 1944 (24-8-44) :—To amend section 29 of the Karachi Small Causes Court Act and to state more clearly the extent to which section 94 of the Civil Procedure Code shall be applicable to that Court.

Bill No. XI of 1944 :—To make better provisions for preventing the adulteration of foods and the sale of such foods. It is proposed to repeal the Bombay Prevention of Adulteration Act, 1925, and to enact in its place a more comprehensive and effective measure.

Government of Bombay

The Arnold Marriage Validating Act, 1943 (Bombay X of 1943) (2-12-1943) :—To validate the marriage solemnized in good faith but without authority between Albert Charles Arnold and Gwendoline Ethel Scanlon.

The Bombay Betting Tax (Amendment) Act, 1943 (Bombay XI of 1943) (12-12-1943) :—To provide for the increase of a totalisator tax and a betting tax to 10 per cent in each case.

The Bombay Weights and Measures (Amendment) Act, 1943 (Bombay XII of 1943) (16-12-1943) :—To make it obligatory on traders to produce for Inspectors all weights or measures or weighing or measuring instruments kept on any premises used for trade whether such weights etc., are used or are in their possession for use for trade or not.

The Bombay Entertainments Duty (Amendment) Act, 1943 (Bombay XIII of 1943) (22-12-1943) :—To increase the rates of duties under the Bombay Entertainments Duty Act, 1923.

The Bombay Increase of Stamp Duties Act, 1943 (Bombay XIV of 1943) (22-12-1943) :—To increase by a surcharge of 50 per cent the stamp duties leviable under the Indian Stamp Act, 1899.

The Bombay Increase of Court Fees Act, 1943 (Bombay XV of 1943) (22-12-1943) :—To increase by a surcharge of 25 per cent the fees leviable under the Court Fees Act, 1870.

The Bombay Co-operative Societies (Amendment) Act, 1943 (Bombay XVI of

1945) (19-12-1945) :—(a) To give arbitration awards or liquidators' orders the status of a decree, and

(b) To provide for a summary procedure for settlement and recovery of the defaulted instalments in respect of debentures guaranteed by Government of land mortgage banks and to take precautionary measures provided in Chapter XI of the Bombay Land Revenue Code, 1878, for the recovery of these dues.

The Bombay Public Conveyances (Amendment) Act, 1943 (Bombay XVII of 1943) (17-1-1944) :—To make the Act applicable to cycle rick-shaws.

The Bombay Legislature Members (Removal of Disqualifications) (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Bombay I of 1944) (29-2-1944) :—Not to disqualify a person for election or continuance as a member of either Chamber of the Bombay Legislature by reason only that he holds or accepts any office in the service of the Crown in India certified by the Government of Bombay to be an office created for a purpose connected with the prosecution of the war.

The Bombay Land Improvement Schemes (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Bombay III of 1944) (28-3-1944) :—(a) To empower the Board to make regulations for carrying out the objects of the scheme ;

(b) To prescribe a penalty in addition to the liability for the cost of maintenance and repair of works so that cases of failure to maintain and repair the work should be as few as possible,

(c) To extend the scope of the existing Section 25 (1) to cover schemes subsidized by the Provincial Government or by any trust and schemes necessary in the interest of members of His Majesty's forces, either serving or retired and of their dependents.

The Bombay Finance (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Bombay IV of 1944) (4-3-1944) :—To extend the life of the Bombay Finance Act of 1932 by one more year.

The Bombay Rent Restriction (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Bombay V of 1944) (24-3-1944) :—To extend the life of the Bombay Rent Act of 1939 by one more year.

The Bombay Non-Urban Labour Housing, Sanitation and Provision Shops Act, 1944 (Bombay VI of 1944) (16 4-1944) :—To provide for the opening of provision shops for and regulating the housing and sanitary conditions of non-agricultural labour in areas outside the municipal and cantonment limits.

The Bombay Rents, Hotel Rates and Lodging House Rates (Control) Act, 1944 (Bombay VII of 1944) (8-5-1944) :—To regulate the supply of accommodation whether residential or non-residential furnished or unfurnished and with or with-

out board in certain areas in the Province and in particular to provide for controlling the rents or rates chargeable for such supply of accommodation and for preventing in certain areas eviction from the accommodation supplied.

The Bombay Growth of Food Crops Act 1944 (Bombay VIII of 1944) (20-5-1944) :—To provide for regulating the cultivation of crops with a view to growing more food crops in the Province.

The City of Bombay Municipal Corporation (Extension of Term) Act, 1944 (Bombay IX of 1944) (9-6-1944) :—To extend the life of the Corporation for a further period of two years i.e. till April 1, 1947.

The Mussalman Wakf, Bombay Public Trusts Registration and Parsi Public Trusts Registration (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Bombay X of 1944) (13-7-1944) :—To dispense with the publication in newspapers of the lists and statements of sums standing to the credit of the trusts' administration funds to save paper and cost of publication.

The Bombay University (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Bombay XI of 1944) (3-8-1944) :—To provide that casual vacancies shall be filled only for the residue of the term of office of the persons who have ceased to be members and that the casual vacancy of an elected fellow shall not be filled if it occurs within six months preceding the date on which his term of office expires.

The Bombay Irrigated Crop Regulation Act, 1944 (Bombay XII of 1944) (28-8-1944) :—To provide for the maximum cultivation of and the maximum use of water in lands under command of irrigation works in the Province and for increased cultivation of food crops in such lands.

Government of Madras

The Madras Local Boards (Second Amendment) Act, 1943 (Madras Act XIX of 1943) (6-10-1943) :—To provide for the appointment of executive officers in panchayats notified by the Government and to define the duties and powers of such officers.

The Madras Co-operative Societies (Amendment) Act, 1943 (Madras Act XX of 1943) (13-10-1943) :—To amend the principal Act to facilitate the recovery of sums due to co-operative societies in Orissa from members of such societies who are residing in this Presidency.

The Madras Proprietary Estates' Village Service and Hereditary village-offices, (Amendment) Act, 1943 (Madras Act XXI of 1943) (15-10-1943) :—To allow a minor registered as heir to a village office under the two principal Acts, a period of five years from the termination of his war service to qualify for the office.

The Madras Prohibition (Suspension) Act, 1943 (Madras Act XXII of 1943) (8-11-1943):—To provide for the suspension of the operation of certain provisions of the Madras Prohibition Act, 1937, in the districts in which it was in force and the revival of the Madras Abkari Act, 1836, in those districts.

The Madras Pawnbrokers Act, 1943 (Madras Act XXIII of 1943) (6-11-1943):—To regulate and control the business of pawnbrokers in the Presidency by licensing pawnbrokers and fixing the maximum rate of interest chargeable by them.

The Tambaram Tuberculosis Sanatorium (Regulation of Buildings) Act, 1943 (Madras Act XXIV of 1943) (22-11-1943):—To provide for the control of the construction of buildings in the neighbourhood of the Government Tuberculosis Sanatorium at Tambaram, and for the exclusion, modification, or restriction of enactments relating to public health from or in such neighbourhood.

The Andhra University (Amendment) Act, 1943 (Madras Act XXV of 1943) (3-12-1943):—To remove the prohibition imposed by section 26 (c) of the Andhra University (Second Amendment) Act, 1942, in the case of vacancies in seats on the Syndicate and the Finance Committee to which nominations are made by the Chancellor.

The Andhra University (Second Amendment) Act, 1943 (Madras Act XXVI of 1943) (3-12-1943):—To omit the reference to Ganjam in the Andhra University Act, 1925.

The Madras University (Amendment) Act, 1943 (Madras Act XXVII of 1943) (12-12-1943):—To enable the Madras University to institute, maintain and manage colleges and laboratories of its own outside the limits of the University and to confer degrees and other academic distinctions on students who have pursued approved courses of study in such colleges and laboratories and passed the prescribed examinations.

The Madras Elementary Education (Amendment) Act, 1943 (Madras Act XXVIII of 1943) (23-12-1943):—To amend section 34 (i) of the Elementary Education Act to make it clear that exemptions from the water and drainage, lighting or scavenging tax under the Madras District Municipalities Act or the Madras City Municipal Act should not be taken into account when determining the education tax levied under that section.

The Criminal Tribes (Madras Amendment) Act, 1943 (Madras Act XXIX of 1943) (23-12-1943):—To substitute the expression "notified tribe" for "criminal tribe" in the Criminal Tribes Act, 1924, to enable the Government to issue a

notification applying certain provisions of the main Act and not necessary all its provisions to persons addicted to the commission of non-bailable offences and also to amend the main Act in certain other respects.

The Madras Restriction of Habitual Offenders Act, 1943 (Madras Act XXX of 1943) (23-12-1943):—To provide for the application of the provisions of the Criminal Tribes Act, 1924, to individual habitual offenders so that, where necessary, restrictions may be placed on the movements of such offenders or a duty laid on them to notify their residences etc., as provided in that Act.

The Madras Debt Conciliation (Second Amendment) Act, 1943 (Madras Act XXXI of 1943) (31-12-1943):—To authorise the Government to direct (a) that a Debt Conciliation Board should not receive fresh applications after a specified date and (b) that the applications received after a specified date and not disposed of before the date referred to in (a), should not be proceeded with.

The Madras Estates Land (Temporary Amendment) Act, 1944 (Madras Act I of 1944) (3-1-1944):—To provide for the temporary assignment subject to certain conditions, of ryoti land situated in an estate and not already in the possession of a ryot or tenant, for periods ranging from 3 to 5 years for the purpose of raising food crops, during the present emergency.

The Madras District Municipalities and Local Boards (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Madras Act II of 1944) (17-2-1944):—To provide for the removal of difficulties experienced in the administration of district municipalities and local boards in cases where the Chairman or Vice-Chairman or the President or the Vice-President is not likely to exercise or discharge some or all of his powers and duties.

The Madras City Municipal and District Municipalities (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Madras Act III of 1944) (28-2-1944):—To amend the Madras City Municipal and District Municipalities Acts so as to make it clear that the deduction of 10 per cent made from the gross annual rent of lands and buildings when assessing them to property tax, should be allowed only in respect of the building and not in respect of the site on which it stands or the adjacent lands occupied as an appurtenance thereto.

The Madras Public Health (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Madras Act IV of 1944) (28-2-1944):—To make separate provision in the principal Act for the treatment and control of leprosy which is now regulated along with other infectious diseases.

The Madras Hindu Religious Endowments (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Madras Act V of 1944) (7-3-1944) :—To provide for the abolition of temple committees, the appointment of Assistant Commissioners to discharge certain duties now performed by Temple Committees and the grant of additional powers to the President of the Board to improve its working.

The Madras Local Boards (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Madras Act VI of 1944) (23-3-1944) :—To amend section 80 (i) of the main Act to empower district collectors to require land-holders in proprietary estates to furnish lists of the lands held by them in the last years 1350, 1351 and 1352 for the purpose of fixing the rent value of such lands for the triennium comprising last years 1353, 1354 and 1355.

The Madras Commercial Crops Markets (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Madras Act VII of 1944) (24-3-1944) :—To provide for the postponement of the elections to market committees for the period of the present war in view of the labour and expenditure involved in the preparation of electoral rolls and holding of elections and also of the present acute shortage of paper.

The Madras District Municipalities (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Madras Act VIII 1944) (27-3-1944) :—To enable the Government to direct such of the municipal councils as are levying the property tax at comparatively low rates to raise the tax to a reasonable level.

The Madras Regulation of the Sale of Cloth (Repeal) Act, 1944 (Madras Act IX of 1944) (25-4-1944) :—To repeal the Madras Regulation of the Sale of Cloth Act, 1937, with effect from April 1, 1944, as the labour involved in the administration of the Act was out of all proportion to the revenue derived from the licensing fees levied under it.

The Madras General Sales Tax (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Madras Act X of 1944) (25-4-1944) :—To amend the main Act (i) to provide that dealers whose annual turnovers are between Rs. 10,000 and Rs. 15,000 should pay sales tax at the rate of Rs. 8 per month and those whose turnovers are between Rs. 15,000 and Rs. 20,000 should pay at the rate of Rs. 12 per month, and (ii) to withdraw the exemption from tax, of sales of bullion and specie.

The Andhra University (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Madras Act XI of 1944) (1-7-1944) :—To amend section 15 class III, clause (4) of the main Act to enable the headquarters of recognised secondary schools in areas which originally formed part of the Ganjam district but were transferred to the Vizagapatnam district consequent on the formation of the Orissa

Province, to take part in the election of two members to the Senate of the University.

The Madras Tobacco Taxation of Sales and Licensing (Repeal) and General Sales Tax (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Madras Act XII of 1944) (1-7-1944) :—To repeal the Madras Tobacco (Taxation of Sales and Licensing) Act, 1939, and to exclude all forms of tobacco from the provisions of the Madras General Sales Tax Act, 1939.

The Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Madras Act, XIII of 1944) (3-7-1944) :—To amend section 56 of the main Act to enable the Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Committee to establish and maintain a first grade residential college at or near Tirupati.

The Legal Practitioners (Madras Amendment) Act, 1944 (Madras Act, XIV of 1944) (14-7-1944) :—To amend the main Act to provide for the constitution, where necessary, of a committee of legal practitioners (i) for any taluk at any place other than its headquarters or (ii) for two or more taluks.

The Andhra University (Second Amendment) Act, 1944 (Madras Act XV of 1944) (1-9-1944) :—To amend the main Act to give the Maharajah Bahadur of Jeypore a right to nominate two members to the Senate and the Chancellor a right to nominate on the recommendation of the Maharajah two members to the Syndicate.

The Andhra University (Third Amendment) Act, 1944 (Madras Act XVI of 1944) (24-9-1944) :—To amend section 22 (ii) of the main Act so as to enable the Academic Council to co-opt members from the staff of University colleges also.

The Perundurai Tuberculosis Sanatorium (Regulation of Buildings) Act, 1944 (Madras Act XVII of 1944) (28-9-1944) :—To provide for the control of the construction of buildings in the neighbourhood of the Tuberculosis Sanatorium at Perundurai and for the exclusion, modification or restriction of enactments relating to public health from or in such neighbourhood.

The Madras Village Panchayats Bill, 1940 :—To make better provision in a separate enactment for the administration of village affairs by panchayats.

The Madras Local Boards (Second Amendment) Bill, 1941 :—To remove panchayats from the scope of the Madras Local Boards Act, 1920, and confine the operation of the Act to District Boards and to make certain other amendments to the Act either for the purpose of removing certain difficulties encountered in working the Act or for the purpose of improving the administration of District Boards.

The Madras Industrial Disputes Bill, 1942 :—To make provision for the promotion of peaceful and amicable settlement of industrial disputes by conciliation and arbitration.

The Annamalai University (Second Amendment) Bill, 1943 :—To amend the principal Act so as to secure the more efficient working of the Act, the main changes being abolition of the Academic Council, alteration of the constitution of Senate so as to make it a more representative body, grant of effective powers to the Vice-Chancellor, etc.

The Madras Forest (Amendment) Bill, 1944 :—To amend the Madras Forest Act to enable the Government in certain cases to place a private forest or waste land under the control and management of an officer appointed by the Government and to make provision for the successful preservation of game in reserved forests and the regulation of the felling of standing trees on lands outside reserved forests.

The Madras City Improvement Trust Bill, 1944 :—To provide for the constitution of a Board of Trustees for the improvement and expansion of the City of Madras by opening up congested areas, laying out or altering streets and by framing and executing improvement schemes.

The Madras Irrigation Works (Repairs, Improvement and Construction) (Amendment) Bill, 1944 :—To amend the main Act (i) to make the landholder liable only for so much of the cost of the irrigation work constructed by the Government on his lands, which is proportionate to the extent of the lands in his estate served by the work and to limit his liability to an amount which would yield a net return of 4 per cent and (ii) to make provision for cases where an irrigation work is intended to serve partly lands situated in two or more estates and partly ryotwari lands.

The Madras Estates Land (Amendment) Bill, 1944 :—To amend section 3 (2) (d) of the main Act so as to make it clear that where a grant as an *inam* is expressed to be of a named village, the area which forms the subject matter of the grant should be deemed to be an estate although it did not include certain lands in the village of that name which have already been granted on service tenure or been reserved for communal purposes or the like.

The Madras District Municipalities (Property Tax Validating) Bill, 1944 :—To validate the levy which had already been made by municipal councils of property tax on lands used exclusively for

agricultural purposes in accordance with the provisions of sub-section (2) of section 81 of the main Act instead of under sub-section (4) of that section.

The Madras General Sales Tax (Second Amendment) Bill, 1944 :—To amend section 14 of the main Act so as to empower inspecting officers to enter the place of business of a dealer and seize accounts, registers and other documents if necessary, and to authorise gazetted officers specially empowered by the Government to search premises other than those used for the conduct of business where there is reason to believe that true account books etc. are secreted and to seize them.

The Malabar Tenancy (Amendment) Bill, 1944 :—To amend section 51 of the main Act to define clearly the scope of that section in regard to rent or *michavaram* payable in kind and to provide for a fair and equitable way of determining the money equivalent of the commodities specified in the section, during the period of the war in view of the abnormal rise in their prices.

The Madras District Municipalities (Second Amendment) Bill, 1944 :—To amend the main Act to provide that the governing body of a college maintained by a municipal council and affiliated to a University shall exercise in respect of the teaching staff and establishment of the college, the powers of appointment, control and punishment.

The Madras Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1944 :—To amend the main Act so as to make it clear that the water cess levied under the Act is not a tax on land, but a fee levied for the water supplied or used for the irrigation of land.

The Madras Prevention of Begging Bill, 1944 :—To provide for the prevention of begging in mofussil areas and to commit offenders in certain cases to workhouses or special homes.

Govt. of United Provinces

The United Provinces Municipalities (Amendment) Act, 1943 (26-11-1943) :—To avoid discrimination in regard to security of appointment and conditions of service between certain educational officers of the Municipal Board and the other employees of the Board who enjoyed such security under section 68 of the UP. Municipalities Act, 1916.

The United Provinces Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Act, 1943 (1-12-1943) :—To secure three main objects : (1) to extend the operation of the Sugar Factories Control Act, 1938, which was due to expire on June 30, 1944, upto June 30, 1947, (2) to set up a com-

mitted to advise the Government regarding the suitability of the various varieties of cane so as to bring about an all round improvement in sugarcane cultivation. (3) to provide that cane grown in the reserved area of a factory shall not be sold without the permission of the Cane Commissioner to another factory.

The Co-operative Societies (United Provinces) Amendment Act, 1944 (18-3-1944) :—To impose an obligation on the employer to make deductions from the salary of his employees who take loans from salary Eater's Co-operative Societies.

The Police (United Provinces Amendment) Act, 1944 (26-7-1944) :—To provide for the punishment of withholding of increments or promotion on the subordinate police force.

The United Provinces Fire Service Act, 1944 (26-7-1944) :—To give responsibility to Provincial Government for the adequacy and efficiency of the peacetime fire-fighting organisations in the towns of Agra, Allahabad, Benares, Cawnpore and Lucknow and any other town to which the Act may be applied.

The United Provinces Nurses, Midwives, Assistant Midwives and Health Visitors' Registration (Amendment) Act, 1944 (31-7-1944) :—To improve the status and conditions of service of the nursing profession and to secure for them wider representation in the Nurses and Midwives Council.

The Court Fees (United Provinces Amendment) Act, 1944 (27-9-1944) :—By section 49 (1) of the third schedule of the Arbitration Act, 1940, the provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure had been repealed and thus the reference to paragraph 17 and 20 in Article 18 of schedule II of the Court Fees Act had become irrelevant. By this act the reference to paragraph 17 and 20 C.P.C. has been substituted by a reference to the Arbitration Act, 1940.

The United Provinces Town Improvement (Amendment) Act, 1944 (6-10-1944) :—To provide for better representation of various interests in the Cawnpore Improvement Trust.

Central Provinces and Berar

The Central Provinces and Berar Finance (Annual) Act, 1944 (1 of 1944) (26-3-44) :—To continue the operation of certain taxation Acts, and to provide for the levy of a surcharge on court-fees and stamp duties and increase in entertainments duty with a view to secure additional revenue to the Province and to check wide-spread inflationary tendency.

The Central Provinces and Berar

Regulation of Couching Act, 1944 (II of 1944) (26-3-44) :—To prohibit the practice of couching of cataract by persons who are not registered practitioners or by persons who do not possess qualifications entitling them to be registered as such.

The Central Provinces and Berar Motor Vehicles Taxation (Amendment) Act, 1944 (III of 1944) (29-3-44) :—To change the basis of taxation on goods vehicles partly to check inflationary tendency and partly to meet changed conditions.

The Central Provinces and Berar Municipalities (Amendment) Act, 1944 (IV of 1944) (9-6-44) :—To penalise public begging within the municipal limits and to make it obligatory upon municipal committees to maintain poor-houses.

The Central Provinces and Berar Prohibition (Amendment) Act, 1944 (V of 1944) (7-8-44) :—To empower Government to exclude a particular area from the operation of the Central Provinces and Berar Prohibition Act, 1918 (VII of 1938).

The Berar Land Revenue Code (Amendment) Act, 1944 (VI of 1944) (4-9-44) :—To enhance the maximum rate of jaglia and Mahar cess to enable Government to recover the increase sanctioned in the emoluments of jagliars and Mahars to meet the increased cost of living.

The Nagpur Improvement Trust (Amendment) Bill, 1944 :—To remove certain doubts regarding the powers of the Nagpur Improvement Trust to undertake schemes for expansion and development within the municipal limits; to provide for powers in respect of sewage disposal, and to remove defects revealed by the operation of the principal Act.

Government of Bihar

The Bihar Entertainments Duty (War Surcharge Amendment) Act, 1943 (Bihar Act VIII of 1943) (5-11-1943). *The Bihar Court-fees (War Surcharge Amendment) Act, 1943 (Bihar Act IX of 1943) (5-11-1943)*. *The Bihar Stamp (War Surcharge Amendment) Act, 1943 (Bihar Act X of 1943) (15-11-1943)* :—To combat inflation by imposing a surcharge not exceeding the amount of the tax payable under the Bihar Entertainments Duty Act, 1937, and of approximately 25 per cent on all court-fees and stamp duties leviable respectively under the Court Fees Act, 1870, and the Indian Stamp Act, 1899, as in force in Bihar, and to increase the fund created to provide money for Post-war Reconstruction.

The Bihar Local Self-Government (Temporary Extension of Term of Office)

Act, 1944 (Bihar Act I of 1944) (3-2-1944):—To secure power to postpone for the duration of the war all general elections in District Boards by extending the term of office of members of District and Local Boards.

The Bihar Tenancy (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Bihar Act II of 1944) (5-2-1944):—To empower officers other than the Collectors of districts to dispose of appeals in rent commutation cases under the section 40 (G) of the Bihar Tenancy Act, 1885.

The Jharia Water-Supply (Amendment) Act 1944 (Bihar Act III of 1944) (14-2-1944):—To repeal a provision of the Jharia Water-Supply Act, 1911, which experience has shown to be unnecessary and a source of uncertainty.

The Bihar Agricultural Income-tax (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Bihar Act IV of 1944) (10-2-1944):—To fix a uniform basis for exemption from taxation under the Bihar Agricultural Income-Tax Act, 1938, by removing the existing provision regarding exemption on acreage basis and to raise, in view of the high prices of food crops, the multiple of the rent or cess valuation on the basis of which the assessment may have his income calculated.

The Jharia Water-Supply (Second Amendment) Act, 1944 (Bihar Act V of 1944) (23-4-1944):—To enable the Jharia Water Board to invest its surplus funds in Government securities or in other securities.

The Bihar Sales Tax Act, 1944 (Bihar Act VI of 1944) (29-5-1944):—To levy a tax on the retail sale of goods with a view to supplement the revenues of the province and to provide adequate funds for schemes of the nation-building department which may be undertaken as a part of Post-War Reconstruction.

The Bihar Municipal (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Bihar Act VII of 1944) (27-6-1944):—To empower municipalities to impose a tax on bicycles.

The Bihar Provincialisation of Roads and Hospitals Act, 1944 (Bihar Act VIII of 1944) (30-6-1944):—To empower Government to take over and provincialise selected roads and hospitals now vested in local authorities for the efficient maintenance of communications in the Province and for the provision of adequate medical facilities to the people of the province.

The Bihar Local Self-Government and Cess (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Bihar Act XI of 1944) (21-7-1944):—To fix the rate of cess on annual profits at the present maximum rate of one anna on each rupee of such profits and to increase the cess income of District Boards by raising

the rate of local cess on the annual value of lands to a minimum of one anna and six pies on each rupee which may be increased by the District Board or by the Provincial Government to two annas on each rupee and to empower Government to prescribe the minimum expenditure to be incurred by District Boards on objects within their competence.

The Patna University (Amendment) Act 1944 (Bihar Act IX of 1944) (29-7-1944):—To make amendments in the Patna University Act, 1917, rendered necessary by the enactment of the Utkal University Act and to make provision for the retention of the existing strength of the Senate and the Syndicate of the Patna University.

The Bihar Co-operative Societies (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Bihar Act X of 1944) (4-8-1944):—To introduce a scheme extending the activities of the Bihar Provincial Co-operative Bank on the lines adopted by the Credit Agricole d' Egypt under which advances of improved seeds, manures, and implements and advances, against the pledge of produce, will be made to cultivators on a large scale.

The Bihar Local Self-Government Laws (Amending) Act, 1944 (Bihar Act XII of 1944) (18-9-1944):—To exclude the application of local laws relating to local self-government and the jurisdiction of local authorities from cantonments and at the same time enable such local self-government functions as may be desirable to be carried on in those areas.

The Bihar Tenancy (Second Amendment) Act, 1944 (Bihar Act XIII of 1944) (23-9-1944). The Chota Nagpur Tenancy (Amendment) Act, 1944 (Bihar Act XIV of 1944) (23-9-1944):—To encourage the landlords to settle on temporary emergency wartime lease as much of surplus lands as possible by providing that occupancy and non-occupancy rights shall not accrue therein so as to promote the Grow More Food Campaign.

N.-W. F. Province

The N.-W.F.P. Legislative Assembly (Members' Allowances) (Amendment) Act, 1944. (25-3-1944):—To authorise the Parliamentary Secretaries to draw the daily allowance permissible to other M.L.A.s during the session of the Legislative Assembly.

The N.-W.F.P. Entertainments Duty (Amendment) Act, 1944 (25-3-1944):—To provide for the withdrawal of the concession of issuing duty-free complimentary tickets by the management as well as by the lessor of the building.

The Rajagopalachariar Formula

Jinnah—Rajagopalachariar Correspondence

The Muslim claim of self-determination was espoused by a prominent Congress leader, Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar and on the 10th of July 1944, he published a formula which had been discussed with, and approved by, Mahatma Gandhi in March 1943 and which he had communicated to Mr. M. A. Jinnah, President of the All India Muslim League, on the 8th of April 1944. The formula was intended to serve as a basis for settlement between the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League.

Mr. Jinnah, while willing to place the formula before the Working Committee of the Muslim League, stated that he could not personally take responsibility "for accepting or rejecting it."

Mr. Rajagopalachariar, however, being of the view that "it was futile to allow Mr. Jinnah, if he could not himself wholeheartedly back it, to put my proposal before the Muslim League", the negotiations were closed.

The following is the text of the exchange of correspondence between Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar and Mr. Jinnah :—

Letter from "C.R." Dated New Delhi, April 8, 1944.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

Here is the basis for a settlement which I discussed with Gandhiji in March, 1943, and of which he expressed full approval. He then authorised me to signify his approval of these terms should I be able to convince you of their being just and fair to all. As the Government have refused to relax any of the restrictions imposed on him to enable him to discuss or negotiate terms of any settlement, I write this to you on his behalf and hope that this will bring about a final settlement of the most unfortunate impasse we are in. You are aware of the intensity of my desire for a settlement. I was very glad when I found it possible to obtain Gandhiji's approval of these terms. I hope that you will bestow your fullest thought to the justice and fairness of these proposals and help to terminate a condition of affairs which is steadily causing all round deterioration in the country.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) O. Rajagopalachari.

Basis for Settlement

Basis for terms of settlement between the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League to which Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah agree and which they will endeavour respectively to get the Congress and the League to approve.

(1) Subject to the terms set out below as regards the constitution for Free India, the Muslim League endorses the Indian demand for independence and will co-operate with the Congress in the formation of a provisional interim Government for the transitional period.

(2) After the termination of the war, a commission shall be appointed for demarcating contiguous districts in the north-west and east of India, wherein the Muslim population is in absolute majority. In the areas thus demarcated, a plebiscite of all the inhabitants held on the basis of adult suffrage or other practicable franchise shall ultimately decide the issue of separation from Hindustan. If the majority decide in favour of forming a sovereign State separate from Hindustan, such decision shall be given effect to, without prejudice to the right of districts on the border to choose to join either State.

(3) It will be open to all parties to advocate their points of view before the plebiscite is held.

(4) In the event of separation, mutual agreements shall be entered into for safeguarding defence, commerce and communications and for other essential purposes.

- (5) Any transfer of population shall only be on an absolutely voluntary basis.
 (6) These terms shall be binding only in case of transfer by Britain of full power and responsibility for the governance of India.

Letter From "C.R." Dated New Delhi, April 17, 1944.

Dear Mr. Jinnah,

"The proposal I gave you in writing when we last met in Delhi must be still with you and perhaps you have read it over again and given further thought to it. I was much disappointed, as you are aware, at your inability to approve of the terms. But I hope you may perhaps reconsider your position. I sincerely believe that the proposals form a fair and satisfactory basis of settlement. I shall be grateful to hear from you as to whether you have reconsidered the matter.

Yours sincerely,
 (Sd). C. Rajagopalachari."

Telegram from "C. R." from Poona Dated June 30, 1944.

Quaid-e-Azam Jinnah, Guest House, Srinagar.

"My letter dated 17th April touching matter personally discussed on 8th April remains yet unanswered. Have now met Gandhiji who still stands by formula presented to you by me. I would like now publish formula and your rejection. This telegram is sent with Gandhiji's approval. I would like you at this juncture to reconsider your rejection. C. Rajagopalachari, "Dilkhush," "Panchgani."

Telegram from Mr. Jinnah to "C.R." Dated July 2, 1944.

Your request to publish your formula. Your wrong version our talk that I rejected your formula is unfair and surprising. True facts are—I was willing place your formula before Working Committee Muslim League, although it was not open to any modification, but you did not agree allow me to do so. Hence no further step was taken. My reaction was that I could not personally take responsibility of accepting or rejecting it and my position remains same to-day. If Mr. Gandhi even now sends me direct his proposal, I am willing place it before Muslim League Working Committee."—Jinnah".

Telegram from C.R." from Panchgani Dated July 4, 1944.

"Thanks telegram. My letter 17th April showed how I felt over what I thought was rejection of formula so far as you were personally concerned. Shall be glad indeed if, as your telegram suggests you did not reject it. Gandhiji, though not vested with representative or special authority in this matter, definitely approved my proposal and authorised me to approach you on the basis. Now again, he reaffirms his assent. Weight of his opinion would most probably secure Congress acceptance. You were un-willing to place it before League Council. I think no purpose served by such procedure so long as it does not have your own support.—C. Rajagopalachari."

Mr. Jinnah's Telegraphic Reply from Srinagar Dated July 5, 1944

"Regret unable go beyond my telegram 2nd July.—Jinnah."

"C.R.'s" Telegram from Panchgani Dated July 8

"Your telegram of 5th received to-day (July 8.) With it private negotiation ends. It is necessary take public into confidence now. I am accordingly releasing entire correspondence ending your wire 5th.—Rajagopalachari."

Rajagopalachari's Reply to Critics

The publication of the Rajaji formula raised a furore of conflicting opinions in the country. In this article specially contributed, Rajaji answers his various critics—the British, the Hindu Sanghataniists, the Indian States and other Minorities.

"Do you agree with inference drawn in England that you favour full entry of the free Indian Government into the war against Japan." To this question put to Gandhiji by the journal "Cavalcade" the answer was an unambiguous three letter word "Yes." To a second question put to remove the apprehensions of Anglo-American capital, Gandhiji's answer was equally clear. He said that his advice would be to respect all such interests and to honour all agreements entered into. This sets at rest all specious excuses.

The "New Statesman" has well pointed out the two distinguishing factors in

the present situation. Gandhiji has met the central demand of the Muslim League and he advises Indian co-operation during the war-period. The journal rightly warns the British Government that this chance for friendship may not come again and that, if Britain should ignore the present chance, it would confirm Indians in their distrust of British good faith. No wiser words were uttered. Let us hope that the intoxication of victory and good news in the war-zone may not cloud the intellect in the judgment of the no less important situation in Asia.

The formula to which Gandhiji has concurred concedes the maximum content of the League resolution of 1940. It can hereafter only be a case of obstruction for obstruction's sake. To make that kind of obstruction a justification for inaction is inconsistent with Britain's claims of responsibility for India. The League has asked for the right to separate for certain tracts, and this has been fully conceded. The limitations by way of territorial re-adjustment with respect to composition of inhabitants and the plebiscite are inherent in the very claim made by the Muslim League. We cannot create states in the twentieth century at the bidding of politicians without asking the people concerned. A refusal to accept this offer because one cannot be sure of the result of a referendum is worse than Ulsterism and cannot be a ground for putting off an Indo-British settlement which is needed for the peace of the world.

There is a chance now for the healing of all sores. My appeal to Britain, to the Muslim League and the people of India of all creeds and communities is that we should not lose this opportunity. If we miss it again, we shall be where we are, which now is a continent-wide bog of corruption and degradation of spirit. Let us be practical and let us help one another. Not one of us can be happy or find our soul and our self-respect if we do not help one another now. Mr. Savarkar has stated that it is the duty of every Hindu Sanghatanist to denounce my proposal. Mr. Savarkar may thus define the duty of his Hindu Sanghatanists. But what about the duty of Indian Sanghatanists whose aim is to be free, and not only to organise against Muslims? We see no alternative but violence and civil war if we do not support just self-determination. Civil war and violence may have a theoretical place in evolution, but it will not be permitted by the British. They will prevent it as long as they have power and hold Hindus and Muslims in full fetterhold.

It is said that I am far away from the Punjab, and Bengal, and that I should leave it to the people of those parts. We are leaving it to them. That is the meaning of the plebiscite: And if I am far away, is Gandhiji also far away? And is Britain nearer, on whom you must depend, my brothers, if this controversy should be kept unsolved? Do you not realise that all the horrors you associated with Pakistan are already there? What we propose will reduce the scope of existing wrong.

The argument of visivisection has been taken up by even some ministers of Indian States. Draw an outline map of India and insert all the Indian States on whose behalf these Ministers claim sovereign right and treaty obligations from the British Crown. One can then understand the meaning of 'Visivisection'.

We have all read the statement of the Chancellor of Princes' Chamber as well as the occasional contributions of esteemed ministers. There is nothing in these pronouncements beyond vague generalities. There is no offer in them on the main point required for Indian Freedom and self-rule—the substitution of loyalty to Indian democracy for the 'paramountcy' of the British Parliament. When Sir Stafford Cripps met the Princes, far from being responsive to national tendencies or falling into harmony with the national demand the Princes drove the eminent lawyer-ambassador to a tight corner by referring to the treaty-rights they held as against the British Government rights which they proposed to requisition not against foreign enemies or the mutual attacks of one Prince against another, but against the movement of democracy in their own territories as if that were insurrection! The use of terms like allegiance to the British Crown cannot alter the fact that it is the British Cabinet and Parliament that exercise paramountcy.

One cannot but be amused at the use of the phrase 'treaty' when there is not a shred of independence on the side of these Princes but only subservience, as of subordinates, and terror of the Political Department of the Viceroy. Cannot the Princes see that it would be far more honourable and consistent with the dignity of their position to accept the true paramountcy of the Indian people, among whom they live in cultural, moral and material unity? The suzerainty of Indian democracy is the logical corollary of political progress. Surely, more consideration, more sympathy and more justice can be expected from the representatives of the

Indian people than from the proud representatives, of the might of Great Britain, from whom they are divided as much in spirit and material interests as in distance. The claim of the Indian States based on so-called treaties is not founded on any popular feeling in the States but is conceived only as a barbed-wire defence against democracy. Here is a continent-wide disturbing factor before which Pakiatan pales into comparative insignificance. Every Indian State will, if this be granted, be an island under British suzerainty. No progress towards democracy is possible if this attitude on the part of the Princes is adhered to. Let us hope and pray that the generalities occasionally indulged in by them will be converted into withdrawal of this anomalous claim, if only because of the irresistible trend of feeling among their subjects, that they should not be in a worse position than the people of British India to whom they are equal in every respect.

Be this as it may, it does not lie in the mouth of those who stand for and press these so-called treaty rights of Princes to raise a discordant note in the name of unity and object to a scheme that places the decision as to the Muslim League's claim in the hands of the people and seeks to respect the ascertained wishes of the people in the areas concerned.

There are important minorities outside the Muslim and Hindu communities. They make no territorial or separatist claim. Their anxieties are in respect of equal civil and political rights with other citizens. This problem of just treatment of minorities is nothing new. It was threshed out at each stage of Indian constitutional reform. Let us not invent and exaggerate distrust, as those who seek to divide us may wish. Let not the new technique of atrocity reports tempt us. The ambition of Indian democracy will be to set an example to the world on just government if not in Industries and Armaments. In this ancient land of immortal culture, the Kings bowed before Dharma, and the people of India will not be less noble than the ancient Kings. This is an assurance planted in the genius of the land and of better value than the overlordship of Britain or the terms of any paper charter.—(*National Press Syndicate*).

Opposition to Rajagopalachari Formula

No public man of our country or generation, certainly no public man of outstanding influence and authority, has ever found himself in a position of such extreme difficulty as that in which his association with what has come to be known as the Rajagopalachariar formula for a Congress-League settlement has placed Mahatma Gandhi. In spite of differences, Mahatma Gandhi has hitherto been held in universal regard and esteem, indeed commanded unbounded influence with all sections of the people of India, except those represented by the Muslim League. While the esteem and regard in which he has hitherto been held remain undiminished and while his leadership for general political purposes is still unquestioned, in the vitally important matter of a Congress-League settlement based on Mr. Rajagopalachari's formula, the Mahatma found himself at loggerheads with a large proportion of these sections if not indeed with most of them. It was not the case, as Mr. Rajagopalachari once tried to make out, that the opposition to his formula was confined only to the Hindu Mahasabha. The Sikhs in the Punjab was much and as openly up in arms against the formula as the Hindu Mahasabha while in the two major provinces that were directly and immediately affected by the formula a large majority of Congressmen, all in fact except those who instinctively support any and every action taken by the Mahatma, had through their accredited spokesman publicly expressed their dissent from and their determination not to accept the formula.

Next to the Congress the most important non-communal political party in India is the Liberal Party and the leaders of that party condemned the formula in scathing terms. Mr. Srinivas Sastri, than whom it is impossible to think of a statesman who is more singularly free from communal bias and whose relations with Mahatma Gandhi had always been

as friendly and cordial as those of any other non-party public man, subjected the formula to merciless criticism, though, of course, in his usual courteous and dignified manner.

Mr. Sastri Condemns the Formula

"My motive is real union—not the union to-day only to drive out the Britisher—but that kind of union which will sustain and remain in the land and make each one regard the other as brotherly, as friendly and as conjoined in the pursuit of common tasks that devolve on statesmen and patriots of a great country," observed the Rt. Hon'ble V. S. Srinivasa Sastri, making an exhaustive and critical analysis of Mr C. Rajagopalachari's formula for a communal settlement at a largely attended public meeting held on the 13th. August 1944 at the Ranade Hall, Madras under the auspices of the Madras National Liberal Party.

Mr. Sastri felt sure that a plebiscite conducted only in those areas where the Muslims were in "absolute majority" would result in favour of Pakistan and there was no doubt about it.

At the outset, Mr. Sastri read out the Pakistan resolution of the Muslim League and the formula of Mr. Rajagopalachari for a communal settlement and said that the Pakistan resolution did not contemplate one single coherent Pakistan, and the words used in the resolution were in plural, namely, "autonomous units." It meant that, while in the north-west there might be a Muslim province which was sovereign, in the north-east there might be another such State and these two were not intended, so far as the resolution went, for one political sovereign State. Secondly, there was also no corridor mentioned in that resolution. The language of the resolution seemed to imply that, while there would certainly be two Muslim States, there was the possibility of a third or a fourth State as well if the contiguous areas referred to were not so contiguous as to form one unit.

Referring to the question of plebiscite, Mr. Sastri said that it would be more or less, a pre-determined matter. The plebiscite had to be taken in the areas where the Muslims were in an 'absolute majority' and the expression 'absolute majority'—in political matters meant majority over all other communities put together; this plebiscite being confined only to those areas, it would declare in favour of Pakistan and there was no doubt about it. That was perhaps the reason why Mr. Rajagopalachari had been saying frequently that there was no rise which the Muslims need fear in giving to the minority the fairness of a plebiscite also.

"Mr. Jinnah, so far as the formula goes, has triumphed," continued the speaker. He (Mr. Jinnah) has got the principle of Pakistan admitted by those who have the greatest influence with the Congress and with the country. He is a lucky man amongst the politicians. Four years ago he got from Lord Linlithgow a declaration in which it was emphatically stated that no changes would be made in the future constitution of India unless beforehand the Muslim community had been consulted, and that community had also agreed to those changes. Mr. Jinnah can also pride himself on that point. He has got two great points—one from the regular Viceroy of India and the other from the "un-official Viceroy" (laughter).

There is a third thing which he has got: it is not so clear on the face of it; but we have to infer it. The Congress has always been claiming that the Muslim League is not the only representative of the Muslim community and in the latest step taken, the Mahatma and Rajaji have, without using these words, it seems to me, accepted that position."

Adverting to the forthcoming Gandhi-Jinnah meeting, Mr. Sastri said: "Supposing Mr. Jinnah and Mahatma Gandhi come to an agreement, the Mahatma is going to talk to the Congress and, through the Congress, to the country and Mr. Jinnah is going to talk to the League and the matter will be settled for India. The Hindu Mahasabha is protesting strongly and the Sikhs are doing the same in the Punjab. If these two persons, Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah agree, however, what can the Hindu Mahasabha and the Sikhs do afterwards? So far as I can see, they are saying that they will make trouble, and if they make trouble, it is a curious position in which we are landing ourselves. If there is a decision arrived at between the Congress and the League, and supposing the Government accept it, this decision will have to be enforced, and enforced against the bitter opposition of the Hindu community and the Sikh community, and these two great leaders, Mr. Jinnah and Mahatma Gandhi, should help the Government in putting down all the dissidents in the country."

Mr. Sastri added that it was not right that any one community merely by putting its feet down and saying "I won't, I won't" should get its own way.

"What are the steps that will be taken in order to enforce the agreement, if it is arrived at?" Mr. Sastri asked and said: "There will be no agreement at all, but, if there is one, how will it be enforced? First of all, having agreed, Mr. Jinnah and the Mahatma, with their most important followers, have to ask the Viceroy for an interview, for, one of the conditions here, is that this agreement cannot take effect unless the British Government agrees to transfer power to the Indian. Therefore, that point must be secured and it cannot be secured until the matter has been submitted to the Muslim League and the Congress; it cannot be submitted to the Congress without its leaders being set free. For that purpose and for the purpose of ascertaining the minds of the British Government regarding their readiness to transfer power, these two people who have agreed should ask for an interview with the Viceroy.

"What the Viceroy's response would be it was highly problematical," Mr. Sastri said. He felt that the Viceroy might say "well, look here. Do not come and ask for independence. We have already offered you the Cripps scheme." He went on: "I do not think, so far as human extends can be foretold, that there is a likelihood at all, or even a five per cent chance of the Government saying yes, you will have independence."

When a national Government was asked for, continued the speaker, the British, who were very clever people, would raise fresh questions during the discussion of which the war would come to an end. (Laughter) Supposing the British Government did agree to the demand of the two leaders, they would have to go to the areas to be demarcated and begin demarcation. Before demarcation could take place there would be an interval during which the Hindus and the Muslims there—those who were for separation and those who were against it—could make their propaganda and they, as practical people, would have to consider whether that plebiscite would be conducted in a peaceful atmosphere. If Mr. Jinnah and his party from Bombay and other Pakistanites from the rest of India could go to those areas to help their co-religionists, would not our Hindu friends there, already in hopeless minority, ask for help from the Mahatma and Rajaji, because both of them had said that they did not want to give Pakistan, but they were compelled to do so. "These people (Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Rajagopalachari) ought to go there in my opinion, observed Mr. Sastri and added: "But they dare not go, having agreed to the principle of Pakistan. It may not be quite proper for them to go."

Mr. Sastri added: "The princes in the Indian States would also have to be consulted in such matters of great importance. They must have a guarantee of protection which they were having from the paramount power." He remarked: "if they are to look for protection, are they to look for protection to Hindustan or to Pakistan, in the west or in the east?" The princes might, therefore, like India to be one and undivided.

Mr. Sastri further observed: "The Government of India who do not want to part with power may say twenty things to frighten the princes. We do not know what lines the princes will take. Very probably they will oppose the new movement altogether."

"Whether the princes oppose it or not, there is one man in the centre who is certain to oppose and say the worst things he can say and that is Dr. Ambedkar. He is certain to make trouble" Mr. Sastri continued.

Mr. Sastri said that he had a shrewd idea that the British people were sincerely divided in their opinion as to Pakistan. There were the Viceroy and the Governors of provinces who were entrusted with the daily task of administration. The tremendous Bengal problem had taught them a very bitter and severe lesson. Unless they had the resources of the whole country in their own hands and managed them as occasions required their position would be made impossible. That was why Lord Linlithgow in the end quietly said: "I think India must be one, and Lord Wavell was obliged to make that declaration early enough.

Mr. Sastri did not want that India should speak with four or five competing, perhaps contesting, voices at the peace conference. He declared that that was the reason why he had been saying for some years now that they could never allow India to be broken up. At that conference there must be one who would be able to say "I represent the 400 millions of India. They all trust me. I am the Prime Minister of the dominion of India." If he was able to say that he was sure that his voice would prevail and general Smuts would hang down his head.

Mr. Sastri continued: "I dread this idea of division of India, I dread it

like poison. It is not going to bring you what you want—the independence of India—even I may be willing to say 'yes', though I think it will be better for us to have one independent India instead of being four independent Indias quarrelling with each other. However, such a thing is not going to happen."

Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Rajagopalachari seemed to think, Mr. Sastri said, that the British people professed to fight for freedom of all and for the establishment of democratic principles and therefore when they asked for freedom it would not be possible for them to say "no". "It is no more than a slender string that will snap at the first touch of reality," and it has already snapped. Only when the present British Government was displaced and another Government like the Labour Government came—they might hope for something: but the Labour Government was not going to come in on its own merits", he added.

In conclusion Mr. Sastri said: "If we make mistake of a serious kind in the distribution of the provinces and in their arrangements we will be putting ourselves and our children into serious trouble and the mischief that we now do cannot be easily rectified".

The Gandhi—Jinnah Correspondence

Since all these were happening Mr. Jinnah received a letter from Mahatma Gandhi dated July 17 and he replied to him on July 24. The following is the full text of the Gandhi-Jinnah correspondence released to the press on Wednesday September 29, 1944:—

Letter from Gandhi dated Panchgani, July 17.

Brother Jinnah,—There was a day when I could induce you to speak in the mother tongue. Today I take the courage to write to you in the same language. I had invited you to meet me while I was in jail. I have not written to you since my release. But today my heart says that I should write to you. We will meet whenever you choose. Don't regard me as the enemy of Islam or of the Muslims of this country. I am the friend and servant of not only yourself but of the whole world. Do not disappoint me. Your brother.—Sd. M. K. GANDHI.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah dated Srinagar, July 24

Dear Mr. Gandhi,—I received your letter dated July 17 here on July 22 and I thank you for it.

I shall be glad to receive you at my house in Bombay on my return, which will probably be about the middle of August. By that time I hope that you will have recuperated your health fully and will be returning to Bombay. I would like to say nothing more till we meet.

I am very pleased to read in the press that you are making very good progress, and I hope that you will soon be alright. Yours sincerely,—Sd. M. A. JINNAH.

The proposed Gandhi—Jinnah meeting could not take place in August as scheduled owing to Mr. Jinnah's indisposition. It however took place at Mr. Jinnah's residence in Bombay on the 9th. September and continued till the 29th. September. The talks between the leaders centred round the Rajagopalachari Formula. The following is the text of the correspondence released to the Press after the negotiations had broken down:—

Letter from Mr Jinnah dated September 10

Dear Mr. Gandhi,—With reference to our talk yesterday, September 9, I understood from you that you had come to discuss the Hindu-Muslim settlement with me in your individual capacity and not in representative character or capacity on behalf of the Hindus or the Congress, nor had you any authority to do so. I naturally pointed out to you that there must be someone on the other side with authority holding a representative status with whom I can negotiate and, if possible, come to a settlement of the Hindu-Muslim question; that for the position you had adopted there was no precedent; and that this raises great difficulties in my way. As you know, I can only speak on behalf of the Muslim League, as the President of the organisation which I represent, and as such I am subject to, and governed by, its constitution, rules and regulations. I think you realise and will admit that the settlement of the Hindu-Muslim question is the foremost and the major hurdle,

and unless the representatives of these two nations put their heads together, how is one to make any headway with it ?

Points for Clarification

Nevertheless, I explained to you the Lahore resolution of March 1940, and tried to persuade you to accept the basic and fundamental principles embodied in that resolution, but you not only refused to consider it but emphasised your opposition to the basic demand indicated in that resolution and remarked that there was "an ocean between you and me." When I asked you, what is then the alternative you suggest? you put forward the formula of Mr. Rajagopalachari, approved of by you. We discussed it, and as the various matters were vague and nebulous, and some required clarification, I wanted to have a clear idea of what it really meant, and what were its implications, and asked you for explanation and clarification regarding the proposals embodied in that formula. After some discussion, you requested me to formulate in writing the points that I thought required or called for explanation and clarification, and to communicate with you and that you would reply in writing before our next meeting on Monday September 11. I am therefore submitting to you the following points which require clarification:—

(1) With regard to the preamble, in what capacity will you be a consenting party if any agreement is reached between you and me ?

(2) Clause 1: With regard to "the constitution for free India" referred to in this clause, I would like to know, first, what constitution do you refer to, who will frame it, and when it will come into being.

Next, it is stated in the formula that "the Muslim League endorsed the Indian demand for independence." Does it mean the Congress demand for independence as formulated in the August resolution of 1942 by the All-India Congress Committee in Bombay or, if not, what is the significance of this term?—for you know the Muslim League has made it clear not only by its resolutions but also by its creed, which is embodied in its constitution, that we stand for the freedom and independence of the whole of this sub-continent, and that applies to Pakistan and Hindustan.

Next, it is stated that the Muslim League "will co-operate with the Congress in its formation of a provisional interim Government for the transitional period." I would like to know the basis or the lines on which such a Government is to be set up or constituted. If you have a complete and definite scheme, please let me have it.

(3) Clause 2: Who will appoint the commission referred to in this clause and who will give effect to their findings? What is the meaning of "absolute majority" referred to in it? Will the contemplated plebiscite be taken district-wise or, if not, on what basis? Who will determine and decide whether such a plebiscite should be based on adult franchise? Who will give effect to the decision or verdict of the above-mentioned plebiscite? Would only the districts on the border, which are taken out from the boundaries of the present provinces by delimitation, be entitled to choose to join either state or also those outside the present boundaries would have the right to choose to join either state?

(4) Clause 3: Who are meant by "all parties" in this clause?

(5) Clause 4: I would like to know between whom and through what machinery and agency will the "mutual agreements" referred to in this clause be entered into? What is meant by "safeguarding defence and commerce and communications and for other essential purpose"? Safeguarding against whom?

(6) Clause 6: "These terms shall be binding only in case of transfer by Britain of full power and responsibility for the Government of India." I would like to know to whom is this power to be transferred, through what machinery and agency, and when?

These are some of the important points that occur to me for the moment, which require explanation and clarification, and I hope that you will let me have full details with regard to the various points that I have raised, in order that I may be better able to understand and judge your proposals before we can deal with satisfactorily. Yours sincerely,—Sd. M. A. JINNAH.

Gandhiji's Demand

Letter from Gandhiji dated September 11 —

Dear Qaid-i-Azam,—I received your letter yesterday at 3-30 p. m. I was in the midst of appointments. I hasten to reply at the earliest opportunity.

I have said in my letter to you that it is implied in the Rajaji formula and I have stated publicly, that I approached you as an individual. My life-mission has

been Hindu-Muslim unity, which I want for its own sake but which is not to be achieved without the foreign ruling power being ousted. Hence the first condition of the exercise of the right of self-determination is the achieving of independence by the joint action of all the parties and groups composing India. If such joint action is unfortunately impossible, then too I must fight with the assistance of such elements as can be brought together. I am glad therefore that you did not break off our talks when I refused to assume or accept representative capacity. Of course, I am pledged to use all the influence I may have with the Congress to ratify my agreement with you. May I remind you that the Rajaji formula was designed in the first instance for your acceptance and submission thereafter to the League?

It is true that I said an ocean separated you and me in outlook. But that had no reference to the Lahore resolution of the League. The Lahore resolution is indefinite. Rajaji has taken from it the substance and given it a shape.

Now for the points raised by you:—

- (1) I have already answered this in the foregoing.
- (2) The constitution will be framed by the provisional Government contemplated in the formula or an authority specially set up by it after the British power is withdrawn. The independence contemplated is of the whole of India as it stands. The basis for the formation of the provisional interim Government will have to be agreed to between the League and the Congress.
- (3) The commission will be appointed by the provisional Government. "Absolute majority" means a clear majority over non-Muslim elements as in Sind, Baluchistan or the Frontier Province. The form of the plebiscite and the franchise must be a matter for discussion.
- (4) "All parties" mean parties interested.
- (5) "Mutual agreement" means agreement between contracting parties. "Safeguarding defence, etc." means for me a central or joint board of control. Safeguarding means safeguarding against all who may put the common interests in jeopardy.
- (6) The power is to be transferred to the nation, that is, to the provisional Government. The formula contemplates peaceful transfer by the British Government. So far as I am concerned, I would like the transfer to take place as early as possible. Yours Sincerely,—Sd. M. K. GANDHI.

MUSLIM LEAGUE STAND

Letter from Mr. Jinnah dated September 11:—

Dear Mr. Gandhi,—I received your letter of September 11 at 5 p. m. today. I note that you have approached me as an individual, and I have already expressed my views about it. Please do not take that I acquiesce in the position that you have adopted, for which there is no precedent. Nevertheless, I proceeded to discuss matters with you, naturally because I am anxious to convert you to my point of view, if possible. I urged on you that the only solution of India's problem is to accept the division of India as Pakistan and Hindustan, as briefly laid down in the Lahore resolution of March, 1940, and proceed to settle the details forthwith. You say the Lahore resolution is indefinite. You never asked me for any clarification or explanation of the terms of the resolution, but you really indicated your emphatic opposition to the very basis and the fundamental principles embodied in it. I would therefore like to know in what way or respect the Lahore resolution is indefinite. I cannot agree that Rajaji has taken from it its substance and given it shape. On the contrary Rajaji has not only put it out of shape but mutilated it, as I explained in my speech which I delivered at the meeting of the Council of the All-India Muslim League at Lahore on July 30, 1940.

You say "the first condition of the exercise of the right of self-determination is the achieving of independence by the joint action of all the parties and groups composing India. If such joint action is unfortunately impossible, then too I must fight with the assistance of such elements as can be brought together." This, in my opinion, is, as I have repeatedly said, putting the cart before the horse and is generally opposed to the policy and declarations of the All-India Muslim League. You are only holding on firmly to the August resolution of 1912. In order to achieve the freedom and independence of the people of India, it is essential, in the first instance, that there should be a Hindu-Muslim settlement.

Of course, I am thankful to you when you say that you are pledged to use all the influence that you have with the Congress to ratify your agreement with me: but that is not enough in my judgment, although it will be a very valuable help to me.

I once more ask you please to let me know what your conception of the basis for the formation of a provisional interim Government is. No doubt it will be subject to agreement between the League and the Congress, but I think that in fairness, you should at least give me some rough idea or lines of your conception, for you must have thought it out by now. I would like to know your proposals or scheme for the formation of a provisional interim Government, which can give me some clear picture to understand it.

You have omitted to answer my question as to who will give effect to the findings of the commission. Also it is not clear to me what you mean by absolute majority when you say it means "a clear majority over non-Muslim elements as in Sind, Baluchistan or the Frontier Province." You have not even replied to my question as to who will decide the form of the plebiscite and the franchise contemplated by the formula.

The answer does not carry any clear idea when you say "all parties" means 'parties interested'.

You say "mutual agreement means agreement between contracting parties." Who are the contracting parties once a provisional interim Government of your conception is established? Who will appoint the central or joint board of control, which will safeguard defence etc.? And on what principle? Through what machinery and agency? And subject to whose control and orders will such a central or joint board be?

You say, "The power is to be transferred to the nation, that is, to the provisional Government". That is all the greater reason why I would like to know full details of the provisional Government as contemplated by you and of your conception. Yours sincerely,—Sd. M. A. JINNAH.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah dated September 13 :—

Dear Mr. Gandhi,—When you arrived here on the morning of the 12th to resume our talks, you were good enough to inform me that you had not had time to attend to my letter of September 11, which reached you the same day at 10-30 p. m. We met again to-day without having received your reply, and I am still waiting for it. Please therefore let me have your reply as soon as possible with regard to the various points mentioned in my letter to you of September 11. Yours sincerely,—Sd. M. A. JINNAH.

Letter from Gandhiji dated September 14 :—

Dear Qaid-i-Azam :—I have your letter of the 13th inst. I understood from our talks that you were in no hurry for my answer. I was therefore taking the matter in a leisurely fashion, even hoping that, as our talks proceeded and as cordiality increased, mutual clarification would come of itself and that we would only have to record our final agreement. But I understand and appreciate the other viewpoint. We should take nothing for granted. I should clarify your difficulties in understanding the Rajaji formula and you should do likewise regarding yours, i. e., the Muslim League's Lahore resolution of 1940.

With reference to the Lahore resolution as agreed between us, I shall deal with it in a separate letter.

Perhaps, at the end of our discussion, we shall discover that Rajaji not only has not put the Lahore resolution out of shape and mutilated it, but has given it substance and form.

Indeed in view of your dislike of the Rajaji formula, I have at any rate for the moment, put it out of my mind, and I am now concentrating on the Lahore resolution in the hope of finding a ground for mutual agreement.

So much for the first paragraph of your letter.

As to the second, I do hold that unless we oust the third party we shall not be able to live at peace with one another. That does not mean that I may not make an effort to find ways and means to establishing a living peace between us.

You ask for my conception of the basis for a provisional interim Government. I would have told you if I had any scheme in mind. I imagine that if we two can agree, it would be for us to consult the other parties. I can say this that any provisional Government, to inspire confidence at the present moment, must represent all parties. When that moment arrives, I shall have been replaced by some authoritative person, though you will have me always at your beck and call when you have converted me or I you, or by mutual conversation we have become one mind functioning through two bodies.

As to the third point, the provisional Government being the appointing

authority, will give effect to the findings of the commission. This, I thought, was implied in my previous answer.

Rajaji tells me that "absolute majority" is used in his formula in the same sense as it is used in ordinary legal parlance wherever more than two groups are dealt with. I cling to my own answer. But you will perhaps suggest a third meaning and persuade me to accept it.

The form of the plebiscite and franchise must be left to be decided by the provisional interim Government unless we decide it now. I should say it should be by adult suffrage of all the inhabitants of the Pakistan area.

As to the fourth, "all parties" means that you and I and every one else holding views on the question at issue will and should seek by peaceful persuasion to influence public opinion as is done where democracy functions wholly or in part.

As to fifth, supposing that the result of the plebiscite is in favour of partition, the provisional Government will draft the treaty and agreements as regards the administration of matters of common interest, but the same has to be confirmed and ratified by the Governments of the two States. The machinery required for the settlement and administration of matters of common interest will, in the first instance, be planned by the interim Government, but subsequently will be a matter for settlement between the two Governments acting through the agencies appointed by each for that purpose.

As to sixth, I hope the foregoing makes superfluous any further reply, Yours sincerely,—Sd. M. K. GANDHI.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah dated September 14 :—

Dear Mr. Gandhi,—I received your letter of September 14 at 4-45 P.M. today in reply to my letter of September 11, (and not of September 13, as you state, which seems to be a mistake), and I thank you for it.

Please let me have, as soon as you can, your promised letter indicating in what way or respect the Lahore resolution is "indefinite".

With regard to the provision in the Gandhi-Rajaji formula that "the Muslim League endorses the Indian demand for independence," I asked you, in my letter dated September 10, "Does it mean the Congress demand for independence as formulated in the August 1942, resolution by the All India Congress Committee in Bombay or, if not, what is the significance of this term." To this you replied by your letter of September 11, that "the independence contemplated is of the whole of India as it stands". Hence, I again ask, does it mean on the basis of an united India? I find that you have not clarified the point satisfactorily.

As regard the next part of this clause, the formula proceed to lay down that "the Muslim League will co-operate with the Congress to the formation of the provisional interim Government for the transitional period". I requested you, by my letter of September 10, to let me know "the basis or the lines on which such a Government is to be set up or constituted. If you have a complete and definite scheme, please let me have it". To this you replied, by your letter of September 11, under reply, that "the basis for the formation of the provisional interim Government will have to be agreed to between the League and the Congress." But that is not meeting my request for clarification or giving me at least the outlines of such a Government, and that is what I have been asking for. I hope that you do appreciate my point when I am requesting you to let me have rough outlines of the proposed provisional interim Government according to the formula, so that I may have some idea.

Of course, I can quite understand that such a provisional interim Government will represent all the parties and would be of a character that will inspire confidence at the present moment, of all the parties. I can quite understand that, when the moment arrives, certain things may follow; but before we can deal with this formula in a satisfactory manner, I repeat again that, as it is your formula you should give me a rough idea of the provisional interim Government that you contemplate and of your conception. What I would like to know would be, what will be the powers of such a provisional interim Government, how it will be formed, to whom it will be responsible, what its composition will be, etc. You, being the sponsor of this Gandhi-Rajaji formula, should give me some rough idea and picture of it, so that I may understand what this part of the formula means.

In your letter of September 14, in reply to my letter of September 11, you inform me that you would have told me if you had any scheme in mind. "I imagine that if we two can agree it would be for us to consult the other parties", you say;

but that is just the point. Unless I have some outlines or scheme, however rough, from you, what are we to discuss in order to reach any agreement?

As regards the other matters which you have further explained, I have noted the explanation, and I do not think I need press you further, although some of them are not quite satisfactory. Yours sincerely.—Sd. M. A. Jinnah.

NO REFERENCE TO PAKISTAN

Letter from Gandhi dated Sept. 15 :—

Dear Qaid-i-Azam—This is in terms of our talk of Wednesday, September 13.

For the moment I have shunted the Rajaji formula and, with your assistance, am applying my mind very seriously to the famous Lahore resolution of the Muslim League.

You must admit that the resolution itself makes no reference to the two nations theory. In the course of our discussions you have passionately pleaded that India contains two nations i.e., Hindus and Muslims and that the latter have their homeland in India as the former have theirs. The more our argument progresses the more alarming your picture appears to me. It would be alluring if it was true. But my fear is growing that it is wholly unreal. I find no parallel in history for a body of converts and their descendants claiming to be a nation apart from the parent stock. If India was one nation before the advent of Islam it must remain one in spite of the change of faith of a very large body of her children.

You do not claim to be a separate nation by right of conquest but by reason of acceptance of Islam. Will the two nations become one if the whole of India accepted Islam? Will Bengalis, Oriyas, Andhras, Tamilians, Maharashtrians, Gujaratis, etc., cease to have their special characteristics if all of them became converts to Islam? These have all become one politically because they are subject to one foreign control. They are trying today to throw off that subjection.

You seem to have introduced a new test of nationhood. If I accept it I would have to subscribe to many more claims and face an insoluble problem. The only real, though awful, test of our nationhood arises out of our common political subjection. If you and I throw off this subjection by our combined efforts, we shall be born a politically free nation out of our travail. If by then we have not learnt to prize our freedom we may quarrel among ourselves and, for want of a common master holding us together in his iron grip, seek to split up into small groups or nationalities. There will be nothing to prevent us from descending to that level, and we shall not have to go in search of a master. There are many claimants to the throne that never remains vacant.

ELUCIDATION OF PAKISTAN

With this background I shall present you with my difficulty in accepting your resolution.

(1) Pakistan is not in the resolution. Does it bear the original meaning Punjab, Afghanistan, Kaabmir, Sindh and Baluchistan, out of which the name was mnemonically formed? If not what is it?

(2) Is the goal of Pakistan Pan-Islam?

(3) What is it that distinguishes an Indian Muslim from every other Indian, if not his religion? Is he different from a Turk or an Arab?

(4) What is the connotation of the word "Muslim" in the resolution under discussion? Does it mean the Muslims of the India of geography or of the Pakistan to be?

(5) Is the resolution addressed to the Muslims by way of education, or to the inhabitants of the whole of India by way of appeal or to the foreign ruler as an ultimatum?

(6) Are the constituents in the two zones to constitute "independent States" an undefined number in each zone?

(7) Is the demarcation to take place during the pendency of British rule?

(8) If the answer to the last question is in the affirmative the proposal must be accepted first by Britain and then imposed upon India, not evolved from within by the freewill of the people of India!

(9) Have you examined the position and satisfied yourself that these "independent States" will be materially and otherwise benefitted by being split up into fragments?

(10) Please satisfy me that these independent sovereign States will become a collection of poor States, a menace to themselves and to the rest of India.

(11) Pray show me by facts and figures or otherwise how the independence and welfare of India as a whole can be brought about by the acceptance of the resolution?

(12) How are the Muslims under the Princes to be disposed of as a result of this scheme?

(13) What is your definition of "minorities"?

(14) Will you please define the "adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards" for minorities referred to in the second part of the resolution?

(15) Do you not see that the Lahore resolution contains only a bare statement of the objective and does not give any idea as to the means to be adopted for the execution of the idea and the concrete corollaries thereof? For instance:—

(a) Are the people in the regions falling under the plan to have any voice in the matter of separation and, if so, how is it to be ascertained.

(b) What is the provision for defence and similar matters of common concern contemplated in the Lahore resolution?

(c) There are many groups of Muslims who have continuously expressed dissent from the policy of the League. While I am prepared to accept the preponderating influence and position of the League and have approached you for that very reason, is it not our joint duty to remove their doubts and carry them with us by making them feel that they and their supporters have not been practically disfranchised?

(d) Does not this lead again to placing the resolution of the League before the people of the zones concerned as a whole for acceptance?

As I write this letter and imagine the working of the resolution in practice, I see nothing but ruin for the whole of India. Believe me, I approach you as a seeker. Though I represent nobody but myself, I aspire to represent all the inhabitants of India, for I realise in my own person their misery and degradation which is their common lot irrespective of class, caste or creed. I know that you have acquired a unique hold on the Muslim masses. I want you to use your influence for their total welfare, which must include the rest.

In this hastily written letter I have only given an inkling of my difficulty. Yours sincerely,—(Sd.) M. K. GANDHI.

Freedom First—Plebiscite And Partition Afterwards

Letter from Gandhi dated September 15 :

Dear Qaid-i-Azam,—I have yours of the 14th inst. received at 9-40 a. m. I woke up at 3 a. m. today to finish my promised letter on the Lahore resolution. There is no mistake about the date, for I wrote in answer to your reminder of the 15th inst.

Independence does mean as envisaged in the A. I. O. C. resolution of 1942. But it can not be on the basis of a united India. If we come to a settlement, assuming of course that it secures general acceptance in the country, the process will be somewhat like this. We reach by joint effort independence for India as it stands. India, become free, will proceed to demarcation, plebiscite and partition if the people concerned vote for partition. All this is implied in the Rajaji formula.

As to the provisional interim Government, I am afraid I cannot carry my answer any further than I have done. Though I have no scheme for the provisional Government, if you have one in connection with the Lahore resolution, which also I presume requires an interim Government, we can discuss it.

The formula was framed by Rajaji in good faith. The hope was that you would look at it with favour. We still think it to be the best in the circumstances. You and I have to put flesh on it, if we can. I have explained the process we have to go through. You have no objection to it. Perhaps you want to know how I would form the provisional Government if I was invited thereto. If I was in that unenviable position, I would see all the claimants and endeavour to satisfy them. My co-operation will be available in that task.

I can give you full satisfaction about your inquiry, "What I would like to know would be: what will be the powers of such a provisional interim Government? How will it be formed? To whom will it be responsible?" The provisional interim Government will be responsible to the elected members of the present Assembly or a newly elected one. It will have all the powers less than that of the Commander-in-Chief during the war and full powers thereafter. It will be the authority to give effect to the agreement that may be arrived at between the League and the Congress and ratified by the other parties. Yours sincerely,—Sd. M. K. GANDHI.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah dated September 17

Dear Mr. Gandhi,—I have your letter of September 15, and I thank you for it,

I note that you have for the moment shunted the Rajaji formula and are applying your mind very seriously to the Lahore resolution of the Muslim League. It is my duty to explain the Lahore resolution to you today and persuade you to accept it, even though you are talking to me, as you have often made it clear, in your individual capacity. I have successfully converted non-Muslim Indians in no small number and also a large body of foreigners, and I can convert you, exercising as you do tremendous influence over Hindu India, it will be no small assistance to me, although we are not proceeding on the footing that you are carrying on these talks in your representative character or capacity, and my difficulties remain until you are vested with a representative status and authority in order to negotiate and reach an agreement with you.

You have stated in your letter dated September 11 that the Lahore resolution is "indefinite." I therefore naturally asked you please to let me know in what way or respect the Lahore resolution is indefinite. And now I have received your letter of September 13 under reply.

The third paragraph of your letter is not seeking clarification but is a disquisition and expression of your views on the point whether the Mussalmans are a nation. This matter can hardly be discussed by means of correspondence. There is a great deal of discussion and literature on this point which is available, and it is for you to judge finally, when you have studied this question thoroughly, whether the Mussalmans and Hindus are not two major nations in this sub-continent. For the moment I would refer you to two publications, although there are many more.—Dr. Ambedkar's book and M. R. T.'s *Nationalism in Conflict in India*. We maintain and hold that Muslims and Hindus are two major nations by any definitions or test of a nation. We are a nation of a hundred million, and, what is more, we are a nation with our own distinctive culture and civilisation, language and literature, art, architecture, names and nomenclature, sense of value and proportion, legal laws and moral codes, customs and calendar, history and traditions, aptitudes and ambitions—in short, we have our own distinctive outlook on life and of life. By all canons of international law we are a nation. Now I shall reply to your various points:—

(1) Yes, the word "Pakistan" is not mentioned in the resolution, and it does not bear the original meaning. The word has now become synonymous with the Lahore resolution.

(2) This point does not arise, but still I reply that the question is a mere bogey.

(3) This point is covered by my answer that the Mussalmans of India are a nation. As to the last part of your query, it is hardly relevant to the matter of clarification of the resolution.

(4) Surely you know what the word "Muslims" means.

(5) This point does not arise by way of clarification of the text of the Lahore resolution.

(6) No. They will form units of Pakistan.

(7) As soon as the basis and the principles embodied in the Lahore resolution are accepted, the question of demarcation will have to be taken up immediately.

(8) In view of my reply to (7) your question (8) has been answered.

(9) Does not relate to clarification.

(10) My answer to (9) covers this point.

(11) Does not arise out of the clarification of the resolution. Surely this is not asking for clarification of the resolution. I have, in numerous speeches of mine and the Muslim League in its resolutions, pointed out that this is the only solution of India's problem and the road to achieve freedom and independence of the peoples of India.

(12) "Muslims under the Princes." The Lahore resolution is only confined to British India. This question does not arise out of the clarification of the resolution.

(13) The definition of "minorities": You yourself have often said "minorities" means "accepted minorities."

(14) The adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards for minorities, referred to in the resolution, are a matter for negotiation and settlement with the minorities in the respective States, viz. Pakistan and Hindustan.

(15) It does give basic principles and, when they are accepted, then the details will have to be worked out by the contracting parties.

(a) Does not arise by way of clarification.

(b) Does not arise...do...do

(c) The Muslim League is the only authoritative and representative organisation of Muslim India.

(d) No; see answer (c).

"YOU REPRESENT ONLY HINDUS"

As regards your final paragraph, before receiving clarifications from me you have already passed your judgment and condemned the Lahore resolution, when you say, "As I write this letter and imagine the working of the resolution in practice, I see nothing but ruin for the whole of India". I understand that you have made clear to me that you represent nobody but yourself, and I am trying to persuade you and to convert you that this is the road which will lead us all to the achievement of freedom and independence not only of the two major nations, Hindus and Muslims, but of the rest of the peoples of India; but when you proceed to say that you aspire to represent all the inhabitants of India, I regret I cannot accept that statement of yours.

It is quite clear that you represent nobody else but the Hindus, and as long as you do not realise your true position and the realities, it is very difficult for me to argue with you, and it becomes still more difficult to persuade you, and hope to convert you to the realities and the actual conditions prevailing in India today. I am pleading before you in the hope of converting you, as I have done with many others successfully.

As I have said before, you are a great man and you exercise enormous influence over the Hindus, particularly the masses. By accepting the road that I am pointing out to you, you are not prejudicing or harming the interests of the Hindus or of the minorities. On the contrary, Hindus will be the greater gainers. I am convinced that the true welfare not only of the Muslims but of the rest of India lies in the division of India as proposed by the Lahore resolution. It is for you to consider whether it is not your policy and programme, in which you have persisted, which has been the principal factor of the "ruin of the whole of India" and of the misery and degradation of the people to which you refer and which I deplore no less than anyone else. And it is for that very reason I am pleading before you all these days, although you insist that you are having talks with me only in your individual capacity, in the hope that you may yet revise your policy and programme. Yours Sincerely,—Sd. M. A. JINNAH.

Letter from Gandhiji dated September 19 :—

Dear Qaid-i-Azam—Many thanks for yours of 17th inst.

I am sorry to have to say that your answers, omitting 1, 2 and 6, do not give satisfaction.

It may be that all my questions do not arise from the view of mere clarification of the Lahore resolution. But I contend that they are very relevant from the standpoint of a seker that I am. You cannot expect any one to agree to, or shoulder, the burden of the claim contained in the Lahore resolution without, for instance, answering my questions 15 (a) and 15 (b) which you brush aside as not arising by way of clarification.

Dr. Ambedkar's thesis, while it is ably written, has carried no conviction to me. The other book mentioned by you, I am sorry to say, I have not seen.

Why can you not accept my statement that I aspire to represent all the sections that compose the people of India? Do you not aspire? Should not every Indian? That the aspiration may never be realised is beside the point.

I am beholden to you, in spite of your opinion about me, for having patience with me. I hope you will never lose it, but will preserve in your effort to convert me. I ask you to take me with my strong views and even prejudices if I am guilty of any.

As to your verdict on my policy and programme, we must agree to differ; for, I am wholly unrepentant. My purpose is, as a lover of communal unity, to place my services at your disposal.

I hope you do not expect me to accept the Lahore resolution without understanding its implications. If your letter is the final word, there is little hope. Can we not agree to differ on the question of "two nations" and yet solve the problem on the basis of self-determination? It is this basis that has brought me to you. If the regions holding Muslim majorities have to be separated according to the Lahore resolution, the grave step of separation should be specifically placed before and approved by the people in that area. Yours sincerely,—Sd. M. K. GANDHI.

MR. JINNAH ELUCIDATES

Letter from Mr Jinnah dated September 21 :—

Dear Mr. Gandhi,—I am in receipt of your letter of September 19 and I have already given you my answers to all your questions relating to clarification of the

Lahore resolution or any part of it, and I am glad that you admit when you say it may be that 'all my questions do not arise from the view of mere clarification of the Lahore resolution', but you particularly emphasise your points 15 (a) and 15 (b).

I regret to say it has no relation to the context of the resolution or any part thereof. You have brought so many matters into our correspondence which are entirely outside the matter requiring clarification, so I have perforce to deal with them. Let me first deal with your letter of September 11.

You say: "My life-mission has been Hindu-Muslim unity which I want for its own sake but which is not to be achieved without the foreign ruling power being ousted, hence the first condition of the exercise of the right of self-determination is the achieving of independence by the joint action of all the parties and groups composing India. If such joint action is unfortunately impossible, then too I must fight with the assistance of such elements as can be brought together."

The gist of your letters up to date is that you are wedded to this policy and will pursue it. In your next letter of September 14, while you were good enough to furnish me with the clarification of the Gandhi-Rajaji formula, you were pleased to observe: "I have, at any rate for the moment, put it out of my mind and I am now concentrating on the Lahore resolution in the hope of finding a ground for mutual agreement".

"INIMICAL TO LEAGUE IDEALS"

In your letter of September 15, you say: "Independence does mean as envisaged in the A. I. C. C. resolution of 1942." It is therefore clear that you are not prepared to revise your policy and that you adhere firmly to your policy and programme which you have persisted in and which culminated in your demand, final policy, programme, and the method and sanction for enforcing it by resorting to mass civil disobedience in terms of the 8th August, 1942, resolution, and you have made it more clear again by stating in your letter of September 19 as follows:—"As to your verdict on my policy and programme, we must agree to differ, for I am wholly unrepentant". You know that the August 1942 resolution is inimical to the ideals and demands of Muslim India.

Then, again, in the course of our discussion of the Gandhi-Rajaji formula, you were pleased to say, by your letter of September 15, as follows:—"For the moment I have shunted the Rajaji formula and with your assistance am applying my mind very seriously to the famous Lahore resolution of the Muslim League". We discussed it in its various aspects, as you told me you were open to be persuaded and converted to our point of view. I discussed the resolution at great length with you and explained everything you wanted to understand, even though you have emphasised more than once that you are having these talks with me in your personal capacity, and in your letter of September 15 you assured me in the following words with regard to the Lahore resolution: "believe me, I approach you as a seeker, though I represent nobody but myself", and that you were open to conviction and conversion.

You had informed me by your letter of September 11 as follows:—"It is true that I said an ocean separated you and me in outlook. But that had no reference to the Lahore resolution of the League. The League resolution is indefinite." I naturally therefore proceed, in reply, to ask you by my letter of September 11 as follows:—"You say the Lahore resolution is indefinite. You never asked me for any clarification or explanation of the terms of the resolution; but you really indicated your emphatic opposition to the very basis and fundamental principles embodied in it. I would, therefore, like to know in what way or respect the Lahore resolution is indefinite." I sent you a reminder on September 13, to which you replied by your letter of September 15, not confining yourself really to matters of clarification, but introducing other extraneous matters with some of which I had already dealt, in reply to this letter of yours of September 15, by my letter of September 17, and furnish you with all the clarifications, informing you that you had introduced several matters which could hardly be discussed in a satisfactory manner by means of correspondence.

LEAGUE CLAIM TO NATIONHOOD

I have already given you all the clarifications you require so far as the Lahore resolution goes and its text is concerned. You again raise further arguments, reasons and grounds, and continue to persist in a disquisition on the point, amongst others, whether Muslims of India are a nation, and then you proceed further to say: "Can we not agree to differ on the question of two nations and yet solve the problem on the basis of self-determination?"

It seems to me that you are labouring under some misconception of the real meaning of the word "self-determination." Apart from the inconsistencies and contradictions of the various positions that you have adopted in the course of our correspondence, as indicated above, can you not appreciate our point of view that, we claim the right of self-determination as a nation and not as a Muslim nation which is our birthright? Whereas you are labouring under the wrong idea that "self-determination" means only that of a "territorial unit", which, by the way, is neither demarcated nor defined yet, and there is no union or federal constitution of India in being, functioning as a sovereign central Government, ours is a case of division and carving out two independent sovereign States by way of settlement between two major nations, Hindus and Muslims, and not of severance of or secession from any existing union, which is "non est" in India. The right of self-determination, which we claim, postulates that we are a nation, and as such it would be the self-determination of the Musalmans, and they alone are entitled to exercise that right.

I hope you will now understand that your question 15(a) does not arise out of the Lahore resolution or of any part thereof. As to 15(b), again, it does not arise as a matter of clarification, for it will be a matter for the constitution-making body chosen by Pakistan to deal with and decide all matters as a sovereign body representing Pakistan "vis-a-vis" the constitution-making body of Hindustan or any other party concerned. There cannot be defence and similar matters of "common concern", when it is accepted that Pakistan and Hindustan will be two separate independent sovereign States. I hope I have now given all satisfactory explanations, over and above the matter of clarification of the Lahore resolution, in the hope of converting you as an individual "seeker". Yours sincerely,—Sd. M. A. JINNAH.

Letter from Gandhiji dated September 22 :—

Dear Qaid-i-Azam,—Your letter of yesterday (21st inst.) so disturbed me that I thought I would postpone my reply till after we had met at the usual time. Though I made no advance at our meeting, I think I see somewhat clearly what you are driving at. The more I think about the two-nations theory the more alarming it appears to me. The book recommended by you gives me no help. It contains half truths and its conclusions for inferences are unwarranted. I am unable to accept the proposition that the Muslims of India are a nation distinct from the rest of the inhabitants of India. Mere assertion is no proof. The consequence of accepting such a proposition are dangerous in extreme. Once the principle is admitted there would be no limit to claims for cutting up India into numerous divisions which would spell India's ruin. I have therefore suggested a way out. Let it be a partition as between two brothers, if a division there must be.

You seem to be averse to a plebiscite. In spite of the admitted importance of League, there must be clear proof that the people affected desire partition. In my opinion, all the people inhabiting the area ought to express their opinion specifically on this single issue of division. Adult suffrage is the best method, but I would accept any other equivalent.

You summarily reject the idea of common interest between the two arms. I can be no willing party to division which does not provide for simultaneous safeguarding of common interests such as defence, foreign affairs and the like. There will be no feeling of security by the people of India without a recognition of the natural and mutual obligations arising out of physical contiguity.

Your letter shows a wide divergence of opinion and outlook between us. Thus you adhere to the opinion often expressed by you that the August 1942 resolution is "inimical" to the ideas and demands of Muslim India." There is no proof for this sweeping statement.

We seem to be moving in a circle. I have made a suggestion. If we are bent on agreeing, as I hope we are, let us call in a third party or parties to guide or even arbitrate between us. Yours sincerely,—Sd. M. K. GANDHI.

Letter from Mr. Jinnah Dated September 23 :—

Dear Mr. Gandhi,—I am in receipt of your letter of September 22, and I thank you for it. I am sorry that you think I have summarily rejected the idea of common interest between two arms, and now you put it somewhat differently from 15(b), when you say there will be no feeling of security by the people of India without a recognition of the natural and mutual obligations arising out of physical contiguity. My answer, already given, is that it will be for the constitution-making body of Pakistan and that of Hindustan, or any other party concerned, to deal with such matters on the footing of their being two independent States.

AUGUST RESOLUTION AND THE LEAGUE.

I am really surprised when you say there is no proof of what you characterise as a sweeping statement of mine, that the August 1942 Resolution is inimical to the ideals and demands of Muslim India. The resolution in its essence is as follows :—

(a) immediate grant of complete independence and setting up immediately of a Federal Central Government on the basis of a united democratic Government of India with federated units or provinces, which means establishment of a Hindu Raj.

(b) that this National Government so set up will evolve a scheme for a constituent assembly, which will be chosen by adult franchise, which will prepare a constitution for the government of India, which means the constituent assembly chosen will be composed of an overwhelming majority of the Hindus, nearly 75 per cent.

(c) to enforce this demand of the Congress the August resolution decides on and sanctions a resort to mass civil disobedience at your command and when ordered by you as the sole dictator of the Congress.

This demand is basically and fundamentally opposed to the ideals and demands of Muslim India of Pakistan, as embodied in the Lahore resolution, and to enforce such a demand by means of resort to mass civil disobedience is inimical to the ideals and demands of Muslim India; and if you succeed in realizing this demand, it would be a death-blow to Muslim India. I see from the correspondence and talks between you and me that you are still holding fast to this fateful resolution.

From the very first day of our talks you made it clear to me, and you have repeatedly said in the course of our correspondence and talk, that you have approached me in your individual capacity, and you assured me that you were a seeker of light and knowledge and that you seriously and earnestly wanted to understand the Lahore resolution and were open to conviction and conversion. Therefore, in deference to your wishes, I made every effort all these days and in the course of our prolonged talks and correspondence to convert you, but unfortunately, it seems, I have failed. And now you have made new suggestions and proposals by your letter under reply :

(1) You say : "I have therefore suggested a way out. Let it be a partition as between two brothers, if a division there must be". I really do not know what this means, and I would like you to elaborate this proposal and give me some rough outlines of this new idea of yours as to how and when the division is to take place, and in what way it is different from the division envisaged by the Lahore resolution.

(2) You say : "Let us call in a third party or parties to guide or even arbitrate between us." May I point out that you have repeatedly made clear to me that you are having these talks as an individual seeker. How can any question of a third party or parties to guide or arbitrate between us arise? Yours sincerely—
Sd. M. A. JINNAH.

Letter from Gandhiji dated September 23 :—

Dear Qaid-i-Azam.—Last evening's talk has left a bad taste in the mouth. Our talks and our correspondences seem to run in parallel lines and never touch one another. We reached the breaking point last evening but, thank God, we were unwilling to part. We resumed discussion and suspended it in order to allow me to keep my time for the evening public prayer.

In order that all possible chances of making any mistake in a matter of this great importance may be removed, I would like you to give me in writing what precisely on your part you would want me to put my signature to.

I adhere to my suggestion that we may call in some outside assistance to help us at this stage. Yours sincerely,—Sd. M. K. GANDHI.

MR. JINNAH'S APPEAL

Letter from Mr. Jinnah dated September 23 :—

Dear Mr. Gandhi,—I am in receipt of your letter of September 23. May I refer you to my letter of today's date which I sent to you in reply to yours of September 22? I have nothing new or fresh to add, but I may say that it is not a case of your being asked to put your signature as representing anybody till you clothe yourself with representative capacity and are vested with authority. We stand by, as I have already said, the basis and fundamental principles embodied in the Lahore resolution of March, 1940. I appeal to you once more to revise your policy

and programme, as the future of this sub-continent and the welfare of the peoples of India demand that you should face realities. Yours sincerely,—Sd. M. A. JINNAH.

Letter from Gandhiji dated September 24 :

Dear Qaid-i-Azam,—I have your two letters of September 23 in reply to my letters of the 22nd and 23rd.

With your assistance, I am exploring the possibilities of reaching an agreement, so that the claim embodied in the Muslim League resolution of Lahore may be reasonably satisfied. You must therefore have no apprehensions that the August resolution will stand in the way of our reaching an agreement. That resolution dealt with the question of India as against Britain and it cannot stand in the way of our settlement.

I proceed on the assumption that India is not to be regarded as two or more nations but as one family consisting of many members of whom the Muslims living in the north-west zones, i. e., Baluchistan, Sindh, North-West Frontier Province and that part of the Punjab where they are in absolute majority over all the other elements and in parts of Bengal and Assam where they are in absolute majority, desire to live in separation from the rest of India.

Differing from you on the general basis, I can yet recommend to the Congress and the country the acceptance of the claim for separation contained in the Muslim League resolution of Lahore of 1940, on my basis and on the following terms:—

The areas should be demarcated by a Commission approved by the Congress and the League. The wishes of the inhabitants of the areas demarcated should be ascertained through the votes of the adult population of the areas or through some equivalent method.

If the vote is in favour of separation it shall be agreed that these areas shall form a separate State as soon as possible after India is free from foreign domination and can therefore be constituted into two sovereign independent States.

There shall be a treaty of separation which should also provide for the efficient and satisfactory administration of foreign affairs, defence, internal communications, customs, commerce and the like, which must necessarily continue to be matters of common interest between the contracting parties.

The treaty shall also contain terms for safeguarding the rights of minorities in the two States.

Immediately on the acceptance of this agreement by the Congress and the League the two shall decide upon a common course of action for the attainment of independence of India.

The League will however be free to remain out of any direct action to which the Congress may resort and in which the League may not be willing to participate.

If you do not agree to these terms, could you let me know in precise terms what you would have me to accept in terms of the Lahore resolution and bind myself to recommend to the Congress? If you could kindly do this, I shall be able to see, apart from the difference in approach, what definite terms I can agree to. In your letter of September, 23 you refer to "the basic and fundamental principles embodied in the Lahore resolution" and ask me to accept them. Surely this is unnecessary when, as I feel, I have accepted the concrete consequences that should follow from such acceptance. Yours sincerely—Sd. M. K. GANDHI.

POINTS OF DIFFERENCE

Letter from Mr. Jinnah dated September 25 :—

Dear Mr. Gandhi,—I am in receipt of your letter of September 24, and I thank you for it. You have already rejected the basis and fundamental principles of the Lahore resolution.

You do not accept that the Mussalmans of India are a nation.

You do not accept that the Mussalmans have an inherent right of self-determination.

You do not accept that they alone are entitled to exercise this right of theirs for self-determination.

You do not accept that Pakistan is composed of two zones, North-West and North-East, comprising six provinces, namely Sindh, Baluchistan, North-West Frontier Province, the Punjab, Bengal and Assam, subject to territorial adjustments that may be agreed upon, as indicated in the Lahore resolution. The matter of demarcating and defining the territories can be taken up after the fundamentals

above-mentioned are accepted, and for that purpose machinery may be set up by agreement.

You do not accept the provisions embodied in the Lahore resolution for safeguarding the minorities, and yet in your letter under reply you say: "With your assistance, I am exploring the possibilities of reaching an agreement so that the claim embodied in the Muslim League resolution of Lahore may be reasonably satisfied", and proceed to say "You must therefore have no apprehensions that the August resolution will stand in the way of our reaching an agreement."

I have already clearly explained to you that the August resolution, so long as it stands, is a bar for it is fundamentally opposed to the Lahore resolution. You then proceed to say: "That resolution dealt with the question of India as against Britain, and it cannot stand in the way of our settlement." I am not at present concerned with Britain, but the August resolution, as I have already stated, is against the ideals and demands of the Muslim League. Further, there is the resolution of Jagat Narayan Lal, passed by the All-India Congress Committee in May 1942, at Allahabad, which, in express terms, lays down as follows:—

"The A. I. C. C. is of opinion that any proposal to disintegrate India by giving liberty to any component State or territorial unit to secede from the Indian Union or Federation will be highly detrimental to the best interests of the people of the different States and provinces and the country as a whole and the Congress, therefore, cannot agree to any such proposal."

These two resolutions, so long as they stand, are a complete bar to any settlement on the basis of the division of India as Pakistan and Hindustan. It is open to the Congress to revise and modify them: but you are only speaking in your individual capacity, and even in that capacity you are holding fast to the August resolution, and you have given no indication of your attitude regarding Jagat Narayan Lal's resolution. I have repeatedly made it clear after we had discussed the Gandhi-Rajaji formula, as you maintained that, to use your own language, "Rajaji not only has not put the Lahore resolution out of shape and mutilated it but has given it substance and form", and proceeded to say: "Indeed in view of your dislike of the Rajaji formula, I have, at any rate for the moment, put it out of my mind and I am now concentrating on the Lahore resolution in the hope of finding a ground for mutual agreement".

When I asked for further clarification, which you furnished me by your letter of September 15, you started by saying: "I have shunted the Rajaji formula and with your assistance I am applying my mind very seriously to the famous Lahore resolution of the Muslim League", and thenceforward the Gandhi-Rajaji formula was not discussed any further, and the question of your representative character and authority, which I had pointed out from the very commencement, therefore did not arise, as you had given me the task of converting you to the fundamentals of the Lahore resolution, and ever since we discussed the Lahore resolution only at great length and examined the pros and cons, and finally you have rejected it.

NEW SUGGESTION

A result of our correspondence and discussions I find that the question of the division of India as Pakistan and Hindustan is only on your lips and it does not come from your heart, and suddenly at the eleventh hour you put forward a new suggestion, consisting only of two sentences, by your letter of September 22, saying: "I have therefore suggested a way out. Let it be partition as between two brothers, if a division there must be." I naturally asked you what this new suggestion of your means, and wanted you to give me rough outlines of this new idea of yours as to how and when the division is to take place and in what way it is different from the division envisaged in the Lahore resolution, and now you have been good enough to give me your amplification, in your letter of September 24 under reply, in which you say: "Differing from you on the general basis I can yet recommend to the Congress and the country the acceptance of the claim for separation contained in the Muslim League resolution of Lahore 1940 on my basis and on following terms." The terms clearly indicate that your basis is in vital conflict with, and is opposed to the Lahore resolution. Now let me take your main terms:—

(a) "I proceed on the assumption that India is to be regarded as two or more nations but as one family consisting of many members of whom the Muslims living in the north-west zones, i.e. Baluchistan, Sindh, North-West Frontier Province and that part of the Punjab where they were in absolute majority over all the other elements and parts of Bengal and Assam where they are in absolute majority, desire to live in separation from the rest of India." If this term were

accepted and given effect to, the present boundaries of the provinces would be maimed and mutilated beyond redemption and leave us only with the husk, and it is opposed to the Lahore resolution.

(b) That even in those mutilated areas so defined, the right of self-determination will not be exercised by the Muslims but by the inhabitants of those areas so demarcated. This again is opposed to the fundamentals of the Lahore resolution.

(c) That if the vote is in favour of separation they shall be allowed to "form a separate State as soon as possible after India is free from foreign domination." Whereas we propose that we should come to a complete settlement of our own immediately, and by our united front and efforts do everything in our power to secure the freedom and independence of the peoples of India on the basis of Pakistan and Hindustan.

(d) Next you say, there shall be a treaty of separation which should also provide for the efficient and satisfactory administration of foreign affairs, defence, internal communications, customs, commerce, and the like, which must necessarily continue to be matters of common interest between the contracting parties." If these vital matters are to be administered by some central authority, you do not indicate what sort of authority or machinery will be set up to administer these matters, and how and to whom again that authority will be responsible. According to the Lahore resolution, as I have already explained to you, all these matters, which are the lifeblood of my State, cannot be delegated to any central authority or Government. The matter of security of the two States and the natural and mutual obligations that may arise out of physical contiguity will be for the constitution-making body of Pakistan and that of Hindustan or other party concerned, to deal with on the footing of there being two independent States. As regards the safeguarding of rights of minorities, I have already explained that this question of safeguarding the minorities is fully stated in the Lahore resolution.

You will therefore see that the entire basis of your new proposal is fundamentally opposed to the Lahore resolution, and as I have already pointed out to you, both in correspondence and in our discussion, it is very difficult for me to entertain counter-proposals and negotiate and reach any agreement or settlement with you as an individual, unless they come from you in your representative capacity. There was the same difficulty with regard to the Gandhi-Rajaji formula, and I made it clear to you at the very outset, but the formula was discussed as you asserted that it met the Lahore resolution in substance: but, while you were furnishing me with the clarification of this formula, you shunted it and we confined ourselves to the Lahore resolution, and hence the question of your representative capacity did not arise regarding this formula. But now you have, in your letter of September 24, made a new proposal of your own on your own basis and the same difficulties present themselves to me as before, and it is difficult to deal with it any further unless it comes from you in your representative capacity.

I cannot agree with you when you finally wind up by saying: "In your letter of September 23, you refer to 'the basis and fundamental principles embodied in the Lahore resolution' and ask me to accept them. Surely this is unnecessary when, as I feel, I have accepted the concrete consequence that should follow from such acceptance." This is obviously far from correct. Why not then accept the fundamentals of the Lahore resolution and proceed to settle the details? Yours Sincerely—(Sd.) M. A. JINNAH.

Letter from Gandhiji dated September 25 :—

Dear Qaid-i-Azam,—Yesterday's talk leads me to inflict this letter on you which I trust you will not mind.

Our conversations have come about as a result of your correspondence with Rajaji in July last over his formula and your consultation with the League Working Committee thereon, and my own letter to you suggesting a meeting between you and me. My proposal of yesterday is an earnest effort to meet the essential requirements of the Lahore resolution. I would like you therefore to think fifty times before throwing an offer which has been made entirely in the spirit of service in the cause of communal harmony. Do not take, I pray, the responsibility of rejecting the offer. Throw it on your Council. Give me an opportunity of addressing them. If they feel like rejecting it, I would like to advise the Council to put it before the open session of the League. If you will accept my advice and permit me I would attend the open session and address it.

You are too technical when you dismiss my proposal for arbitration or outside guidance over points of difference. If I have approached as an individual

and not in my representative capacity, it is because we believe that if I reach an agreement with you it will be of material use in the process of securing a Congress-League settlement and acceptance of it by the country. Is it irrelevant or inadmissible to supplement our efforts to convince each other with outside help, guidance, advice or even arbitration? Yours sincerely,—Sd. M. K. GANDHI.

ONE-SIDED BUSINESS

Letter from Mr. Jinnah dated September 26 :—

Dear Mr. Gandhi,—I am in receipt of your letter of September 25. It is entirely incorrect and has no foundation in fact for you to say that our conversations have come about as a result of my correspondence with Rajaji in July last over his formula. It is equally baseless to say "and your consultations with the League Working Committee thereon." It was entirely in response to your letter of July 17, 1944, which I received while I was at Srinagar, with a fervent request on your part to meet you and you ended that letter by saying, "Do not disappoint me." In my reply, again from Srinagar, dated July, 24, 1944, intimated to you that I would be glad to receive you at my house in Bombay on my return, which would probably be about the middle of August. This was long before the meeting of the Working Committee or that of the Council of the All-India Muslim League, and long before I reached Lahore, and when you arrived here and told me that you were approaching me in your individual capacity, I at once made it clear to you and informed you, both in our talks and by my letter, that the position you had taken up had no precedent to it, and further that it was not possible to negotiate and reach an agreement unless both the parties were fully represented: for it is one-sided business, as it will not be binding upon any organisation in any sense whatever, but you would as an individual only recommend it, if any agreement is reached, to the Congress and the country, whereas it would be binding upon me as the President of the Muslim League. I cannot accept this position. I hope you do see the unfairness and the great disadvantage to me, and it is so simple and elementary for any one to understand.

As regards your proposal of yesterday, which you have simplified in your letter of September 24, I have already sent you my reply.

With regard to your suggestion to be allowed to address the meeting of the Council, and if they feel like rejecting your "offer" the matter should be put before the open session, let me inform you that only a member or delegate is entitled to participate in the deliberations of the meetings of the Council or the open session, respectively. Besides it is a most extraordinary and unprecedented suggestion to make. However, I thank you for your advice.

As regards your proposal for arbitration and outside guidance, I have already replied to you, and it is not merely technical but a matter of substance. I fully reciprocate your desire to secure a Congress-League settlement.

However, I regret I have failed to convince you and convert you, as I was hopeful of doing so. Yours sincerely,—Sd. M. A. JINNAH.

Letter from Gandhiji dated September 26 :—

Dear Qaid-i-Azam,—In view of my letter to you of yesterday, left to myself, I would have refrained from dealing with your letter before our meeting today. But I have deferred to Rajaji's advice to finish the chain of correspondence.

I confess I am unable to understand your persistent refusal to appreciate the fact that the formula presented to you by me in my letter of the 24, as well as the formula presented to you by Rajaji, give you virtually what is embodied in the Lahore resolution providing at the same time what is absolutely necessary to make the arrangement acceptable to the country. You keep on saying that I should accept certain thesis which you call the basis and fundamental principles of the Lahore resolution, while I have been contending that the best way for us who differ in our approach to the problem is to give body to the demand as it stands in the resolution and work it out to our mutual satisfaction. It is on this plan that I understand Rajaji's formula to be conceived, and it is on the same plan that I have tried to work it out in the course of and as a result of our talks. I contend that either gives you the substance of the Lahore resolution. Unfortunately you reject both. And I cannot accept the Lahore resolution as you want me to, especially when you seek to introduce into its interpretation theories and claims which I cannot accept and which I cannot ever hope to induce India to accept.

Your constant references to my not being clothed with representative authority are really irrelevant. I have approached you so that, if you and I can agree upon

a common course of action, I may use what influence I possess for its acceptance by the Congress and the country. If you break, it cannot be because I have no representative capacity or because I have been unwilling to give you satisfaction in regard to the claim embodied in the Lahore resolution. Yours sincerely,—Ed. M. K. GANDHI.

Gandhiji's Contention

Letter from Mr. Jinnah dated September 26 :—

Dear Mr. Gandhi,—I have received your letter of September 26 and I note that you have written it with Rajaji's advice. Of course, it is for you to follow such advice as you may choose to do, but I am only concerned for the moment with you. I note that at the last moment you have resurrected the Gandhi-Rajaji formula, although it was shunted all this time, and you proceed to say that this formula gives me virtually what is embodied in the Lahore resolution. You further say that on the same plan you have tried to formulate your letter of September 24, and you maintain that either gives me the substance of the Lahore resolution. In your previous letter you asserted that your formula gives me the "essence" of the Lahore resolution. I see very close family resemblance between the two, and the substance of one or the other is practically the same, only it is put in different language, and I have already expressed my opinion that, in my judgment, they neither meet the substance nor the essence of the Lahore resolution. On the contrary, both are calculated completely to torpedo the Pakistan demand of Muslim India. I have never asked you to accept certain theses, nor have I introduced any theories in the Lahore resolution. Theses and theories are matters for scholars to indulge in.

I am very sorry I have to repeat, but I am compelled to do so, that I cannot agree with you that my references to your not being clothed with representative authority are really irrelevant. On the contrary, they have an important bearing, as I have already explained to you more than once. You again repeat that if you and I can agree upon a common course of action, you may use what influence you possess for its acceptance by the Congress and the country. I have already stated from the very beginning that that is not enough, for the reasons I have already given. Your representative capacity comes into play when you are making counter-proposals, and I cannot understand how you can say that it is irrelevant. No responsible organisation can entertain any proposal from any individual, however great he may be, unless it is backed up with the authority of a recognised organisation and comes from its fully accredited representative. However, I need not labour this point any more, as I have already explained it in our previous correspondence.

If a break comes, it will be because you have not satisfied me in regard to the essence of the claim embodied in the Lahore resolution. It is not a question of your being unwilling, but in fact it is so. If a break comes, it will be most unfortunate. If one does not agree with you or differs from you, you are always right and the other party is always wrong. The next thing is that many are waiting prepared, in your circle, to pillory me when the word goes; but I must face all threats and consequences, and I can only act according to my judgment and conscience.—Yours sincerely,—Sd. M. A. JINNAH.

Mahatma addresses Prayer Meeting

"Addressing a prayer meeting after the announcement of the breakdown of the negotiations, Gandhiji said he had hitherto told them that he was not without hope with regard to the outcome of the talks. He had now to confess that the result that he was hoping for had not materialised. But he had no sense of disappointment or despondency. He was convinced that even out of that breakdown good would result.

Gandhiji added that although the Qaid-i-Azam and he had known each other fairly well in public life before, they had never come into such close personal contact. Their conversations were carried on with friendliness and cordiality. He wanted all the communities to cultivate the same spirit of friendliness and cordiality in their relations with one another. They should try to convert one another through it.

They might ask, "Why was it then that he and the Qaid-i-Azam had failed to convert each other." His reply was that he had tried his level best to go as far as he could to meet the Qaid-i-Azam's viewpoint. He had taken incalculable pains to understand him and to make himself understood. But he had failed.

He had placed before the Qaid-i-Azam Rajaji's formula but that did not

commend itself to him. He had thereupon put forth another proposal of his own in its place but even that had failed to secure Mr. Jinnah's approval. In the same way, Mr. Jinnah's proposals had failed to commend themselves to Gandhiji. If either of them had been weak, they would have possibly come to some sort of agreement, but as responsible men they could not afford to be weak. A helmsman had to be firm and un-wavering or else the ship would fonder upon the rocks. Each one of them had tried to convince the other. It was possible that both of them might be in the wrong. But so long as each felt himself to be in the right he could not let go his hold.

The news of the breakdown, he knew, would cause grief to the friends of India and might give cause for jubilation to their enemies. He drew their attention to the last sentence in their statement in which he had said that it was not the final end of their efforts.

Although they had been unable to appreciate each other's viewpoint, the public could help them to do so. They should not lose heart. If there was any one who had reason to feel disappointment, it was he. He had knocked at the Qaid-i-Azam's door. But, as he had already observed, there was no despondency in him. It was not for a votary of truth and non-violence to feel despondent if his effort, at times, failed to yield the result aimed at. Failure should only serve as a spur to further effort. God alone knew what was best for them. It was not for them to question God's ways. Therefore, instead of feeling despondent they should regard the breakdown as a challenge to their faith and as an incentive for greater effort to establish true unity among the various communities.

The Lahore Resolution of the League

On the 26th of March, 1940, the All-India Muslim League resolved at Lahore that

"It is the considered view of this Session that no constitutional plan would be workable in this country acceptable to the Muslims unless it is designed on the following basic principle, viz. that geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted, with such territorial re-adjustments as may be necessary, that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority as in the North-Western and Eastern zones of India, should be grouped to constitute "independent States" in which the constituent units shall be autonomous and sovereign . . ."

The resolution proceeded to stress that :

"Adequate, effective and mandatory safeguards should be specifically provided in the constitution for minorities in these units and in the regions for the protection of their religious, cultural, economic, political, administrative and other rights, and interests in consultation with them.

Conversely, it envisaged identical guarantees in an identical manner for Muslim minorities in other parts of India.

Next, it authorized the Working Committee 'to frame a scheme of constitution in accordance with these basic principles providing for the assumption finally by the respective regions of all powers such as defence, external affairs, communication, customs and such other matters as may be necessary.' No such scheme of constitution, however, has yet been published.

Breakdown of Unity Talks

Regret in Britain and America

London—28th. September 1944

Mr. Amery declined in the Commons to-day to say anything about the breakdown of the Gandhi-Jinnah discussions until the situation was cleared. He was replying to Mr. Reginald Sorensen who asked, "What communications respecting the political issues arising from the Gandhi-Jinnah discussions had been already conveyed by the Indian leaders to the Viceroy and whether the Viceroy and Governor-General will take steps to confer with them on the termination of their discussion."

Mr. Amery, in a written reply, said, "I am not aware that any communication has at present been addressed by either leader to the Viceroy in connection with the discussions. Members will have seen the report in to-day's Press that the conversation has broken down. In the circumstances, I would prefer to say nothing more until the situation is cleared."

VICEROY URGED TO TAKE THE INITIATIVE

Profound regret was expressed this afternoon by well-known sympathisers with India in Britain and America at the news that the Gandhi-Jinnah talks had broken down, but there is a general hope that a way would still be found out of the difficult situation.

The Secretary of the India League, Mr. *Krishna Menon*, said: "While it is impossible to form an opinion on the scant information available, there is little doubt that there is no finality about the present situation, and the leaders will undoubtedly find a way out."

Dr. *Maud Royden* said: "Like many people in this country I heard the news that the talks had broken down with consternation and keen disappointment. It is impossible not to hope that they may be resumed, because, in spite of the fact that Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah do not represent the whole of India, yet they undoubtedly represent the two greatest sections of the Indian people. Had they been able to reach an agreement, it would have given an impetus to the other agreement. Is it too much to hope that the Viceroy may see his way now to take a hand?"

The political commentator, Mr. *H. N. Brailsford*, stated: "Everybody regrets that the talks have failed, but until I know more as to the reason, I do not think I could give an opinion on the matter."

The well-known Labour M. P., Mr. *Pethick Lawrence*, said: "I feel sure I am voicing the sentiments of many people in this country in expressing regret at the news that the two distinguished statesmen of India have not found it possible so far to reach an agreement. No details have been published and therefore, it is not possible to judge if the failure to reach an agreement is final and we can only hope some means will be found to make a new and more successful approach to the problem at issue."

Pearl Buck, interviewed in New York, said: "If it is true that the conversations between Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah are broken off, I consider it a tragedy not only for India and England but for all the United Nations who would find a new hope if India had now a definite prospect of freedom. But my hope is always in the people of the country rather than in individuals."

Sardar J. J. Singh, President of the India League of America, said: "Not knowing the details as to what caused the breakdown it is hard for me to comment. However, the Indian community in the United States and American friends of India are bound to be disappointed. We had all hoped that the talks would bring about an agreement which could have led to a resolution of the political deadlock at last."

GANDHIJI'S OFFER MOST DEMOCRATIC

"It is a pity," said Mr. *William Dobbie* M.P., that Mr. *Jinnah* should be the Leader of the Muslim League. Gandhiji had suggested the fairest means of resolving the Indian deadlock by conceding to the Muslims Pakistan.

Gandhiji's suggestion for holding a plebiscite in provinces affected by Pakistan cannot be improved upon. I am convinced that this was the most democratic approach to the solution of the communal problem, which had vitiated the political situation in India for so long.

Certainly, the time has come when the British Government who cannot plead innocence in this matter should courageously face the issues and tell frankly men like Mr. Jinnah that their claim to leadership cannot be acceptable if they are not prepared to abide by democratic methods and procedure.

"THE TIMES" COMMENTS—LONDON—29TH. SEPTEMBER 1944

The failure of the Gandhi-Jinnah talks, says *The Times* to-day (Friday), throws back in the melting pot the whole problem of Indian minorities. If the leaders of the two major political parties could have reached a common approach to the main question which in importance, out-ranks all others in the Indian political strife to-day—the method by which an All-India Constitution is to be framed—the result would have been a forward step of some magnitude. An agreement on the broad principles of the new Constitution would have enabled an exploratory move to begin at once in accordance with Lord Wavell's expressed hope; it would have paved the way for the co-operation of the main political parties in the working of the transitional Constitution; and it would thus have tackled the present paralyzing deadlock.

In the second place it would have meant the final abandonment of the claim by Mr. Gandhi and, by implication by the Congress Party to speak *ex cathedra* in

the name of India. It appears from the published correspondence that neither Mr. Gandhi nor Mr. Jinnah was able to rid himself of his communal pledges in a measure sufficient to enable them to face the problems of the present day with the necessary breadth of vision. Perhaps younger men, less conscious of party affiliations and more concerned with the great prospects open to their country, might have done—indeed, may yet do—better. It should have been impossible for Mr. Gandhi, especially as he insisted upon the personal as opposed to the representative character of his activities in Bombay, to have admitted in full Mr. Jinnah's claim to Pakistan, should such prove essential for the security of Moslem communal interests.

Mr. Jinnah's statement indicates some slight hope of fresh conversations and Mr. Gandhi speaks of an 'adjournment'. However, this may be, there are other leaders; there are other parties. The practice of consultation and conference must be actively promoted by Government; and if this is done, the seed of agreement will certainly be discovered. British policy towards India hinges on the assumption that the people of India can frame a succession Government. It is for Britain as well as India to see that this assumption is not belied.

The breakdown in the Gandhi-Jinnah talks will cause no surprise to English observers, writes the *Birmingham Post* editorially to-day (Thursday.) "If there ever was any prospect of anything materially different, anything in any way more helpful to India in the existing circumstances, it arose from the circumstance that Mr. Gandhi talked as a free agent without responsibility. Mr. Jinnah, to be sure, already suggested otherwise—and it is perfectly true, as he now complains, that no 'settlement' could have been effectively negotiated by the two parties, one of whom represented nobody but himself. A settlement, however, at no time seemed practicable; at no time came into a cautious appraisal of possibilities. What was hoped optimistically perhaps, but not unreasonably, was that Mr. Gandhi might be so far convinced of the fundamental reasonableness of the Moslem case as to go away in a mood to recommend that case to the great predominantly Hindu organisations and to Hindu leaders. It is not known exactly how and why Mr. Jinnah failed. It may be that final disagreement arose over matters of detail rather than principles. But for the moment at any rate, Mr. Gandhi remains unconvinced. Perhaps it is fair to add that nobody but congenial optimists expected him ever to accept Mr. Jinnah's premises or look with favour upon Mr. Jinnah's demands."

DELHI REACTIONS—NEW DELHI—28TH, SEPTEMBER 1944

Official quarters generally express extreme regret at the breakdown of the Bombay talks but point out that the published correspondence shows that the attempt on either side was not so much to negotiate as to argue and try to get the other side to accept one's own point of view.

Official quarters repudiate the allegation that the Government was interested in, or made any attempt at pulling strings in order to prevent the success of the talks.

FEELING IN BOMBAY

The outcome of the present series of Gandhi-Jinnah talks has been received with mixed feelings. Sir *Chimantlal Sitalvad* and his school welcome the breakdown as there will be no partition of India. The Communists who were enthusiastic about the negotiations feel that both leaders spent all these three weeks discussing abstract things not connected with the realities of the present day. League circles await a lead from Mr. Jinnah. They feel disappointed that no agreement was reached between the leaders on this occasion but they are not attempting to apportion blame. European quarters also deplore the absence of agreement between Mr. Jinnah and Gandhiji but they lay the blame at Gandhiji's door on the ground that he is still adhering to the August 8 Resolution.

A noteworthy feature of the present talks is the spirit of cordiality and friendliness between Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah and the complete absence of invective as in the past. Both stick to their ideals. Gandhiji spoke with supreme confidence that the seemingly insoluble can be solved if the press, the public and the League Council ask Mr. Jinnah to revise his opinion. In other words, Mr. Jinnah requires this persuasion and Gandhiji drops the hint that Mr. Jinnah would revise his views if the League and the Indian public urge him to do so.

Leaders' Views

MR. N. R. SARKAR

Mr. N. R. Sarkar, ex-Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, said :
"It is difficult for me—and I think that is the case with most others—to say

whether I did or did not expect this result from the Gandhi-Jinnah talks. We all had our moments of optimism and our moments of pessimism. But no one was prepared for the disclosure now made public that at no stage did the negotiators get to grips with the proper issues. We could not help the feeling that the negotiations have not been properly handled. And the tragedy of the situation is that there is no means now open to us of retrieving the position since the Congress cannot formally meet to consider the situation resulting from the failure of the talks. It would no doubt be some help if Mr. Jinnah would indicate how he envisages that the broken threads of negotiations will be picked up again."

RT. HON. V. S. S. SASTRI

The Rt. Hon. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri said :

True satyagrahis will not admit defeat but they are few. The rest of us cannot help being depressed by the breakdown. The British Tories alone have cause to rejoice. Does the breakdown restore the *status quo ante*? Is the Gandhi—C. R. Formula killed once for all? I would fain hope it was. But supposing negotiations are to be resumed, will the Congress be free to disown it utterly? I have misgivings unless the rank and file who are now dumb compel the High Command to recognise the weight of public opinion. We shall only plough the sands again. The Jagatnain resolution of the A. I. O. C., no doubt, represents the majority view, and it is likewise statesmanlike and safeguards the future of the country. The reviving vitality of our great political organisation must make itself felt in checking the growth of the League spirit, which would cut up and maim the country for ever.

Gandhiji must free himself from the Pakistan obsession, if his future services to the Motherland are to maintain the qualities of wisdom and foresight. Mr. Jinnah shares the responsibility of these abortive talks with the Mahatma. He has not abated one jot of his demands or shown the least desire to see the other man's point of view. This may be strength, but it is not the strength which will surmount difficulties or solve problems. It spells the ruin and perpetual stagnation of the country. He rejected, out of hand, the suggestion of arbitration which is going to be the saviour of the world from the dangers of international strife. What has he to say on the merits of the questions. Is it open to him to make a demand and say to India and to the world, "Grant this or I will stop anything and everything."

DR. P. SUBBAROYAN

Dr. P. Subbaroyan, ex-Minister, said :

I am sorry that the Gandhi-Jinnah negotiations have ended and there has been no settlement. I hope that the public would respond to the appeal of Mr. Jinnah not to feel embittered and to have hope as he has himself told us that this is not the final end of the efforts. Gandhiji has also asked us not to lose heart. Therefore, I am hoping that a new method of rapprochement between the two leaders will soon be found and I don't propose to go into any particular point on which the negotiations broke down.

But it must be said that Gandhiji did make an offer specific in its terms by his letter of September 24 but this Mr. Jinnah unfortunately thought did not in any way meet the Lahore Resolution of the Muslim League. It would have been better if Mr. Jinnah had followed it with a counter-offer which he has not chosen to do. Gandhiji's offer contained in this letter, therefore, stands and will be there to be modified and accepted by the Muslim League when they chose to do so. It is, therefore, the duty of Congressmen to popularise this offer among the people.

MR. TAMIZUDDIN KHAN

"I do entertain a sanguine hope that soon after the release of the members of the Congress Working Committee, which should on no account be further delayed, fresh negotiations will be initiated and God willing, results would be more satisfactory" observed Mr. Tamizuddin Khan, Education Minister, Bengal.

Paying a tribute to Mr. C. Rajagopalachari for his efforts he said, "I have every word of appreciation for the insight of Mr. Rajagopalachari, for his patience and perseverance which have brought the country to this stage out of a seemingly hopeless position and I do hope he will rise to the situation now created by the failure of the talks and will be able to give a fresh and more practical lead to the Congress and the country."

Proceeding he said, "The news of the breakdown of negotiations must have been received with profound sorrow by all well-wishers of the country both in India and abroad. It is quite apparent from the correspondence which passed between

the two leaders that the failure was inevitable. Mr. Jinnah's acceptance of the final terms offered by Gandhiji would have seriously jeopardised the demand of the Muslim nation for Pakistan. However, the whole of Muslim India is undoubtedly behind Mr. Jinnah and fully supports the stand taken by him in the negotiations. But the failure should not give rise to pessimism. As the principle of Pakistan has been recognised, the time is not far off when it will be realised that all the facilities for the practical fruition of this scheme must be considered."

MR. GADGIL

Mr. Gadgil, President of the Maharashtra Congress Committee, said: "It is a matter of regret, and this cannot be the end of it. It required two years for the two leaders to come together and discuss, it will only require another two months to see them together. The Hindu and Muslim masses care more for the substance than for the shadow. They are bound to bring pressure, for both love freedom, and both want it, here and now." He added: "I see nothing but hope, not in the far future, but in the immediate one, and hence it should be everybody's duty to create conditions which will help the resumption of negotiations, the supreme need of the hour."

SIR C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR

Sir C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar, Dewan of Travancore, said, "The correspondence between Gandhiji and Mr. Jinnah that has been released clarifies an issue which never seems to have been in doubt from the outset.

"Mr. Jinnah's view has throughout been that Muhammadans wherever situated, lay claim to constitute a nation. His demand is not based on Pakistan being a territorial unit. His idea is that there can be no matters of common concern even with regard to defence, internal communications, foreign affairs, customs, etc. In his own words, Pakistan and Hindustan will be separate independent sovereign States (vide Mr. Jinnah's letter dated September 21, 1944.) Each sovereign State is apparently to be composed of individuals situated in many territorial units and separated from each other by long distances, differences of language, origin and economic outlook. There can at no time be a compromise between those who make such a claim and those who hope to realise the unity of India as a territorial and administrative unit, while providing the amplest safeguards for minority rights. Even Mr. C. Rajagopalachari must admit that his *bets noirs*, the Indian States, have never asserted the possibility of an Indian constitution without Central authority in matters of common concern for the whole of India.

"It is fervently hoped that no more attempts will be made to square the circle or reconcile the irreconcilable, and that all efforts be concentrated on bringing together elements that are united by a common purpose and a common ideal, namely a strong and unified India. I venture to express this hope, although it must be observed that political parties and their leaders are often more inclined to negotiate with their opponents than with their potential friends."

SIR O. SETALVAD AND SIR V. CHANDAVARKAR

Sir Chimanlal Setalvad and Sir Vithal Chandavarkar, in a joint statement, say:

"Although we are as keen as Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Rajagopalachari on solving the communal problem and to achieve the freedom of India from foreign domination, we do not regret the breakdown of the negotiations between Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah, for the negotiations were based on the acceptance by Mr. Gandhi of the vicious principle of the partition of India into Hindustan and Pakistan. We are sure that an appreciable number of the following of Mr. Gandhi must also be heaving a sigh of relief, because they too are against the partition of the country, although on account of their personal loyalty to Mr. Gandhi, they refrained from giving expression to their real feelings. Such a partition with different sovereign States, with no Central authority to control subjects of common interests like Defence, Foreign Relations, Communications, etc., must inevitably lead to friction between Hindustan and Pakistan, thus producing conditions, under which India must come again under foreign domination. The correspondence shows that Mr. Gandhi is alive to all these dangers, but his overwhelming desire to achieve immediate independence impels him to grant the principle of separation. In one of his letters, he says to Mr. Jinnah: "Let us unite to get rid of the British, and then you can divide the country into as many parts as you like." India, if so divided, is bound to be an easy prey to any foreign power. Let the Muslims and other substantial minorities be reassured by the establishment of coalition ministries both in the Centre and in the Provinces and by the provision of statutory safeguards for

their special interests but we should never agree to divide India into separate sovereign States, which must mean ruination to India and would be harmful to the Muslims themselves.

DR. N. B. KHARE

"I am glad that the failure of the longdrawn-out negotiations between Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah has at least been announced and the proposal for the division of India has been buried—I hope—for ever," says Dr. N. B. Khare, in a statement to the Associated Press. "No. rational being could have ever expected these negotiations to succeed, but Congressmen were banking upon them too much although inwardly they did not like them. It appears from the published correspondence between the two august negotiators that there was not an inch of common ground between them from the very start. It is surprising that they met at all, and it is still more surprising that they did carry on for a period of 13 long days.

It is evident that Pakistan, as envisaged in the 1940 resolution of the Muslim League at Lahore, cannot be obtained by negotiations; if at all, it can be carved out only by the use of the sword. I hope that this failure will encourage all thinking and reasonable people and communities to lessen their insistence on self-interest and to unite for the welfare and freedom of India and to give up all stans, schemes and schisms."

ALLAMA MASHRIQI

Allama Mashriqi, the Khaksar leader, says:

"I do not see any failure when both leaders have been in conference for nearly three weeks and departed. The real difficulty is that neither Mahatma Gandhi nor Mr. Jinnah wishes to get out of the rut of dead theoretical politics, created round them by long years of cries for independence, on to the smooth road of living practical politics leading to immediate freedom. I must admit, however, that Quaid-i-Azam has realised this difficulty considerably more than Mr. Gandhi and that is what makes me more hopeful of an early settlement. Our next step can only be to go on striving and I have now resolved to meet Mahatma Gandhi at the earliest opportunity available to me."

The Allama asks all Khaksars who had gone to Bombay to return quietly to their homes.

MR. M. N. ROY'S SUGGESTION TO MR. JINNAH

Mr. M. N. Roy says:

Any other result of *Gandhi-Jinnah* talks was a matter of wishful thinking. Therefore, the news of the breakdown is not unexpected for those who took a critical and realistic view of the situation.

The breakdown, however, is not a political calamity. A great illusion having been at last dispelled, a more practical approach to the problem of India's constitutional advance should now be attempted. But next to the British that would very largely depend on Mr. Jinnah. He has to give up the idea of coming to an agreement with Hindu India. He must now realise that Hindu India would never accept the Muslim demand of self-determination.

All the questions raised by Mr. Jinnah during the protracted talks and evasively replied by Mr. Gandhi can be satisfactorily answered by a democratic coalition composed of the Radical Democratic Party, Scheduled Castes Federation, the Non-Brahmin organisation of Southern India and many other elements outside the two Hindu organisations and their allies and satellites. A democratic coalition will represent the non-Muslim toiling masses, constituting the overwhelming majority of the people.

I appeal to Mr. Jinnah to take the initiative in convening a conference of the above popular bodies, which will agree about the future constitution and demand transfer of power to a Provisional Government, based on a democratic coalition. The British, however unwilling they may be to transfer power, will have no plausible excuse to resist the demand of a coalition representing a united front of the majority of the people belonging to all communities. Old parties and leaders have made a mess; let us open a new chapter if we want to get out of frustration and avoid a possible civil war.

MR. B. G. KHAPARDE

Mr. B. G. Khaparde, Secretary of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha, says that he is not in the least sorry that the *Gandhi-Jinnah* conversations have broken down. He hopes that Mr. Gandhi will yet take a lesson from what has transpired between him and Mr. Jinnah. The nation will watch further movements of Mr. Gandhi in this connection. Anyway Pakistan seems to have received its final blow."

MR. SHAHABUDDIN

Mr. *Shahabuddin*, Minister, Bengal, said: "I am deeply shocked at the failure of the talks. In fact, all patriots in India and all sympathisers outside must have been rudely shocked on the breakdown of negotiations." Continuing, he said: "While reading through the correspondence, it appeared that the main point on which the negotiations failed was that of plebiscite. In my opinion, this question should not have been pressed by Gandhiji. Once the principle of Pakistan has been accepted, there seems to be no justification for allowing non-Muslims in Pakistan areas to take part in plebiscite."

Concluding, he said: "However, there is no reason to be pessimistic as, in the words of Mr. Jinnah, 'this is not the final end of our efforts.' I do hope that Congress and non-Muslims will soon realise that Pakistan is the only solution of the political and communal problem of India."

MR. L. G. THATTE

Mr. *L. G. Thatte*, General Secretary of the All-India Anti-Pakistan Front, who led a batch of pickets at Sevagram before Mahatma Gandhi's departure for Bombay, in a statement says, "Mr. Gandhi, as he himself admits, has no right to speak on behalf of the Hindus."

Mr. *Thatte* adds that it is necessary that Hindu youths from all provinces should carry on non-stop picketing for two months at Mahatma Gandhi's residence demanding that he should in future abstain from speaking on behalf of the Hindus.

MALIK BARKAT ALI

Malik Barkat Ali, M. L. A. (Muslim League), says: "I am really deeply grieved to learn that the Gandhi-Jinnah talks for a settlement, to which the whole country was looking forward with profound hopes, have ended unsuccessfully. It is, however, a relief to learn from the two leaders that they look forward to the resumption of these talks. However, I am sure that every believer in the freedom of this country will view this result with the greatest disappointment."

Malik Barkat Ali adds: "I will not apportion blame at this stage. I want the two leaders to continue as friends and agree to differ. May the time soon come, when there will be a complete union of minds between the two leaders. The Mahatma says that he will continue to work for the freedom of his country with such elements as he can gather under his flag. With the Muslim outside that flag, such efforts are a vain hope and predetermined to meet defeat and disaster."

DR. B. S. MOONJE

Giving his reactions to the failure of Gandhi-Jinnah talks, Dr. *Moonje* said: "The Hindu-Muslim problem has become more complicated. It is not clear whether Gandhiji has agreed to Pakistan or not. He speaks of separate sovereign States in one place and of one family in the other. How can the two be reconciled? Either he treats Muslims as a separate nation, in order to satisfy Mr. Jinnah, just like England, France and Germany or he treats them as members of one common family divided into several Provinces under one Central Government. If it is the latter, then he and the Mahasabha agree. In that case, representation in Provincial or Central Government will be on the basis of population. I cannot understand Gandhiji when he says that the Centre will have no overbearing Hindu majority. Thus, the whole situation is at present quite complicated."

Suggestion by Indian Christian Leaders

Raja Sir *Maharaj Singh*, President, and Mr. *B. L. Rallia Ram*, General Secretary of the All-India Conference of Indian Christians, in a joint statement say:

We greatly regret that the talks between Mahatma Gandhiji and Mr. *Jinnah* have not met with the success for which many had hoped both in India and outside. Never-the-less, they have been useful in clarifying the difference between the two leaders. Apart from other points, the talks really broke down on the very important question of the plebiscite necessary before any partition of India can be made. Mr. Gandhi desired a common plebiscite, while Mr. *Jinnah* wanted only Muslims to vote. On this point Indian Christians, though they prefer that there should not be any vivisection of India, consider the point of view of Mr. Gandhi to be more fair and more reasonable than that of Mr. *Jinnah*. The latter, however, was justified in thinking that a communal settlement should be arrived at before the third party left India. We consider that further efforts should be made to reach a settlement between Hindus and Muslims and are of opinion that, before long a conference should be convened by Indian leaders containing representatives

not only of the two leading political parties, but also of important minorities and interests."

Indian Press Comments

The *Hindustan Times* says: "Rightly or wrongly, it seems now that Mr. Jinnah has concluded that the Muslim majority areas cannot stand on their own legs and he, therefore, makes the impossible claim that other areas with their predominantly non-Muslim populations should be added thereto. The absurd form to which he has now been compelled to reduce his claim and his refusal to accept Gandhiji's proposals which were, in effect, the substance of the League's demand, prove beyond doubt that the solution for the communal distemper is not in any plan of partition."

Continuing, the paper observes: "The issue of the present negotiation clearly points to some form of Confederation as the true remedy. If this is sufficiently realised the talks will not have been held in vain. A Confederation of autonomous units with homogeneous populations will provide for the satisfaction in the fullest degree of the natural desire for independent evolution of the component States as well as for the efficient administration of matters of common interest which arise out of the essential economic and cultural unity of India."

Despite the breakdown reported from Bombay, the *Dawn* regards the failure of the Bombay Talks "more as a stage of proceedings than the filing of an insolvency petition."

The paper stresses some lessons of the failure and concludes: "The lesson of the talks is that Mr. Rajagopalachari had not really succeeded in winning over Mr. Gandhi to the historical inevitability of self-determination for the Muslims of India. Darkly the Mahatma refers to "other elements" on whose co-operation the Congress would depend. We do not know if any tactics are implied, but the Muslims as a whole have now a better inkling of the mind of the Mahatma and the value of solidarity in their ranks. Our earnest anticipation is that there will be greater efforts for mutual accommodation on the part of the Hindus despite the door banged by Mr. Gandhi. Mr. Jinnah, it is clear from his letters, put the Muslim case with precision and profound faith in his cause and Muslims are fortunate that in him they have a leader, unselfish and farsighted, who is worthy of their confidence. Success has been described as the last phase of a series of failures."

The *National Call* points out that, "At no stage in the Bombay talks has Mahatma Gandhi thought of himself as a Hindu. At all times he has put forward his case as an Indian. This may not have appealed to Mr. Jinnah, who, having painted himself thick in Muslim communal colours, cannot imagine that a person being born a Hindu can still aspire to represent all people and all communities."

PUBLIC OPINION MUST ASSERT ITSELF

The *Amrita Bazar Patrika* shares the optimism of Mahatma Gandhi that matters will not rest where they are and that negotiations will be resumed at no distant future. The leaders have done what they could. It is now for public opinion to assert itself. The procedure adopted by Mr. Jinnah in the talks, the paper adds, smacked more of a law court than of a joint army headquarters. The lawyer in him got the better of Mr. Jinnah as a patriot. His approach to some of the important questions was more legalistic than practical. There can be no settlement or compromise unless the parties are equally earnest. The paper pays tribute to Mahatma Gandhi's "inexhaustible patience and supreme regard of personal prestige" in the talks.

The *Statesman* says that the correspondence make it clear that the two men never or seldom got to grips. They talked across an interval and their letters at times appear to evade the points made by the one and the other. A serious difficulty was Mr. Gandhi's peculiar position. Mr. Jinnah argued as a leader of a strong party, Mr. Gandhi as a leader of great influence but not representative of anyone and anxious to use his influence for the good of all. This enabled him at times to evade the pressure of argument. The talks broke down of themselves because there was no initial agreement about the basis of discussion, not because there was any external interference. The experiment may be renewed and then too everyone will give the protagonists every chance.

Commenting on the Gandhi-Jinnah talks the *Hindustan Standard* says that it is not oppressed with any sense of disappointment at the failure, for it never expected that any negotiation on the present basis would succeed. As the separate

nation theory of Mr. Jinnah has been thoroughly disposed of by Mahatma Gandhi, the proposal of Rajaji should not be persisted in. The journal sees no cause for despondency because it is confident that India will become independent at no distant future, and also believes that it will not be necessary to wait for an agreement with Mr. Jinnah for this.

Writing on the Gandhi-Jinnah correspondence the *Star of India* says: "It makes dismal reading. There is hardly anything in it to promote optimism. The only hope left is that the worst has not happened yet, and that this is not the final end of the two leaders' efforts. The breakdown has been caused by difference on such primary questions as the representative scope of the Muslim League, the two-nation theory and the scope and machinery of the plebiscite and whether independence should precede self-determination or *vice versa*. The journal is most surprised at Mr. Gandhi's insistence on his particular viewpoint with regard to the last. Mr. Gandhi has also unceremoniously repudiated the two-nation theory, the bedrock of the Pakistan demand. In regard to the National Government, Mr. Jinnah's acceptance of Mr. Gandhi's clarification would have amounted to delivering the Muslim nation, hand and feet bound, to the dominant Hindu majority."

The *Morning News* is not prepared to accept the termination of the negotiations as a "failure" because a good deal of mutual understanding has gone forth from one side to the other. Mr. Jinnah wants a partition and Mr. Gandhi, notwithstanding his assertions to the contrary, has been converted to grant it.

The *People's Voice* says that the failure of the talks should be a spur to fresh activities for the peoples' cause.

BRITAIN MUST TAKE THE INITIATIVE

The *Pioneer* says that the breakdown of Gandhi-Jinnah talks cannot but cause the bitterest disappointment to the public. Both the leaders were indissolubly-wedded to their respective party creeds—one to the ill-fated August Resolution of 1942 and the other to the vague but none the less uncompromising Lahore resolution of 1940. Negotiations conducted in the proselytising spirit cannot possibly lead to a settlement. The hope of unity has proved to be a mirage. Bugged in frustration, the country is desperately looking for a lead. Will it come, and if so, from where? The initiative will have to be taken by the British Government. For better or for worse, she has to proceed "immediately upon the cessation of hostilities" to put India in charge of her own destiny.

Describing the Gandhi-Jinnah talks as "a great dialectical combat" the *Civil and Military Gazette* says, "The dialectical adventures of Mr. Jinnah and Mr. Gandhi have not been entirely fruitless however as they have clearly revealed the wide gulf which divides the Congress from the Muslim League."

The paper adds: "Mr. Jinnah has emerged from the conferences in Bombay with his reputation as a dialectician enhanced by his resistance to yield to the Congress resolutions while Mr. Gandhi has only exposed the hopelessness of the tactics in trying to secure a solution of such great problems as now divide the Congress and the Muslim League on the one hand and the Hindus and Muslims on the other in his 'individual capacity'."

"In the outcome of the Gandhi-Jinnah conferences in Bombay there is also a lesson for observers outside the Empire who hold the opinion that the serious conflict between the political aspirations of the different communities in India is the result of British intrigue".

Mahatma Gandhi's Letter to Viceroy

Lord Wavell Refuses to entertain Mahatma's request

Ever since Gandhiji was released, the country has been hearing from him numerous proposals made with the sincere object of arriving at a satisfactory compromise with the British Government and other parties. In the following pages we give the various statements issued and interviews granted by Mahatmaji since his correspondence with H. E. the Viceroy on the 17th. June 1945 and ending with the breaking up of the negotiations with Mr. M. A. Jinnah on the basis of the Rajagopalachari formula on the 29th. September 1945. On the 17th June, Mahatmaji wrote to the Viceroy from Nature Cure Clinic, Poona as follows :—

Dear friend,—But for the fact that this letter is along the lines of your pre-occupation, I should not have troubled you with any letter from me.

Though there is little cause for it, the whole country and even many from outside expect me to make some decisive contribution to the general good. I am sorry to say my convalescence threatens to be fairly long. Even if I was quite well, I could do little or nothing unless I knew the mind of the Working Committee of the Congress. I pleaded as a prisoner for permission to see them. I plead now as a free man for such permission. If you will see me before deciding, I shall gladly go wherever you want me to, as soon as I am allowed by my medical advisers to undertake long-distance travelling.

I have circulated among friends for private use copies of the correspondence that passed between the authorities and me during detention. I do feel, however, that in fairness to me Government should permit its publication in the press.

My address will be as above till the 30th. June.

I am, yours sincerely, (Sd.) M. K. Gandhi.

Viceroy's Reply—New Delhi—22nd. June 1944

The Viceroy sent the following letter in reply :

Dear Mr. Gandhi,—I have received your letter of June 17. In consideration of the radical differences in our points of view which appeared in our recent correspondence, I feel that a meeting between us at present could have no value and could only raise hopes which would be disappointed.

I am afraid that similar considerations apply to your request to see the Working Committee. You have recently made public your adherence to the 'Quit India' Resolution, which I am afraid I do not regard as a reasonable or practical policy for the immediate future.

If after your convalescence and on further reflection you have a definite and constructive policy to propose for the furtherance of India's welfare, I shall be glad to consider it.

Since you have circulated, without any reference to me, the correspondence which passed between us and it has in consequence appeared in the press, I have given instructions for the publication of the whole of the political letters which were written during your detention.

Yours Sincerely, (Sd.) Wavell.

National Government during War

Gandhiji Explains demand

Interview to British Paper

Mr. Gandhi in a three-hour interview at Pauchgani with Mr. Stuart Gelder, the *News Chronicle* Special Correspondent, on the 11th. July 1944, stated that he was prepared to accept and advise the Congress to participate in a war-time National Government in full control of civil administration. Such a Government would give the military all railways, port and other communication facilities required.

Mr. Gandhi is quoted by Mr. Gelder as saying: "This would involve a declaration now of Indian independence after the war and establishment of a new National Government. While rule by Ordinance would be superseded by normal civil administration, the Viceroy's position will be thus defined: 'He would remain and have complete control with the Commander-in-Chief over British and Indian armies. In other affairs he would be like the King of England—guided by responsible Ministers.' With popular Governments automatically restored in all Provinces, the National Government, with the defence portfolio in its hands, would be genuinely interested in the country's defence.

Mr. Gelder says that Mr. Gandhi stressed that he had no authority to speak in the name of the Congress without consulting the Working Committee, but Mr. Gelder's opinion is that there is no doubt that his views and the Hindu-Muslim proposals as endorsed by him, would be accepted by the Working Committee.

In reply to a question whether, if the Working Committee members were released and the Government felt unable to grant India's wishes, Mr. Gandhi would restart civil disobedience, Mr. Gandhi said, "No. I cannot take the country back to 1942. History cannot be repeated". Mr. Gandhi's opinion is that neither the food situation nor the suffering of the people can be ameliorated without the transfer of civil administration to Indian hands.

Mr. Gelder's opinion is that in view of Mr. Gandhi's uncompromising pacifism, he would cease to function as the adviser of the Congress after independence is gained.

Mr. Gelder also saw Mr. Rajagopalachari whom he quotes as saying: "It is quite possible that the British Government may make a friend of Gandhiji.....It may not be necessary for the British war effort now to befriend him, but for future Indo-British relations."

MR. CHURCHILL'S ATTITUDE

One interesting point is that Mr. Gelder says he laid before the Viceroy a complete report of both his Poona talk and now the Panchgani talk. Mr. Gandhi felt that this was not of much use. He said: "It is common talk among us that whatever the Viceroy wishes personally, he has no authority in the political field. Mr. Churchill doesn't want a settlement. He wants to crush me, if he has been correctly reported. He never denied the report. The beauty of it for me—the pity of it for him—is that no one can crush a Satyagrahi who offers his body in willing sacrifice, thus leaving the spirit free."

The *News Chronicle's* editorial states, "Mr. Gandhi's latest gesture shows a way out of the deadlock. Obviously the pre-requisite must be successful negotiations between Moslems and Hindus." (U. P. A.)

NO DESIRE TO EMBARRASS BRITAIN

The *United Press of India* adds:

"I have no intention of offering civil disobedience to-day. I cannot take the country back to 1942. History can never be respected. Even without the authority of the Congress, if I wanted to do it I could start Civil disobedience to-day on the strength of my supposed influence with masses but I would be doing so merely to embarrass the British Government. This cannot be my object." Mahama Gandhi expressed himself in these words in an interview to Mr. Stuart Gelder, Correspondent of the *News Chronicle*, the exclusive publication whereof in this country has been given to the *Times of India*.

When it was pointed out that the Viceroy would want to know how Gandhiji would influence the Working Committee members before His Excellency would permit a meeting with them, Gandhiji replied that history did not repeat itself. He said: "The whole situation has been reviewed anew. The point, therefore, for me to discuss with the Working Committee is to know how they react to the knowledge I have gained since my release. I have to take up the thread that was broken by the Government in 1942. I was first to negotiate and on failure to offer civil resistance if I thought necessary. I want to plead with the Viceroy. I can only do so when I know the Working Committee's mind."

"NEWS CHRONICLE'S" COMMENT

Only the *News Chronicle* to-day (11th. July) deals with the subject in the course of an editorial covering a column and draws attention to its correspondent, Mr. Stuart Gelder's interview and describes Gandhiji's pronouncement as "of far-reaching significance." The paper states that Gandhiji's views go very close to the Cripps Offer. "This is an unmistakable and important advance. The difference between Mr. Gandhi's and Sir Stafford Cripps' proposals are so small that clearly it offers

a new opportunity to seek an agreement. With reference to Gandhiji's proposals to Mr. Jinnah, the article declares that the communal problem is the thorniest of all, "but the settlement of the issue is so greatly in the interests of Britain, India and world in general that we hope the Government of India will use their good offices as actively as possible in helping to bring about the settlement. Mr. Gandhi's latest gesture certainly shows a way out of a prolonged deadlock towards practical fulfilment of India's political aspirations."

It is difficult on the basis of the reports received thus far to ascertain the truth about Rajaji's Pakistan proposal as endorsed by Gandhiji. Yesterday the *Times'* Bombay Correspondent stated that the negotiations had ceased and Rajaji said that it was futile to place the scheme before the League Executive if Mr. Jinnah could not himself whole-heartedly support it. However, the *News Chronicle* to-day asserts that the scheme is at present under consideration of the League Working Committee.

REACTIONS IN BRITAIN

Although public attention has been naturally-enough focused on Allied military successes on the Eastern Front, Normandy and Italy and the problems created by the frequent "Doodle Bug" (flying-bomb) raids, the latest political news from India—Gandhiji's overtures to the Muslim League and statements on such questions as co-operation with the Allied war effort in the formation of a National Government—are reported in the last few days in the British Press, in most papers briefly and at some length in the *News Chronicle* and the *Manchester Guardian*.

Friends of India consider these developments as highly encouraging but the significance of these has not yet been widely appreciated and certainly not commented upon.

While British reactions to Gandhiji's reported readiness to concede the principle of Pakistan cannot yet be said to have crystallised, the *Times'* Delhi Correspondent's meassage to-day painstakingly enumerates all the difficulties. Describing Gandhiji's offer as "the Hindu offer to the Muslims", the correspondent states that it would be a fair guess to assume that the Hindu sentiment is best pleased with the passages in Rajagopalachari-Jinnah correspondence which assume that Mr. Jinnah has rejected the offer and the negotiations have closed. The correspondent also suggests that the fact that Gandhiji is content to deal with Mr. Jinnah through an intermediary shows that the Hindus are not yet ready to deal with the Muslims on the basis of equality. Moreover nothing was said in the Congress offer about the composition of the proposed National Government. Almost every point in the scheme is criticised adversely, the correspondent concluding by stating that Mr. Rajagopalachari said nothing about the constitutional status of the proposed National Government. (F. O. S. C.)

Statement on Talk with British Journalist

Handing over to Press representatives at Panchgani on the 12th. July 1944 two statements for publication, Mahatma Gandhi explained that they were two sets of notes prepared after discussion with an English journalist. One statement, said Mahatma Gandhi, was intended for publication after the journalist had communicated his impressions of Mahatma Gandhi to the Viceroy in Delhi and the other statement contained notes of talks which the Mahatma gave to the journalist to discuss with anyone who cared to understand Mahatma Gandhi and how his mind was working.

The following is the write-up, the publication of which Mahatma Gandhi agreed to under certain circumstances. This write-up was written following an interview between Mahatma Gandhi and a British journalist:—

I saw Gandhi at Panchgani on the 4th July. I told him "my editor is anxious to help in solving the political deadlock in India. I went to Delhi and I was disappointed. I hope you will not disappoint me."

I asked, "Supposing you saw the Viceroy, what would you say to him?"

He immediately replied: "I would tell him that I sought the interview with a view to helping and not hindering the Allied war effort. But I can do nothing without seeing the members of the Working Committee, for I believe that my authority under the August resolution ended with my imprisonment. It was not revived by my release. You are not interested in my personal views, but you should be, if I spoke as a representative."

I interrupted and said: "The Viceroy and everybody else is interested to know your mind because of your hold on the masses of India."

He replied : "I am a democrat and I cannot exploit that hold except through the organisation in the building of which I had a hand."

But again I interrupted and said : "Before the Viceroy permits you to see the Committee, he would want to know how you would influence the members."

"CONDITIONS OF 1942 DO NOT EXIST TO-DAY"

He said : "History does not repeat itself. The conditions of 1942 do not exist to-day. The world has moved on during the last two years. The whole situation has to be reviewed *de novo*. The point therefore for me to discuss with the Working Committee is to know how they react to the knowledge that I gained since my release. I have to take up the thread that was broken by the Government in 1942. I was first to negotiate, and, on failure, to offer civil resistance if I thought it necessary. I want to plead with the Viceroy. I can do so only when I know the Working Committee's mind. But I tell you that the common talk among us is that whatever the Viceroy may wish personally, he has no authority in the political sphere. Mr. Churchill does not want any settlement. He wants to crush me if he has been correctly reported. He has never denied the report. The beauty of it for me, and the pity of it for him, is that no one can crush a Satyagrahi, for he offers his body as a willing sacrifice and this makes the spirit free."

SECOND STATEMENT

The following is the second statement :

"I saw Mahatma Gandhi on July 4th at Panchgani. I told him : "My Editor is anxious to help in solving the political deadlock in India. I went to Delhi and I was disappointed. I hope you will not disappoint me." I asked him, "Supposing you saw Lord Wavell, how would you begin the talk? What would you say to him?"

He promptly replied that he would tell the Viceroy that he had sought the interview with a view to helping and not hindering the Allies, and it was to this end he had asked for permission to see the members of the Congress Working Committee. He said he felt he had no authority to act in the name of the Congress. According to the canons of Satyagraha, when a civil resister was imprisoned, the authority vested in him automatically came to an end. Hence the need for him to see the members of the Working Committee.

I said : "The Viceroy might feel, as you swear by the August resolution and by the weapon of civil disobedience, your meeting the Working Committee members may only result in their re-investing you with authority to carry on civil disobedience in the name of the Congress and the result will be that when you came out of the interview, you will hold the pistol at the Viceroy's head and say, 'Do this or I start civil disobedience.' That would make things worse than they are to-day."

Gandhi replied : "At the back of that is utter distrust of my profession that I am and have always been a friend of the British. Therefore, I can never use the weapon of civil disobedience during the war unless there was a very grave reason, as for instance the thwarting of India's natural rights to freedom."

My next question was : "Supposing the Working Committee was let out of jail to-morrow and the Government refuses to give India what they want, would you start civil disobedience?"

TRANSFER OF POWER ESSENTIAL

Gandhi replied : "If the Working Committee came out, they would take stock of the situation and discuss things among themselves and with me. I can tell you this, that I have no intention of offering civil disobedience to-day. I cannot take the country back to 1942. History can never be repeated. Even without the authority of the Congress, if I wanted to do it, I could start civil disobedience to-day on the strength of my supposed influence with the masses. But I would be doing so merely to embarrass the British Government. This cannot be my object. But the Working Committee would not sit still while the people are suffering. It is my conviction that we cannot improve the food situation and alleviate the sufferings of the people unless power and responsibility are transferred from British into Indian hands. Without such transfer the attempt of Congressmen and others to alleviate the people's sufferings are most likely to lead to conflict with the Government."

I interrupted and said : "With things as they are, I cannot believe that they will transfer authority now. This Government will not concede the demand for Independence while the war is on."

"WILL BE SATISFIED WITH CONTROL OF CIVIL ADMN."

Gandhi replied that there was a difference between what he would ask to-day and what was asked in 1942. To-day he would be satisfied with a National Government in full control of civil administration. It was not so in 1942. Such a Government would be composed of persons chosen by the elected members of the Central Assembly. "This would mean, declaration of the Independence of India, qualified as above, during the war."

I thought it was a great improvement on the 1942 position. I asked him if the military would control the railways and ports, etc. Gandhi replied that the National Government would let the military have all the facilities that the military might require. But the control would be that of the National Government. Ordinance rule would give place to normal administration by the National Government.

"Will the Viceroy be there?" I asked.

He said: Yes, but he will be like the King of England—guided by responsible Ministers. Popular Government will be automatically restored in all the Provinces, so that both the Provincial and General Governments will be responsible to the people of India. So far as military operations are concerned, the Viceroy and the Commander-in-Chief will have complete control. But it must be possible for the National Government to offer advice and criticisms even in military matters. Thus the portfolio of Defence would be in the hands of the National Government which would be genuinely interested in the defence of the country and may render great assistance in the shaping of policies. The Allied forces would be allowed to carry on their operations on Indian soil. I realise that they cannot defeat Japan without that.

Gandhi made it clear that the expenses of the Allied operation on the Indian soil should not be borne by India.

CONGRESS AND NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

"If a National Government is formed, would you advise the Congress to participate in it?" I asked.

Gandhi replied in the affirmative.

"So it means that if a National Government is formed, the Congress will join and help the war effort. What would be your position?" I asked.

Gandhi replied: I am a lover of peace through and through. After Independence was assured, I would probably cease to function as adviser to the Congress and as an all-war resister I would have to stand aside, but I shall not offer any resistance against the National Government or the Congress. My co-operation will be abstention from interfering with the even tenor of life in India. I shall work with the hope that my influence will always be felt to keep India peace-minded and so affect the world policy towards real peace and brotherhood among all without the distinction of race and colour.

Supposing there is a conflict between the civil and military authorities, how would the dispute be settled? If, for example, civil authorities wanted to use the railway to carry two thousand tons of food and the military authorities wanted it for carrying munitions, what would you advise? I next asked.

Gandhi replied: As I said before, I would not have to advise on such matters. But supposing I had to I can conceive the necessity of allowing precedence to the military. But supposing the military wanted to blow off places or practise manoeuvres in disregard of the lives of people, I would say hands off. The thing is that with mutual trust such difficulties would not arise and if they did, they would be easily adjusted. If there is no trust, I cannot work. I cannot work for Allied victory without trust. If they trusted, a settlement would be easy to achieve. Freedom for India will bring hope to Asiatic and other exploited nations. To-day there is no hope for the Negroes, but Indian freedom will fill them with hope.

Finally I asked: What about the Hindu-Muslim differences?

MR. CHURCHILL'S ATTITUDE

Gandhi replied, if the British meant well there would be no difficulties. Gandhi said in conclusion, "Most of us believe that whatever the Viceroy may wish personally, he has not the authority in the political sphere. Mr. Churchill does not want a settlement. He wants to crush me, if he has been correctly reported. He has never denied the report. The beauty of it for me, and the pity of it for him, is that no one can crush a Satyagrahi for he offers his body as a willing sacrifice and thus makes the spirit free.

In the course of his explanatory statement, Mahatma Gandhi said that

throughout his talks with the British journalist, he had emphasised the fact that he was speaking for himself and in no sense involving the Congress in what he said. He added: "I do not know how far to-day I represent the views of the members of the Working Committee. And about Hindu-Muslim formula which has nothing to do with these two statements, I have not spoken as a Hindu. I have spoken as an Indian first and an Indian last. My Hinduism is my own—I personally think it embraces all faiths. Therefore, I have no authority to speak as a representative of the Hindus. That I respond to mass mind and the masses know me instinctively is a fact which cannot be gainsaid, but I have not built my case upon it.

GANDHIJI EXPLAINS TO PRESSMEN

Mahatma Gandhi issued a statement explaining how he came to make an important pronouncement on the present political situation to a British journalist. Characterising the publication as a "misfire," Gandhiji apologised to the Indian Press and handed over to reporters two statements:

"I had not authorised publication of the interview, of even the substance. I had said that it should not be published unless I authorised its publication and in no case had I ever dreamt that the interview would be published with exclusive rights to any one paper. If it was to be published it should have been broadcast throughout India. Therefore, I had to offer that apology publicly in order to soothe myself and also to show to the Press my appreciation that they have respected my desire to be left alone and also not to report anything which I had not authorised. I know that some things have appeared in the Press without authority but, generally speaking, I must confess the Press has obliged me by refraining from reporting things that are not authorised.

My object in seeing Press people is purely to advance the cause for which I am living, namely the freedom of India through truth and non-violence. I do not seek publicity for the sake of it and just now I feel I would serve the cause better by remaining in obscurity if such things were possible. Therefore, I had warned Gelder that he was not to publish anything from me unless I authorised it. He has published what he has, I have no doubt with the best of intentions but somehow or other I feel he has not served the cause as well as he might have. I passed nearly three hours with him distributed over three days in order that he might know the whole of my mind. I believed him and still believe him, to be a well-wisher of India as he is a lover of his own country and I accepted his word entirely when he told me that he approached me not as a journalist principally, but as one desiring to see that the political deadlock was resolved. Whilst I declared my views with absolute freedom, I told him that his first business should be to go to Delhi and if he could reach the Viceregal throne he should see the Viceroy and give him what impressions he had gathered. Having myself failed to get an interview with the Viceroy, I felt that Gelder being a reporter of a prominent English daily, might be able to serve the cause. Even in South Africa, where I was working in a hostile atmosphere, I was fortunate enough to get journalists and editors to help me when they became impressed by my earnestness and the justice my cause. I was handling the disabilities of Indians in South Africa.

GLARING INACCURACIES

The publication, therefore, at this stage of an abstract of two interviews seems to me to be misfired. I, therefore, propose to give you two notes prepared after discussion with Gelder one of which, namely, the shorter one, after his pilgrimage to Delhi he was free to send to his paper and the other he could discuss privately with anybody who cared to understand me or who Gelder thought should know how my mind was working. You will see after you have read the two notes that he has compressed the two in the report published by him. You will notice also that there are some glaring inaccuracies in the report as published. I want to guard myself against being understood as accusing Gelder of wilful distortion. But I have found it times without number during my public life covering a period of over fifty years that my statements do not admit of being easily abridged or paraphrased. In 1897 I very nearly lost my life when *Reuter* sent an abridged summary of a pamphlet I had written and distributed in India in 1896. The summary was, I have no doubt, an unconscious distortion of what I had written. Fortunately my life was spared when I was lynched and I was able to show that the case based against me on the strength of the summary was utterly wrong. Here the abridgement has no such mischievous consequences. I recall the South African incident in order to emphasise my point.

APPEAL TO JOURNALISTS

All my life I have handled what seemed to be forlorn causes. I have been also a fairly successful journalist but I did not embark upon that calling for a living. It was a venture in order to advertise the cause I was handling and I give this long preface before handling the two statements to fellow-journalists in the hope that they would respond to my earnest wish that they would co-operate with me in dealing with the situation which, if properly handled, may yield promising results for mankind.

I was ill prepared for this ordeal that is in front of me. I am in Panchgani trying to rebuild a broken body. The desire not to see statements published at this stage was also prompted by regard for my health. I want to get well quickly and to be in full working order. Since things are so shaping themselves that I might not be able to carry out that wish, the statement being before the public, I have to watch the reaction and deal with misunderstandings.

I have kept you, gentlemen, away from me and you have been very kind to me. You have waited in the hope that some day I would satisfy your natural inquisitiveness. I am afraid that you will be perhaps oversatisfied because if your chiefs still keep you here you will give me daily summary of reactions in the Press. I do not expect that I shall want to deal with them all, but in so far as there is misunderstanding I will have to remove them if I possibly can.

Discussing the statement Gandhiji said : Throughout this I have emphasised facts that I was speaking for myself and in no sense involving the Congress in what I said. I do not know how far to-day I represent the views of the members of the Working Committee. As regards the Hindu-Muslim formula which has nothing to do with these two statements, I have not spoken as a Hindu. I have spoken as an Indian first and an Indian last. My Hinduism is my own—I personally think it embraces all faiths. Therefore, I have no authority to speak as a representative of the Hindus. That I respond to the mass mind and the masses know me instinctively is a fact which cannot be gain-said, but I have not built my case upon it. As a representative of Satyagraha as I know it, I felt it my duty to pour out my heart to an Englishman who I thought and still think is a sympathetic listener. I claim no further authority for my views. I stand by every word that appears in the two statements I have given to you but I speak on behalf of no one but myself.

Gandhiji Explains Gelder Interview

Mahatma Gandhi met the pressmen at Panchgani on the 13th. July 1944 and explained to them the Gelder interview recently published in the Press.

"I hold the 'Quit India' resolution to be absolutely innocuous" said the Mahatma. "The Gelder interview notes are in no way in conflict with the 'Quit India' resolution as I have interpreted it."

"The question before me", added the Mahatma, "and before all India is how to implement the resolution at the present time, i.e., nearly two years after the passing of the resolution. The Gelder interview notes show the way how it can be done in a perfectly honourable manner."

Explaining the difference between his and Cripps' Proposals, Mahatma Gandhi said : "My proposal is wholly different. The Cripps' Proposals were unacceptable to me for the simple reason that they contemplated almost perpetual vivisection of India and would have created an effective barrier against Indian Independence."

Mahatma Gandhi said : "Some have said that I have admitted that the August resolution has lapsed. Not only have I never said it, on the contrary at Maharsabtra workers' meeting I made it clear to the friends, who had gathered around me at Poona, that no comma of that resolution could be altered by anybody except those who passed it, namely, the Working Committee and finally the A. I. C. C. What I have said and what I re-affirm is that my authority under the resolution had undoubtedly lapsed according to my view of the working of 'Satyagraha'."

"The premature publication of the interview to Mr. Gelder has led to some confusion in the minds of Congressmen. Let me make it clear that the lapsing of my authority has nothing to do with the normal activities of the Congress. What no one can do in the name of the Congress is mass civil disobedience, which was never started and which as I have said, I cannot at the present moment, even in my personal capacity, start."

"The 'Quit India' resolution, I hold to be absolutely innocuous. The Gelder interview notes now published are in no way in conflict with the 'Quit India' resolution, as I have interpreted it and as the joint author of it I have every right to interpret it."

"The question before me and before all India is how to implement the resolution at the present time, i.e., nearly two years after the passing of the resolution. The Gelder interview notes show the way how it can be done in a perfectly honourable manner. Those who approve of the stand I have taken up will naturally support it. People having difficulty are free to refer to me, but their approval of the stand taken by me must not be interpreted to mean suspension of the normal activities of the Congress, and if the Government interfere with those activities the inherent right of individual civil disobedience is in no way suspended under the statement referred to by me. The statements constitute my individual personal effort to end the present deadlock. They are more addressed to the powers that be than to the people. If there is a hearty response, there will be no occasion for civil disobedience, individually or not."

WHOLLY DIFFERENT FROM CRIPPS' PROPOSALS

Answering a question put by a reporter, whether the Cripps' Proposals could be compared with his recent statement, Mahatma Gandhi said: "My proposal is wholly different. The Cripps Proposals were unacceptable to me for the simple reason that they contemplated almost perpetual vivisection of India and would have created an effective barrier against Indian independence. I want to say this without the slightest disrespect to Sir Stafford Cripps. He still remain to me the same friend that he claimed to be when he was here. For me friendships abide in spite of political differences.

"One fundamental element in my attitude is that I shall never be a party to the sale of the rights of the people of the States for the sake of freedom of the people of British India. At the same time I am no enemy of the Princes. I consider myself to be their friend, if any body cares to understand. I am quite prepared to suggest a solution at once honourable to them and to the people."

"PUBLICATION OF INTERVIEW : A MISFIRE"

Mahatma Gandhi issued a statement explaining how he came to make an important pronouncement on the present political situation to a British journalist. This statement was issued by Mahatma Gandhi on his own initiative. The following is the statement:—

Characterising the publication as a "mishfire", Gandhiji apologised to the Indian press and handed over to reporters two statements.

"I had not authorised publication of the interview, or even the substance. I had said that it should not be published unless I authorised its publication and in no case had I ever dreamt that the interview would be published with exclusive rights to any one paper. If it was to be published with exclusive rights, it should have been broadcast throughout India. Therefore, I had to offer that apology publicly in order to soothe myself and also to show to the press my appreciation that they have respected my desire to be left alone and also not to report anything which I had not authorised. I know that some things have appeared in the press without authority, but generally speaking I must confess the press has obliged me by refraining from reporting things that are not authorised.

"My object in seeing press people is purely to advance the cause for which I am living namely, the freedom of India through truth and non-violence. I do not seek publicity for the sake of it and just now I feel I would serve the cause better by remaining in obscurity, if such things were possible.

NOT AUTHORISED

"Therefore, I had warned Gelder that he was not to publish anything from me unless I authorised it. He has published what he has, I have no doubt, with the best of intentions, but somehow or other I feel he has not served the cause as well as he might have. I passed nearly three hours with him distributed over three days in order that he might know the whole of my mind. I believed him and still believe him to be a well wisher of India as he is a lover of his own country and I accepted his word entirely when he told me that he approached me not as a journalist principally, but as one desiring to see that the political deadlock was resolved. Whilst I declared my views with absolute freedom, I told him that his first business should be to go to Delhi and if he could reach the Viceregal throne he should see the Viceroy and give him what impressions he had gathered. Having himself failed to get an interview with the Viceroy, I felt that Gelder being a reporter of a prominent English daily might be able to sever the cause.

"Even in South Africa where I was working in a hostile atmosphere, I was fortunate enough to get journalists and editors to help me when they became im-

pressed by my earnestness and the justice of my cause. I was handling the disabilities of Indians in South Africa. The publication, therefore, at this stage of an abstract of two interviews seems to me to be misfired. I, therefore, propose to give you two notes prepared after discussions with Gelder, one of which, namely the shorter one, which after his pilgrimage to Delhi he was free to send to his paper and the other he could discuss privately with anybody who cared to understand me or who Gelder thought should know how my mind was working.

HANDLED FORLORN CAUSES

"You will see that he has compressed the two in the report published by him. You will notice also that there are some glaring inaccuracies in the report as published. I want to guard myself against being understood as accusing Gelder of wilful distortion. But I have found it times without number during my public life covering a period of over 50 years that my statements do not admit of being easily abridged or paraphrased. In 1907 I very nearly lost my life when Reuter sent an abridged summary of a pamphlet I had written and distributed in India in 1906. The summary was, I have no doubt, an unconscious distortion of what I had written. Fortunately my life was spared when I was lynched and I was able to show that the case based against me on the strength of the summary was utterly wrong. Here the abridgement has no such mischievous consequences. I recall the South African incident in order to emphasise my point. All my life I have handled what seemed to be forlorn causes. I have been also a fairly successful journalist, but I did not embark upon that calling for a living.

"It was a venture in order to advertise the cause I was handling and I gave this long preface before handling the two statements to fellow journalists in the hope that they would respond to my earnest wish that they would co-operate with me in dealing with the situation which if properly handled may yield promising results for mankind.

SPEAKING IN PERSONAL CAPACITY

"I was ill prepared for this ordeal that is in front of me. I am in Panchgani trying to rebuild broken body. The desire not to see statements published at this stage was also promoted by regard for my health. I want to get well quickly and to be in full working order. Since things are so shaping themselves that I might not be able to carry out that wish, the statement being before the public I have to watch the reaction and deal with misunderstandings.

"I have kept you, gentlemen, away from me and you have been very kind to me. You have waited in the hope that some day I would satisfy your natural inquisitiveness. I am afraid that you will be perhaps oversatiated because if your chiefs still keep you here, you will give me daily summary of reactions in the press. I do not expect that I shall want to deal with them all, but in so far as there is misunderstanding I will have to remove them if I possibly can.

"I stand by every word that appeared in the two statements I have given to you, but I speak on behalf of no one but myself,

Britain Using Jinnah as a Cloak

"I live for a cause and if I perish, it is for the cause," declared Mahatma Gandhi, in an informal chat, reiterating his faith in the destiny of a Free India.

A reporter suggested that it might be that His Majesty's Government do not, for the duration of the war, entertain any idea for the transference of power and it was feared that Mr. Jinnah would not be agreeable to accept *Mahatma Gandhi's* suggestion, because a National Government might, in his opinion, consolidate the position of the Hindus in the Centre. Mahatma Gandhi exclaimed: "If Mr. Jinnah does not accept my suggestion or if the powers that be do not, I would consider it most unfortunate. That would show that neither of them wants India to be really free at this juncture and give India a full share in winning the war for freedom and democracy. I myself feel firmly that Mr. Jinnah does not block the way, but the British Government do not want a just settlement of the Indian claim for independence which is overdue and they are using Mr. Jinnah as a cloak for denying freedom to India. I have uttered my warning in the talk I gave to Mr. Stuart Gelder."

Mahatma Gandhi said that it must be the duty of all fair-minded people to break what he called "the diabolical conspiracy to stifle India's aspirations."

I have the firmest faith, he declared, that they may win the war in the trial of brute strength, because brute strength when applied to limitless finances will naturally be supreme, but it will be only a physical victory and lead to another world war. This is the outpouring of a lacerated heart.

Amery Refrains from Comment

Eden Announces Debate in Commons

Mr. Amery, replying to questions by the Labour Members, Mr. Sorensen and Mr. Harvey about Mr. Gandhi's recent pronouncements, said in the Commons on the 13th. July 1944:—I have seen Press accounts of certain statements made recently by Mr. Rajagopalachari and an interview with Mr. Gandhi by a correspondent of the *News Chronicle*. The former apparently referred to proposals for a Hindu-Muslim settlement which Mr. Rajagopalachari discussed with Mr. Gandhi in March 1943. These proposals were recently communicated to Mr. Jinnah. The present position is obscure and I would prefer to refrain from comment until the situation is clearer. I would naturally welcome any effective move towards a settlement between the two major communities.

Mr. Sorensen: Do I understand it is quite possible that in the very near future Mr. Amery will seize this opportunity to resume negotiations or provide facilities for fresh consideration of the whole matter, especially in view of the statement yesterday by Sir Firoz Khan Noon?

Mr. Amery: I understood from Sir Firoz Khan Noon that there was a misunderstanding in the Press and Sir Firoz Khan Noon's statement referred to a settlement after the war and not the present position. Any settlement at all is a matter for the two communities to agree upon between themselves.

Earl Winterton (Conservative): Will Mr. Amery give an assurance that in any negotiations to which the Government of India is party, equal rights are given to the Muslim League as to the predominantly Hindu Congress which is unalterably opposed to the views of the Muslim League and the great majority of Muslims in India.

Mr. Amery: There will be no question of the Government of India exercising one-sided influence on these discussions in any manner.

Sir Herbert Williams (Conservative): Will 50 million people, described as untouchables, have some consideration as well as Mr. Gandhi?

Mr. Amery: They do not enter into these present negotiations, if indeed negotiations are in progress.

Mr. Eden, the Leader of the House, indicated that the Commons would discuss India shortly. Mr. Sorensen asked: In view of the recent developments in India, will an opportunity be given in the very near future for the House to have a discussion on India—certainly before we rise for the summer recess?

Mr. Eden: I have received a request for this and I think it may be possible to arrange it before the House rises.

Mahatma Gandhi Replies to his Critics

Asserting that there was no conflict between the principles enunciated in the August resolution and what he had suggested in the recent interview, Mahatma Gandhi in talk with pressmen at Panchgani on the 14th. July 1944 said: "I have received bitter criticism of my views expressed in the Gelder interview. Some of my correspondents say that under the influence of Moderates and moneyed men I have betrayed the cause of our country. If for nothing else for dealing with such critics, I am glad of the premature publication of the interview.

"I do not want to sail under false colours. The country as well as the Government should know me exactly as I am. I have never concealed the fact that I am a friend of everybody, moderates, moneyed men, Englishmen, Americans or any other, irrespective of caste, colour or persuasion. My belief and practice are directly derived from my non-violence. My non-co-operation is non-co-operation with evil, not with the evil-doer. Underneath my non-co-operation is my earnest desire to wean the evil-doer from the evil or harm he is doing, so that I can give him hearty co-operation. Again, if I associate with so-called Moderates or with moneyed men, I do so to seek their co-operation in the cause I am handling. But I approach them with an open mind so that I correct myself where I find myself in the wrong. I have known of no cause that I have espoused that has suffered because of such association.

"I SEE NO CONFLICT"

"Some critics have suggested that by my present attitude I am lending moral weight to the Allied cause. They forget that my offer, such as it is, is subject to the

condition that the Allies, in this case the British Government, should recognise full independence, qualified during the pendency of the war. I see, therefore, no conflict between the principles enunciated in the August Resolution and what I have now suggested. May I suggest to critics that they should wait till the British Government have spoken. The statements made by me were meant in the first instance for the Government. Mr. Gelder sprung a surprise. He has done so with the best of motives. After all there is a higher power ruling all the actions of human beings."

General Approval in America

Mr. Gandhi's new programme evoked the keenest interest among political observers. In some responsible quarters it is considered an encouraging move from the United Nations' viewpoint, while the authorities stress, it is a move in the right direction but opined that a full understanding of its significance required the closest study of Mr. Gandhi's phraseology the text of Mr. Gandhi's offer is so far not available here. One competent observer said that in the midst of war the British might find it difficult to yield on such a matter as putting military control in the hands of National Government even under the Viceroy.

The Chairman of the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. Sol Bloom, said: "It is a step in the right direction."

Mr. Millard Tydings, Chairman of the Senate's Territories Committee, said: "It looks like progress towards a solution of the Indian problem".

The Republican Senator, Mr. Gerald Nye, said. "It is gratifying to see the possibility to get together on a issue which is threatening to become the most embarrassing".

The Democratic Senator, Mr. Dennis Chaves, said: "It is the Indian nation's problem and I am willing to go along any solution they desire. If they want to co-operate with the British, that is fine. If they want to be anti-British I would not criticise. Nations should be allowed to decide their destinies."

"NEW YORK SUN"

After pointing out that both the Congress and Muslim League have been irreconcilable, the paper says on the 14th. July:—"C. R. and Tej Bahadur Sapru and other moderates in the Hindu Party have not become discouraged and now say they have obtained Mr. Gandhi's assent to the formula which is certainly a great advance. . . . The proposed agreement is obviously less simple than it sounds. Moslem and Hindu populations overlap many geographical sections but, if agreement can be consolidated on the basis of Mr. Gandhi's formula, other things can surely be worked out in time. To make it possible, even this reported concession by Mr. Gandhi, a great deal of change must have been going on in India."

"HERALD TRIBUNE"

The *Herald Tribune*, in a leader on Mr. Gandhi says: "The concessions on Mr. Gandhi's part hold out the prospect of a candid consideration of the real basis of Indian self-government while the war continues and orderly progress towards some kind of settlement which will permit the British pledge to Indians to take effect at the proper time with the minimum strife and friction. One may wonder after the failure of the civil disobedience campaign whether Mr. Gandhi still has prestige and authority to influence the course of events. Although Mr. Gandhi's conciliatory attitude probably reflects the sentiments of the great mass of Indian people, one wonders whether his past errors will not prove a bar to present leadership. In any case, advances are welcome, as the utmost co-operation and most enlightened statesmanship will be needed to solve the problem of India."

Anxiety to end Deadlock

A journalist suggested to Mahatma Gandhi at Panchgani on the 19th July that it had been said by a large section of the overseas Press that he (Gandhiji) had revised his attitude because of the favourable war situation and also because the Congress suffered a heavy defeat and that his latest stand was considered as a climb down.

Mahatma Gandhi, replying, said: I am glad you have put the question exactly as you have seen it in the critical press. I confess that I am not able to go through all press criticisms and therefore, I find myself at a disadvantage. Your question, therefore, is doubly helpful to me.

Let me remind critics at the outset that publicity of the interview (to Mr. Stuart Gelder of the *News Chronicle*) was not of my seeking. As I have already remarked, it was meant for the powers that be. I ask for a dispassionate examination of my proposals on their merits. I should not mind a climb down if it resulted in the attainment of Indian Independence. I may say that the favourable war situation had nothing to do with my proposal, if only for the simple reason that, in the flush of approaching victory, my proposal was not likely even to receive a hearing. But as a lover of peace, not merely in India, but peace among all mankind, I could not but make a proposal for what it is worth. After all, there is such a thing as world opinion, apart from the opinion of authorities.

"A united, enlightened, powerful opinion of the world is bound to affect those who are to-day wielding what appears to be absolute power in waging the war and experience has taught me that one should not be afraid of being misunderstood or of rejection of one's proposal, if it is sound in itself.

"The heavy defeat of the Congress I do not feel at all. I have not a shadow of doubt that this passage through fire and suffering by thousands of Congressmen and Congress sympathisers has raised the status of India and the strength of the people. Throughout all my long public life I have not experienced a sense of defeat, heavy or otherwise. I know many Congressmen are labouring under a sense of frustration. Poor men, they do not know the value of self-suffering. But even that frustration is only momentary. Victory, that is Independence of India as a whole, is a certainty. That it may not come in my life-time is a matter of indifference to me. I can but work for it till the end of my life. Victory will come when God wills it.

PEOPLE'S HEROISM AND SACRIFICE

"Only to-day I wrote to a friend who wanted to know the difference between now and August 1942. From it I quote relevant sentences. I have said the difference 'between now and August '42 is that at that time I had no knowledge of the response the people, both pro-Congress and anti-Congress, would make. Now I know the kind of response they made. The heroism, suffering, and self-sacrifice of those who took part in this struggle are beyond praise, but weighed in the scale of truth and non-violence there are glaring defects in the popular demonstration. And I can only say that India failed to reach her natural goal at the time because of these defects. Whatever may be true of other nations, I have no doubt that India can come to her own fully by truth and non-violent means. In the face of sabotage and the like, rulers have as usual lost their heads and resorted to reprisals unheard of before. I write this under correction. I have asked for an impartial tribunal for the investigation of charges against the Congress and my counter-charges against the Government. Unless I am convinced to the contrary, I shall continue to believe that the molehill of popular violence has been shown on behalf of Government to have been a mountain and the Himalayan violence of the authorities has been generally defended as no more than necessary for the occasion. I must, therefore, refuse to judge popular action by the footrule of truth and non-violence unless I can apply the same measure for Government action. This is one difference. The second difference is the terrible progressive starvation of the people. Whether it is due to wrath of God or incompetence of the rulers, or universal pressure of war is not relevant to the elucidation of my reply. I hold that these two causes mark decisive differences between now and August '42. I would be unworthy of my creed if I failed to make use of all the resources of head and heart that God has vouchsafed to me for discovering a solution of the deadlock. What is that solution is submitted by me. It is nothing less than the present declaration of freedom of India, limited during the war period by the exigencies of the war. This limitation you know. If the offer is accepted, then I would be criminally guilty if I did not advise the Congress to accept it.'

"If my proposal reaches full fruition, what is to-day a war of brute strength would be turned into a war for the liberation of the exploited peoples of the world. Then it would be a war between predominantly moral strength, plus the minimum of brute strength, matched against pure brute strength which is being used for the exploitation of China and the weaker States of Europe.

"Rajaji's offer has seen the light of day only now, but I had personally subscribed to it when I was fasting in prison camp. It is now sixteen months old. For the rest of the offer, I must carry out the contract between Rajaji and myself. He is to bear the brunt of all criticism that might be made about that offer.

MUTUAL SLAUGHTER MUST END

"Finally, I would say to my critics to enter with me into the sufferings, not only of the people of India, but of those whether engaged in the war or not, of the whole world. I cannot look at this butchery going on in the world with indifference. I have an unchangeable faith that it is beneath the dignity of men to resort to mutual slaughter. I have no doubt that there is a way out. I am vain enough to think that my malaria was God-sent, and He used Government as His instrument for discharging me.

"I should be never reconciled to myself if, for fear of hostile criticism or wrath of impatient Congressmen or even possible displeasure of members of the Working Committee, I did not express personal opinion, the acceptance of which I hold must result in bringing peace to the world, even out of the present turmoil."

Gandhiji's Call to Allied Nations

The British news magazine *Cavalcade* sent four questions to Mahatma Gandhi somewhere in July 1944. The fourth question stated: "Will you outline your conception of the role of a free India in the post-war world with special relations to the peoples of the British Commonwealth and the United States of America?"

Gandhiji replied: "If I have any say in post-war policy, a free National Government of India will promote a Commonwealth of all World States naturally including the British Commonwealth and America and also if possible belligerent States so as to reduce to the minimum the possibility of armed conflict between different States."

Amplifying his reply in the course of a talk with journalists at Panchgani on the 21st. July, Gandhiji said: I have answered the question as a confirmed war resister and if I became a party to the August Resolution and if I now suggest what I consider to be perfectly honourable solution, it is because thereby I expect to promote the war resistance effort. I dream of a world where there will be no strife between nations and nations. It is possible only if Great Britain, America and Russia contemplate such world peace, deliberately omit China for, unfortunately China is not able, like Russia, Britain or America to stand alone, though much bigger than all these three powerful nations and more ancient, China is still menaced by Japan and needs all the assistance that she can get before she can rise to her full height. I see no chance for the groaning world unless the three States now demonstrate to the world that they have one mind, that they are not putting forth the effort they are doing for any selfish design but that they are truly fighting for all democracies on the face of the earth.

"My proposal is an acid test and I have no shadow of doubt that its hearty acceptance by Britain will immediately turn the scales and ensure the defeat of the belligerent powers and fill exploited nations of the earth with hope. You see that I am therefore fighting for no small stake."

The following are the three other questions:

Question: Do you agree with inferences being drawn in London following the publication of your interview that you favour full entry of free Indian Government in the war against Japan?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Regarding Pakistan, there is a tendency here to interpret your last contact with Mr. Jinnah as indicating your acceptance of Pakistan. Is this so?

Answer: Mr. Rajagopalachari's formula indicates my way of meeting the communal difficulty. I am indifferent whether it is called Pakistan or not.

Question: In the event of free Indian Government taking control of finance, what policy will you advise regarding Anglo-American capital interests in India?

Answer: My advice would be to respect Anglo-American capital interest, which in the absence of agreement, is not considered by an impartial tribunal inconsistent with Indian national interests.

British Journal Answered by Mr. Gelder

A scurrilous personal attack on Mr. Gandhi by "*Great Britain and the East*" which has been cabled from London to India by Reuter, has deeply offended both Englishmen and Indians here who are hopeful that the Mahatma's approval of the Rajagopalachari's proposals and the statements to me may pave the way to a settlement of the deadlock," writes Mr. Stuart Gelder, "*News Chronicle*" correspondent in the "*Times of India*," from Bombay on the 22nd. July 1944:

"It will interest your readers, continues Mr. Gelder, to know that the British Ministry of Information representative in Chungking approached me early this year and asked if I would write a monthly article for this journal. He informed me that the Ministry was "fathering" the publication and that they took a deep interest in it. I informed the representative that I could not undertake to write anything or to express any views which I was not prepared to write or express in my own paper. On this condition I wrote an article on the Chinese financial situation, which was not passed by the Chinese censor. I told the British Ministry of Information representative that I could not alter any thing I had written and that he had better find someone who was prepared to trim his views. I was not asked to write again, and had I been asked I should have declined.

"May I recall the editorial from the journal which appears in your columns to-day? The writer states: "An Indian observer says, truly enough, that the country is sick to death of the impasse into which Mr. Gandhi has led it. Readers are entitled to ask: What is the name of this observer? When and from where did he make this observation? The journal continues: "There are signs evident enough in the movements of various parties to get away from the deadlock, but a very old and ill man sits tight and affirms he cannot change his attitude and no considerable section of his own party dares challenge his authority.

A LIE

"This is a lie. I believe that I am the only journalist with whom Mr. Gandhi has been generous enough to discuss the political situation in detail. He stated specifically in my interview that he spoke only as an individual, and he has repeated time and again not only to me but to the Viceroy, that he can make no constructive move without the authority of the Working Committee from whom he is separated. The whole point of the interview was that he was prepared to move with a changing world that he would not now offer civil disobedience and that he was prepared to accept a national civil government with limited powers if its establishment were accompanied now by a specific promise of Indian independence after the war. That this is regarded as a change of attitude and a most conciliatory gesture, is proved by the entire Indian press which has devoted columns of discussion to his proposals outlined to me, and is still discussing them.

PERSONAL ATTACK

"Finally comes the personal attack. '*Great Britain and the East*' says: 'India is certainly not without men who think for themselves (a gratuitous tribute for which Indians will be profoundly grateful), and the result of their thought is the growing conviction that Mr. Gandhi must not be allowed to block the way'. Of course, the result of their thought is nothing of the kind. It is, on the contrary, a very deep and widespread conviction that the British Government must allow Mr. Gandhi to pave the way.

"The journal continues: 'Mr. Gandhi himself must be aware of a decline of his influence. He has shown himself eager for interviews at his present retreat but newspaper correspondents no longer flock to his feet. American correspondents, in particular, are fighting shy of a man whose jumbled creed they have more difficulty in understanding. He found them easy game in their search for piquant copy, but for them the politician who remains static in opinion in the changing circumstances has lost much of his value.' This is a tissue of malicious distortion and an insult to every journalist now working in India. I did not waste Mr. Gandhi's time or my own by asking him whether he was aware of a decline in his influence. The Indian press, including such a moderate organ of opinion as the '*Times of India*' which asked permission to publish my cable to the '*News Chronicle*' in full, does not appear to be aware of it, nor do leading industrialists who issued a statement on Sunday nor any informed person in this country outside a home.

"The facts about the attitude of journalists to Mr. Gandhi are clear and irrefutable. There was not a newspaper in India which would not have gladly printed an interview with Mr. Gandhi at any time he cared to give it. The '*Times of India*' had (and still has) a reporter near his residence every day since his release from the prison. When he was at Jubu the chiefs of the '*Associated Press of America*' and the '*American United Press*' and the representative of '*Life and Time*' travelled 800 miles from Delhi on their own initiative to seek an interview. When I was in Delhi recently the representative of one of the most important journals in America, with one of the largest circulations in the world approached me and asked if I thought Mr. Gandhi would give an interview now, as this

journal was most anxious to print his views. Another well-known journalist, whose articles are read by millions of Americans and Englishmen, submitted a list of questions to Mr. Gandhi many weeks ago. It was explained to all these people that Mr. Gandhi's illness made it undesirable for him to see them. It is a gross libel to suggest that he has been waiting for interviewers who would not come. Mr. Gandhi did not ask to see me. "I can testify to the fact that he saw me with some reluctance, but he believed that my paper, which has always tried to present the Indian case with scrupulous fairness, might be able to help in solving this deadlock. I told Mr. Gandhi that I was anxious for this not only for the sake of India, but for the sake of the peaceful future of my own country and for the future of my children and all English children who, I hope, will grow to adult life in a saner, happier world. My only excuse for imposing a strain on a sick man was that I might be able to contribute to this end, and I wish to emphasise that it was entirely my imposition to which Mr. Gandhi responded with such kindness.

This kind of ill-informed intervention by an obscure English journal at a time when all men of good-will are trying to find an honourable solution, is deplorable and can do much harm. Both as an Englishman and a journalist I am ashamed of it. If there is any truth in the suggestion that any British or American journalist is not interested in the views of Mr. Gandhi at this time, it has a reflection on British and American journalism and not on Mr. Gandhi.

Now, we may ask:—"Who is the correspondent in India of *'Great Britain and the East'*? When did he go to Delhi, or Jubu or Panchgani, to observe the reluctance of the newspapermen to see Mr. Gandhi and his frustrated eagerness to see them? What is the precise nature of support given by the British Ministry of Information to this journal? Why is it being 'fathered' in the Far East? These questions demand an answer."

British Rejection of Offer

Gandhi Pained and Amazed

Mahatma Gandhi, in an interview to the Press at Panchgani on the 30th. July on the House of Commons debate, with particular reference to the consensus of opinion expressed in the Commons that the economic development of India was of greater importance than the solution of the political deadlock, said:

"I have noticed this. It has caused me pain as also amazement that the representatives of the British nation, who have a long and distinguished record of heroic fight for political freedom, should divorce the economic development of India from political subjection and give the former preference over the latter. To me it looks like putting the cart before the horse, and I have not yet seen any horse performing the trick of pushing the cart with its nose. It was, therefore, a pleasure to find two noted industrialists, Mr. J. R. D. Tata and Sir Homi Modi, summarily rejecting the idea put forth in the House of Commons and holding out, I suppose, from bitter experience, that the economic development of India was dependent upon the solution of the political deadlock, in other words a proper National Government functioning at the Centre. I suppose they had in mind the gigantic concessions that have been made during recent years to British monopolists. They must have had in mind also the strangling of Indian enterprise. What can be, therefore, happen without a National Government is not the economic development of India, but its exploitation and degradation.

"Members of the House of Commons, not knowing the realities in India, may philosophise and talk of the immediate importance of economic development. I wish they can see what is going on to-day in India. I have a shadow of doubt in my mind that the Bengal famine, as also famines in other parts of India, were man-made and not God-made. I need not impugn the honesty of the rulers who have been sent out to India from Britain.

"QUIT INDIA" RESOLUTION NO HASTY CRY

"I hold that in spite of all the honesty that the British rulers can summon to their assistance, it is impossible for them to get behind the Indian skin and know the real disease. The consensus of opinion in the House of Commons, therefore, is for me a terrible pointer. It confirms me, in my opinion, that the 'Quit India' resolution was no hasty cry, conceived in anger. To put the same in parliamentary language, it demands that India must be now governed by Indians chosen by her own people—not a coterie but the whole mass of people without distinction of race, creed or colour. It is unfortunate that the House

of Commons has once more missed the opportunity of making the issue between the Allied powers and the Axis powers a real issue of Democracy versus Autocracy, or the exploitation of classes or nations by a class or a nation armed to the teeth. My offer presented that issue in the clearest possible language that I could command. It was presented on behalf of all the exploited nations and races of the earth. It is a great pity that the Lords and the Commons have turned down my offer. The Allies will have their victory, but the exploited races will not feel the glow of it. They will know that the seeds of another and deadlier war will be sown by that very victor. I ask myself the question, "Must rivers of blood flow for such an empty victory?"

SUITS AMERY'S CONVENIENCE TO BRUSH ASIDE OFFER

"Mr. Amery knows better, but it is convenient for him to brush aside my offer by saying that the formula is not even the starting point," said Mahatma Gandhi in an interview to the representative of the *News Chronicle*, London, in reply to Mr. Amery's statement that Gandhi's formula is "not even the starting point."

Gandhi added: "Had it not been the starting point, there would not have been all the discussion about my formula that has taken place in the press."

Asked if he shared the feeling that the British Government is planning to by-pass the political problem by focussing public attention on economic issues, Gandhi said: "Imagine the economic regeneration of England if she is politically subjected to an extraneous power. I can understand the ruthless exploitation of the economic resources of India by a power that has held her in bondage for over 150 years, but that will not be economic prosperity for India. It will spell economic dejection and political degradation. I am amazed that British statesmen who happen to be ruling India to-day are not satisfied with the mere rejection of a plan conceived in all honesty but that they should even suggest that the political question should be shelved during the war and that attention should be concentrated on India's economic salvation."

Gandhi Replies to Critics

Mahatma Gandhi, in an interview, at Bombay on the 2nd August replied to a number of questions put by a correspondent of the *London Daily Worker*.

The first question he asked was: "You promise all aid to the Allied war effort. How concretely will the character and quantity of the war effort in India and other countries be changed through the establishment of a National Government in India?"

Mahatma Gandhi replied that the question required a detailed answer, whereas the basis of his offer was to give a moral weight to the Allied cause. This the cause lacked at present.

Asked to explain what he meant by 'adding moral weight' to the Allied cause, Mahatma Gandhi said: "The Allies are to-day making brave declarations about democracy and liberty which to me, or, to put it plainly, to the exploited nations, mean nothing. Mere declarations pleasing to the ear can give no satisfaction to the sufferers. By the 'exploited nations' I mean the Asiatics and Africans. If the Allies are fighting for the democracy, their democracy should include all the exploited races of the earth. Facts, as I see them, prove the contrary. Almost all, if not all, parties agree that India was never so much under foreign domination as it is to-day.

IF INDIA'S DEMAND IS ACCEPTED

"A clear acceptance of the Indian demand for Independence and consequent establishment of a national responsible Government subject to the limitations I have mentioned, would immediately change the character of the Allied cause. It will be immediately differentiated from the cause of the Axis Powers, if the latter's fight can be described as a cause.

Question: "What material gain will accrue to the Allies from the recognition of India as an Independent country, subject to the proviso accepted by you?"

Reply: "I must refuse to descend from the platform I occupy. Surely, if the character of the Allied cause is to be radically altered, as I claim it must be by the acceptance of my offer, all else must follow as a matter of course. But whether it does or not, I want the acceptance of my offer to be on the unadulterated moral basis. It should be enough for the Allies to have the guarantee that their military operations will not, in any way, be adversely affected by India being counted as an

independent nation, not merely in word but in fact. I hold that the effect of the declaration of India's Independence, accompanied by simultaneous sincere action, should by itself take the wind out of the sails of the Axis Powers. And I should be surprised if they do not capitulate almost immediately on the declaration.

"Suppose England was under foreign rule to-day under India, and the ruling power was engaged in war with some other nations and involved England willy-nilly in that war: suppose further, that the foreign power suddenly declared England independent without the later having put up an armed fight for freedom, would not every Englishman enthusiastically support the erstwhile foreign ruler, now turned a friendly power? You can now understand what will happen to India if, when Britain is in sight of victory, she were to declare the independence of India.

"Having said all this to elucidate my answer, I wish to suggest that my offer furnishes a basis for honourable negotiation and release of members of the Congress Working Committee. A discussion of details and filling in the gaps, deliberately left in my offer, must follow a matter of course.

"QUIT INDIA" RESOLUTION

The correspondent then told him that the Tory Press in Britain confuses the people by stating that "Gandhi still adheres to the 'Quit India' resolution." They exploit the fact that the British people are unaware of the burning anti-Fascist and patriotic content of the resolution. The correspondent asked him to clarify his statement that the resolution was innocuous.

Mahatma Gandhi replied: "The whole of the resolution is a noble document. The 'Quit India' slogan is an innocuous and natural cry. The sting was in the sanction clause of the resolution, authorising me to offer mass civil disobedience in the event of the rejection of the National Demand. As I have said, my authority has lapsed and even if it has not, I cannot organise mass civil disobedience at the present moment.

"Therefore the resolution should be read without the sanction clause, and I challenge anybody to take exception to a single word in that resolution. 'Quit India' read together with the Congress offer, that the Allied operations on the Indian soil might continue, means nothing more and nothing less than that British rule should end in its entirety, even while the war is going on—if the war is merely for the deliverance of the exploited nations of the earth."

The correspondent next reminded him of his statement that the Cripps offer contemplated almost perpetual vivisection of India and asked him what it meant. Mahatma Gandhi smiled and said: "Surely, it can mean only one thing: the Cripps offer divided India into Princely India and Democratic India. Is not that vivisection?"

PROTECTION OF MINORITIES

The correspondent told him that a lot of propoganda was being made in reactionary circles in England, particularly by the Tory Press to the effect that if Gandhiji's demand was granted, the minorities would suffer.

Mahatma Gandhi replied: "That is a function belonging to the Rajaji formula. I can only say that the formula contemplates the fullest protection to the smallest minority. If there are any gaps left in it, they will be filled in at the time of mutual discussion that must precede a final settlement"

PROF. CANTLIN'S SUGGESTION

The suggestion that the issue of political sovereignty and Independence in India should be separated from the issue of military security is made by Professor George Cantlin, a writer and philosopher, in a letter to the *News Chronicle*, London on the 2nd. August. He says: "The plan so successfully adopted in Egypt should be reproduced in India. In Egypt, as in India, there were acute communal differences. The Congress has certainly never shown itself more hostile to Britain than the Wafd did at one stage or the negotiations less promising. But a new policy was inaugurated and it was so successful that the recent North African campaign was able to achieve its goal precisely because of it. That Egyptian policy was what it is now popular to call 'functional distinction'—an issue of political sovereignty and independence as separated from the issue of military security in which the British Commonwealth then, as the United Nations in India now, had a vital interest."

LABOUR M. P. ON NEED FOR SETTLEMENT

Mr. Philip Price, M. P. who is an important member of the Labour Party's

Empire Committee, interviewed at London on the 2nd. August said that a political settlement was necessary, but even "if a political settlement comes, an economic settlement will be difficult because the Congress and the Muslim League, as at present run, will not get down to this question."

Referring to Mr. Amery's speech in the Commons, Mr. Price said it was "better than those he had heard for long time" though he was sorry Mr. Amery did not deal with the question of land and rural indebtedness.

Mr. Price admitted that the release of imprisoned leaders "would certainly help to clear the air" but he denied the right of Gandhiji to "speak for all India." He agreed with Gandhiji's rejecting a division of India and hoped Mr. Jinnah's Pakistan was "only a bargaining counter". On the basis of his four years' experience in Russia as the *Manchester Guardian* correspondent, Mr. Price suggested the "Russian model of autonomous States as the idea of India."

Discussing the forthcoming Jinnah-Gandhi meeting, Mr. Price expressed the belief that a "big Hindu-Muslim capitalist combination may agree together to exploit the workers and peasants of India."

Regarding Mr. Clement Davies' proposals for settlement, Mr. Price thought them "worth exploring", especially the inclusion of India under the South-East Asia Command and also welcomed anything making for India's participation in the United Nations' war effort "with equal prestige."

In contrast to Mr. Price, Mr. Sorensen M. P. considered Mr. Amery's speech as having dismally failed to seize the opportunity presented."

BRITISH AIRMEN'S APPEAL TO GOVT.

An appeal to His Majesty's Government to end the present political deadlock in India was made by members of the Royal Air Force at London on the 2nd. August.

"We cannot but deplore the ignoring of Mr. Gandhiji's recent proposal for a National Government in India which could mobilise India's millions for real war effort along with the other United Nations." The above extract from a letter to the *Daily Worker* signed by forty-one members of the Royal Air Force shows how strong is the feeling in the forces at the continued deadlock in India.

"The spectre of famine is again beginning to haunt the much-tried people of India," the letter goes on. "because of this we in the armed forces regard the failure to establish representative government in India as a grave handicap to the overthrow of Japanese fascism."

Gandhiji To Perform 'Symbolic Act' On August 9

Mahatma Gandhi issued the following statement to the press from Sewagram on the 5th. August in connection with the forthcoming 9th of August:—"Many Congressmen ask me how to celebrate the forthcoming 9th of August. That date was a turning-point in India's fight for freedom. I had intended to spend 9th August 1942 in peaceful introspection and to inaugurate negotiations for a settlement. But the Government or fate had decided otherwise. The Government went mad, so did some people. Sabotage and the like were resorted to and many things were done in the Congress name or in my name. I am aware that I do not represent the Congress mind always. Many Congressmen repudiate my non-violence. The Working Committee is the only body which can legitimately and truly represent the Congress.

"As an old servant of the country, however, I can advise and Congressmen are at liberty to treat my advice as instructions. I have already said that mass civil disobedience cannot be offered now but mass civil disobedience is one thing and individual action in the sense of self-respect and liberty is wholly another. It is a universal duty for all time, the discharge of which requires no sanction save that of one's own conscience.

"In a previous note I have pointed out when and where the duty arises. But the forthcoming 9th is a special occasion. There has arisen much misunderstanding about Congress purpose and mine. I must avoid all avoidable risks. Therefore, in all places except in Bombay my advice is not to disregard special police prohibitions for that day. For Bombay I have already given advice through the Mayor of Bombay. I need not reiterate the advice here. I have selected Bombay as the most suitable place for the simple reason that it is most easily accessible to me and is the place where the historic meeting of August 1942 was held. Whatever it is to be, it will be a symbolic act. Curiosity is natural and pardonable, but I plead for restraint. The self-imposed curb will be good for the country. My work will be finished if I succeed in carrying conviction to the human family that every man

or woman, however weak in body, is the guardian of his or her self-respect and liberty. This defence avails though the whole world may be against the individual resister. I have suggested the present symbolic procedure to see whether those who organise the demonstration have co-operation from the local public. Freedom of 400 million people through purely non-violent effort is not to be gained without learning the virtue of iron discipline not imposed from without but sprung naturally from within. Without the requisite discipline non-violence can only be a veneer.

"The second thing that I should like done on the forthcoming 9th August is for those who have gone underground to discover themselves. They can do so by informing the authorities of their movements and whereabouts or by simply and naturally doing their work in the open without any attempt to evade or elude the police. To go underground is to elude the police. Therefore real discovery is to discover oneself to the party eluded. Nothing should be done unless the conviction has gone home that a particular action is essential for the cause. In the absence of such a conviction those who see this note may ignore it and should follow what they consider best for the country. What everyone should do on the 9th whether they have conviction as to non-violence or not or whether they are Congress men or not is to carry out on the 9th the whole or any part of the fourteen-fold programme reiterated in my recent note, just for example, everyone should spin. Communities should find ways of giving expression to mutual understanding and brotherhood. Hindus and Muslims may organise joint programmes of prayers. God may bless the Qaid-e-Azam and me with wisdom to reach a common understanding in the interest of India. Hindus should visit Harijans and render them the service they may need. The spirit of service and helpfulness should pervade the atmosphere everywhere. I have experienced friendliness from Englishmen and Americans wherever I have met them, whether officials or laymen. I invite their co-operation especially on the 9th. Let them realise that the August resolution was not conceived in hatred. It was an unvarnished statement of the natural right of the people of this land. To those who share my faith I would advise fasting and prayers on the auspicious day. This must not be a mechanical act. It must be done without ostentation for self-purification and penance. Its uplifting power is capable of being tested by every individual for himself. If the demonstration is carried out in the spirit in which I have conceived it, I have no doubt that will lead to an early end of the misery of the masses."

Congress—League Settlement

"Sikh Friends are Unnecessarily Perturbed"

"I would urge critics not to mind my inconsistencies, so-called or real. Let them examine the question on merits and bless the effort if they can," observed Gandhiji in an exclusive interview to the "*United Press*" special representative on the 8th August when the latter sought clarification on his statement issued from Panchgani wherein he stated "All my recent declarations are quite consistent with all my previous declarations on the communal problem."

The special representative quoted Gandhiji's writings from '*Harijan*' from 1940 to 1942 wherein Gandhiji criticised the partition of India as a sin and unpatent truth etc., and asked if those declarations were consistent with his support to Mr. Rajagopalachari's formula which envisages partition of India.

Gandhiji said: "Though I would avoid answering all questions on the subject before the forthcoming meeting between the Quaid-i-Azam and me, I must not postpone answering yours. I know my present attitude has puzzled and pained many people. I have not revised the opinion quoted by you. At the same time that I made the statement you refer to, I was also party to the self-determination resolution of the A-I. C. C. I hold that Rajaji's formula gives effect to that resolution. I would however urge critics not to mind my inconsistencies so-called or real. Let them examine the question on merits and bless the effort if they can."

Answering another question whether in the event of failure of the Gandhi-Jinnah talks he would withdraw his support to Rajaji's formula or would the formula stand, Gandhiji said, "I do not believe in dying before my death. I do not approach the forthcoming visit with the expectation of failure. I always hope for the best and prepare for the worst. I would therefore ask you not to anticipate failure. Ask me when failure stares you and me in the face."

Referring to the apprehension of the Sikhs expressed in the recent All-Parties Sikh Conference that Gandhiji would make further surrender to the Muslim League,

Gandhiji said : "My Sikh friends are unnecessarily perturbed. I can settle nothing for anybody but myself. The Congress resolution is a sacred trust and I have no doubt that it will be discharged fully. Brave people are never frightened by bogeys. Let the Sikh friends examine the proposal on merits. And if they find an evident flaw in it I shall correct it and so I am sure will the Quaid-i-Azam if he is satisfied that there is flaw."

Gandhi's Reply to Bengal Deputation

The group of Bengal Congressmen led by Mr. *Kiron Sankar Roy*, leader of the Bengal Assembly Congress Party, discussed with Gandhiji at Wardha on the 11th. August Rajaji's formula for communal settlement and explained to him how people in Bengal viewed the formula. There was a frank exchange of views and the Bengal leaders were relieved that they had been able to apprise Gandhiji of the real feeling in Bengal over the formula and that Gandhiji would bear in mind the position of Bengal in his talks with Mr. Jinnah.

The application of the formula to Bengal on district-wide basis, it appears, would have the result of cutting up the province into two areas, one of which will comprise three-fourths of Bengal with a total population of 50 millions, Muslims forming about 70 per cent. Economically this area is rich and the population of Hindus in this area will be considerably more than even the total population of Hindu Bengal that would be left behind. Economic considerations would necessitate the tacking of Hindu Bengal to neighbouring provinces like Orissa and Bihar, and if the formula is to be given effect to, it is pointed out that the process of dismemberment of Bengal would be complete. Bengal leaders are emphatic that it would be very difficult for the people of Bengal who had struggled with good results against the Curzonian partition three decades ago, to yield to any kind of partition now or in the future as Bengal, situated as at present, is culturally and linguistically one single homogeneous unit, perhaps the largest in India. It is, however, affirmed that Bengal accepted the principle of self-determination, but it should be applied on the linguistic and cultural basis as embodied in the Congress resolution.

The main criticism against Rajaji's formula is based on sentiment and the reply may be that sentimental grounds can be advanced by both sides and Muslims may equally well insist that their sentiment demands separate existence. If the establishment of a State based on violence is to be ruled out, it is asked, and if foreign rule is to be ended, what is the alternative before the country? It is pointed out that critics of the formula have not yet suggested any alternative means of advancing the cause of Indian independence. There is the other criticism that even if Gandhiji and Mr. Jinnah came to an agreement, there is nothing to indicate that the British Government is in any mood to transfer power. No one in Congress circles here is under any illusion that the moment Gandhiji and Mr. Jinnah produce an agreed demand, independence will be ushered in.

Gandhiji told a number of his interviewers that they may assume that independence would not come within his life-time. If Gandhiji and Mr. Jinnah came to an agreement on the communal question, it is believed that it will have removed the greatest obstacle in the way of Indian freedom and if other and new obstacles are raised by the power-that be, they will have to be dealt with by them.

LEAGUE AND INDEPENDENCE ISSUE

The position that clearly emerges from the talks which many leaders has with Gandhiji in recent weeks is that Independence will be a necessary preliminary to the application of the right of self-determination. It is essential that the League must first agree to throw in its lot with the Congress in demanding the transfer of power from Britain and there should be active co-operation, not merely silent sympathy. The right of self-determination may be conceded but details must necessarily await the achievement of Independence. If the coming Bombay talks produce good results on these preliminary points, one may expect a conference of all interests affected by the concession of the right of self-determination to be convened for considering details. All details such as the protection to be afforded to the minorities and the structure of the machinery for the administration of common subjects will await the conclusion of the Bombay talks and the achievement of Independence.

It was understood that Gandhiji informed Bengal Congress leaders that they were at liberty to express their opinion on the merits of Rajaji's formula.

Mr. K. S. Roy on Talks with Gandhiji

Mr. Kiron Sankar Roy, the Bengal Congress leader, issued a statement on the interview that he and six other prominent Congressmen from Bengal had with Mahatma Gandhi recently on the Rajagopalachari Formula at Sewagram. "We submitted to Mahatmaji that, this being a matter which concerned Bengal vitally, nothing should have been done and nothing should be done in future without consulting the Provinces concerned. We are glad to state that Mahatmaji has agreed not to make anything final without consulting the Provinces concerned."

Mr. Roy adds: "We also pointed out to him that, in view of his blessing given to Rajaji's scheme, it was difficult for the public in general and Congressmen in particular to judge the scheme on its merit. We have not the slightest doubt that, if there had not been this blessing of Mahatmaji, the scheme would have been summarily rejected by the nation. But to-day any adverse criticism of it may be interpreted as want of confidence in Mahatmaji. As no Congressman would like to be misunderstood in that fashion, he hesitates to discuss the scheme freely and frankly or even to express his honest opinion to Gandhiji himself. Gandhiji said that honest, *bona fide* criticism does not embarrass him, but helps him in guiding the country to its proper goal. He expressed himself very strongly on the subject and further said that Congressmen would be failing in their duty if they did not express their views freely and fearlessly even though his name was associated with it. We therefore hope that no Congressman will hesitate to express his honest opinion to Mahatmaji."

Of the C. R. formula itself, Mr. Roy says that it means, *inter alia*, the partition of Bengal into Hindu Bengal and Muslim Bengal, the former being a part of Eastern Pakistan and the latter a part of Hindustan. It involves the admission of the two-nation theory, and also goes against the Congress resolution inasmuch as it envisages the formation of units on religious and communal basis.

Viceroy Rejects Gandhi's Offer

No National Govt During War

Mahatma Gandhi in a letter to the Viceroy said that he was prepared to advise the Congress Working Committee to declare that in view of the changed conditions mass civil disobedience, envisaged by the resolution of 1942, could not be offered and that full co-operation in the war effort should be given by the Congress, if a declaration of immediate Indian independence was made and a National Government responsible to the Central Legislature was formed.

The Viceroy in his reply rejected this offer and observed that it was impossible during the period of hostilities to bring about any change in the constitution by which means alone a National Government, such as Gandhiji suggested, could be made responsible to the Central Assembly. He added that until the war was over, responsibility for defence and military operations could not be divided from the other responsibilities of Government and until hostilities ceased and the new constitution was in operation, His Majesty's Government and the Governor-General must retain their responsibility over the entire field.

The Viceroy also referred to the conditions, the fulfilment of which was necessary for the bestowal of freedom on India after the war. The object of these conditions, he said, was to ensure the fulfilment of the duty of His Majesty's Government to safeguard the interests of the racial and religious minorities and of the depressed classes and their treaty obligations to the Indian States.

The following correspondences passed between H.E. the Viceroy and Mr. Gandhi:—

Mahatmaji's Letter—Dilkusha, Panchgani, 15th July, 1944

Dear friend,

You have no doubt seen the authentic copies, now published in the Indian press, of the statements given by me to Mr. Gelder of the "News Chronicle." As I have said to the press, they were meant primarily to be shown to you. But Mr. Gelder, no doubt with the best of motives, gave the interview premature publicity. I am sorry. The publication will nevertheless be a blessing in disguise, if the interview enables you to grant at least one of my requests contained in my letter of 17th June, 1944.

I am, yours etc. (Sd.) M. K. Gandhi.

His Excellency the Viceroy.

Viceroy's Camp.

Viceroy's Reply—New Delhi, 22nd July, 1944

Dear Mr. Gandhi,

Thank you for your letter of 15th July. I have seen the statements you made to Mr. Gelder, and your subsequent explanation of them. I do not think I can usefully comment at present, except to repeat what I said in my last letter that if you will submit to me a definite and constructive policy I shall be glad to consider it.

Yours sincerely, (Sd.) Wavell.

Gandhi's Second Letter

As at Ashram Sevagram, Camp Panchgani 27th July, 1944.

Dear friend,

I must admit my disappointment over your letter of the 22nd instant. But I am used to work in the face of disappointment. Here is my concrete proposals.

I am prepared to advise the Working Committee to declare that in view of changed conditions mass civil disobedience envisaged by the resolution of August 1942 cannot be offered and that full co-operation in the war effort should be given by the Congress, if a declaration of immediate Indian independence is made and a National Government responsible to the Central Assembly be formed subject to the proviso that during the pendency of the war the military operations should continue as at present but without involving any financial burden on India. If there is a desire on the part of the British Government for a settlement, friendly talks should take the place of correspondence. But I am in your hands. I shall continue to knock so long as there is the least hope of an honourable settlement.

After the foregoing was written I saw Lord Munster's speech in the House of Lords. The summary given by him in the House of Lords fairly represents my proposal. This summary may serve as a basis for mutual friendly discussion.

Yours Sincerely, (Sd) M. K. Gandhi

Viceroy's Reply—New Delhi—15th. August 1944

Dear Mr. Gandhi,

Thank you for your letter of 27th July. Your proposals are (1) that you should undertake to advise the Working Committee (a) "that in view of changed conditions mass civil disobedience envisaged by the resolution of August 1942 cannot be offered and (b) "that full co-operation in the war effort should be given by the Congress" provided (ii) that His Majesty's Government (a) declare immediate Indian independence and (b) form a "National Government" responsible to the Central Assembly "subject to the proviso that during the pendency of the war the military operations should continue as at present but without involving any financial burden on India."

2. His Majesty's Government remain most anxious that a settlement of the Indian problem should be reached. But proposals such as those put forward by you are quite unacceptable to His Majesty's Government as a basis for discussion and you must realise this if you have read Mr. Amery's statement in the House of Commons on July 28th last. They are, indeed, very similar to the proposals made by Moulana Abul Kalam Azad to Sir Stafford Cripps in April 1942 and His Majesty's Government's reasons for rejecting them are same as they were then.

3. Without recapitulating all these reasons in detail, I should remind you that His Majesty's Government at that time made it clear (a) that their offer of unqualified freedom after the cessation of the hostilities was made conditional upon the framing of a constitution agreed by the main elements of India's national life and the negotiation of the necessary treaty arrangements with His Majesty's Government, (b) that it is impossible during the period of hostilities to bring about any change in the constitution by which means alone a "national Government" such as you suggest, could be made responsible to the Central Assembly.

The object of these conditions was to ensure the fulfilment of their duty to safeguard the interests of the racial and religious minorities and of the depressed classes and their treaty obligations to the Indian States.

4. It was upon the above conditions that His Majesty's Government invited Indian leaders to take post in an interim Government which would operate under the existing constitution. I must make it quite clear that until the war is over, responsibility for defence and military operations cannot be divided from the other responsibilities of government and that until hostilities ceases and the new constitution is in operation, His Majesty's Government and the Governor-General must retain their responsibility over the entire field. So far as

the question of India's share of the cost of the war is concerned this is essentially a matter for settlement between His Majesty's Government on the one hand and the Government of India on the other hand and the existing financial arrangements can only be re-opened at the instance of one or the other.

It is clear in these circumstances that no purpose would be served by discussion on the basis which you suggest. If, however, the leaders of the Hindus, the Muslims and the important minorities were willing to co-operate in a transitional government established and working within the present constitution, I believe good progress might be made. For such a transitional government to succeed there must, before it is formed, be agreement in principle between Hindus and Muslims all important elements as to the method by which the new constitution should be framed. The agreement is a matter for Indians themselves. Until the Indian leaders have come closer together than they are now, I doubt if I myself can do anything to help. Let me remind you too that minority problems are not easy. They are real and can be solved only by mutual compromise and tolerance.

6. The period after the termination of hostilities for which the transitional government would last would depend on the speed with which the new constitution should be framed. I see no reason why preliminary work on that constitution should not begin as soon as the Indian leaders are prepared to co-operate to that end. If they can arrive at a genuine agreement as to the method of framing the constitution, no unnecessary time need be spent after the war in reaching final conclusions and in agreeing to treaty arrangements with His Majesty's Government. There again the primary responsibility rests on the Indian leaders.

Yours sincerely
(Sd.) Wavell.

British Govt. not to part with Power

Interviewed by the "Associated Press" on the Viceroy's reply Mahatma Gandhi said on the 18th August:—"The published correspondence shows that I left no stone unturned to confirm to the Viceregal requirements. The final Government reply is positive proof that the British Government have no intention of winning public support. I do not confine myself to the Congress, since its main demand has been backed by almost all political parties. So far as the technical winning of the war is concerned, they have evidently no need for such support. Moral support they seem to despise. Boiled down, the Viceroy's proposition means that unless all the main parties agree as to the constitution of the future, and there is agreement between the British Government and the main parties, there is to be no change in the constitutional position, and the Government of India, as at present, is to be carried on. The names of parties given in the Government reply are illustrative only. I have no doubt that on due occasions more will be exhibited as from a conjurer's bag and who knows how and when the British Government will agree to surrender control. It is as clear as crystal that the British Government do not propose to give up the power they possess over the 400 millions, unless the later develops strength enough to wrest it from them. I shall never lose hope that India will do so by purely moral means.

"The problem of food meanwhile remains unsolved. Only a National Government, envisaged by me, can provide a genuine solution. Any other will be a mirage. It is most unfortunate that at the critical juncture the Qaid-i-Azam has fallen ill and under medical advice cannot see me till he is free from his illness. A proper heart agreement between us can induce a revision of the firm refusal of the British Government as conveyed through His Excellency's letter. Let us all pray that the Qaid-i-Azam may be soon restored enough to see me and that God may so dominate our hearts as to lead us to a right solution.

"I would like to assure all parties to be affected by our solution that we will not come to any terms which will compromise or ignore a single interest. The Rajaji formula is capable of being amended. If it is found to contain flaws as many as Hindu and Sikh friends have suggested it does, no solution is likely to last unless, on the face of it, it is right and is acceptable to the people of India as a whole."

All India Spinners' Association

Gandhiji's Appeal

The following is a gist of *Mahatma Gandhi's* speeches at the meetings of the All-India Spinners' Association held at Sevagram in September 1944:

Mahatma Gandhi said he had learnt something of what the country had gone through during the last two years. Events of an age seemed to have been crowded in those two years. When the whole country was passing through untold suffering, the Charkha Sangh could not escape unscathed. They could not shirk their duty for fear of Government repression. Such a thing would have surprised him and pained him deeply. He had deliberately kept the Charkha Sangh a non-political organisation and had hoped that, whatever happened in the country, the Charkha Sangh would not be affected by it. But his hopes had been falsified, Charkha Sangh had come in for a heavy hand from the Government.

The Charkha Sangh was born of the deep conviction that, if India was to live as a non-violent State, it could do so only through the spinning wheel and all it meant. If India could win independence through non-violence, i.e., through the spinning wheel, it would augur good for the whole world. But he could not make India believe in Charkha as a means for independence by just talking about it. Therefore, in order to give his ideas a practical garb, he had established the Charkha Sangh. Through the Sangh he had hoped to carry the message of the spinning wheel to every village and every home and thus demonstrate to the world how the Charkha could become the basis of a non-violent society. But in view of the happenings of the last two years, he could not help feeling that the Charkha Sangh had fallen short of that object.

All these things had made him think intensely as to why the Sangh had failed and what changes it should undergo in order to make a new beginning and attain its ideal in the quickest time possible. If it had penetrated every home in the 700,000 villages of India who could crush it. The Government could not imprison forty crores of men and women, nor could it shoot down all of them.

Had the Sangh succeeded as it ought to have in realising its object, that by itself would have brought us Swaraj. If the Sangh had succeeded in its mission, it would have generated the requisite non-violent strength and guided the popular enthusiasm in the right channel. Instead of despair and frustration there would have been a new hope in every Indian heart.

Mahatma Gandhi said he had presented the Congress with the message of the Charkha years ago. The Congress took it up but half-heartedly. Congressmen perhaps felt that they needed his services, and so they put up with the spinning wheel as one of his fads. They mechanically repeated the formula that Swaraj hung on the spinner's thread. If the Charkha Sangh had succeeded in demonstrating the power of the wheel, it would have enabled them to have a living faith in non-violence. Congressmen would have sought the help and guidance of the Sangh in order to carry the message of the Congress to the villagers. Instead he had been faced with the painful spectacle of the Sangh looking up to the Congress for help. He had told them often enough that they should forget politics and concentrate on the wheel with all its implications. That and that alone, he considered, to be true politics, *Satvic* politics. Every village that assimilated the message of the wheel would begin to feel the glow of Independence. Other village industries would automatically follow in the wake of the wheel and so would basic education and serve as a means of quickening the intelligence of the villagers. The whole conception of the Basic Education Scheme was the utilisation of all the bodily faculties in order to quicken the intelligence. All his latest discoveries, e.g., the discovery of village industries, basic education, etc., had come to him through the contemplation of the spinning wheel. To him the wheel represented a philosophy of life, a living symbol of Ahimsa. It meant the creation of a society based on non-violence, free from exploitation of any kind. If they could succeed in bringing that awakening to the 700,000 villages, it would mean independence for the whole of India. To-day the so-called Gandhites were charged with being wooden, dull and ignorant as a rule. He had been told that Gandhism could not stand before Communism and similar philosophies that had captured the imagination of the West. In fact Gandhism has become a term of reproach. But the very term Gandhism was a misnomer. However he would say this that those who believed

in the cult of the Charkha should be able to convert others to their view by dint of their knowledge of the science of the Charkha and reasoning.

"DEMONSTRATION OF AHIMSA IN ACTION"

Many of them had taken to the Charkha because of their faith in him. Faith was good, But he wanted them to combine it with knowledge, so that they could hold their own against sceptics. If the Charkha Sangh was to fulfil its expectations, its members should be living examples of non-violence. Their whole life should be a demonstration of Ahimsa in action, they should have healthy bodies and healthy minds. If they had been what they should be, the villagers would have taken to the Charkha most enthusiastically. The problems of communal disharmony and untouchability, etc., would have vanished like dew before morning sun. He knew that it was a difficult job. He himself had not been able to master the art satisfactorily. He had lived in Sevagram for more than six years. The Ashram offered the villagers some economic relief, rendered to them every kind of service that it could, and yet it had not succeeded in introducing the wheel in every home. Why was it so? Was his faith in the power of the wheel unwarranted? He did not think so. His faith remained undimmed; if they had failed in translating it into action, it was due to his and his associates' imperfections. It was in order to enable the Sangh to attain what it had failed to attain so far that he had suggested breaking it up into its component parts. He would suggest distributing the money that the Sangh possessed among able workers who should go to the villages with the determination of devoting their lives to the spread of the wheel.

To-day, the Charkha Sangh was a highly centralised institution. To-morrow it would become completely decentralised. All the workers who would go to the villages would run their independent centres. The central office would inspect their work and give them necessary guidance so that the principles for which the Sangh stood did not suffer neglect.

MAIN WORK LIES IN VILLAGES

Elucidating his idea, Mahatma Gandhi said: "The whole conception of the wheel has its roots in the villages and the consummation of the Sangh's existence would be in its diffusion in the innumerable villages in India. In order to attain that end, the Sangh should make the following changes in its mode of work: (A) As many workers as are ready and whom the Sangh may select should be sent to the villages to take up independent work; (B) The activities of the Sangh in regard to production centres and sales bhandars for the towns should be limited; (C) The scope of the training centres should be extended and the course of studies made more comprehensive; and (D) if a province or a district wishes to become independent of the central office, it should be allowed to do so."

Mahatma Gandhi indicated that a worker should enter the life of the villagers in all its aspects, serve them, help them and guide them in every way, so that he could win their confidence and mould their lives in such a way as to lay down the basis of a non-violent society.

A joint board of Charkha Sangh, Gram Udyog Sangh and Talimi Sangha should be formed and it should issue necessary directions from time to time for giving effect to the new policy. They should consider themselves jointly responsible for the full evolution of Ahimsa. Its full evolution would mean complete independence. These three organisations should so perfect themselves in knowledge and technical equipment that the country's political thought should depend on them instead of their depending on the changing politics of the orthodox type. This should be self-evident to them.

In short, concluded Gandhiji, the workers of these three organisations should be models of Ahimsa in action in every respect. If this is not possible, we should tone down our ideal. The present state of affairs is, to say the least, most 'anomalous.'

"CHINESE EFFORT PALES INTO INSIGNIFICANCE"

His object, he pointed out, was not to find fault but to bring home to them the reality of the situation. A proper appreciation of the reality was the hallmark of wisdom. There was no doubt that the Sangh had done tremendous amount of philanthropic work. It was the biggest co-operative organisation in the world. He had read the book on China's Co-operatives that Pt. Jawaharlal had sent to him. The Chinese effort in his opinion paled into insignificance before the Charkha Sangh. He did not wish to belittle the Chinese effort. It had produced great results. The Sangh had a much wider horizon. It had distributed 4½ crores of rupees among

the poor with a capital of 25 lakhs. But that was not enough. He expected of it something much greater, much higher. And in that the Sangh had failed. Why was it so? They did not lack self-sacrificing workers. In fact, it gladdened his heart to see so many willing self-sacrificing men and women who were ready to lay down their all at the feet of the Motherland. A country which could produce such men and women, could never come to grief. He knew that independence was coming and coming fast, but the question was what part would the Sangh have played in bringing it about?

EXHORTATION TO WORKERS

A discussion followed in which some of the members pointed out that the Charkha had been introduced as an economic measure in the first place. Though they had heard Gandhiji associate it with Ahimsa, they had not understood that it could by itself create a non-violent social order.

Gandhiji explained to them that the wheel could be a symbol of violence or non-violence. After all the wheel was there during the reign of the Moghul Emperors, and the spinners and weavers were none the better for having taken up the wheel and the loom.

From ancient but historical times the wheel had been a symbol of the slavery of women and the arrogance of the rulers. The spinners and weavers were subjected to untold suffering. He had taken up the wheel as a symbol of non-violence and deliverance of the masses through it. It dawned on him that the same wheel could be made the means of ending exploitation and misery of the poor. It could be used to infuse new life in the 7,00,000 villages of India. The same knife that took away life in the hands of a butcher could become the means of saving life in the hands of a surgeon.

If they were truly non-violent, there would be no mutual bickerings, no fear in their hearts. They would become flauntless and truthful. "Even the best of us are often afraid to speak out the whole truth. Why should it be so? We should be courteous but firm and clear in speaking out the truth."

He confessed that he had not laid as much emphasis as he should have on the Charkha as a symbol of non-violence in the past. But it was never too late to mend. He had now suggested the remedy. But he did not want them to adopt it unless it appealed to both their head and heart. He did not want to proceed unless he could carry them with him fully. He was not going to look up for new co-workers. He could not create a new world like Vishwamitra. But this much he would make clear that he could not contemplate a highly industrialised and independent India with equanimity. That independence could not bring peace and happiness to the forty crores of India's masses. In that society, the prosperity of the few would be purchased at the expense of the exploitation and misery of many. It would mean the old law of the jungle.

His mind had been trained to think differently. He would like to take with him the weak, the lame and the halting as well and if by doing so his progress was slowed down he would not mind it. The Independence which could bring relief and happiness to the lowliest and the last could only come through Ahimsa, that is to say, through the wheel. Therefore, if they could make the Sangh serve that purpose, they would have all his co-operation. If not, they could continue as a mere philanthropic organisation but that would not be enough for him. In that case they must leave him to plough his lonely furrow.

The All India Muslim League

Working Committee—Lahore—29th. July 1944

Proceedings & Resolutions

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League met at Lahore on the 29th. July 1944 at the Mamdot villa where the League President Mr. Jinnah was staying with the Nawab of Mamdot, President of the Punjab Provincial Muslim League.

Of the 21 members of the Working Committee all excepting two viz. Begum Mohd. Ali Sahiba and Mr. Latif-ul-Rehman attended the meeting. In view of the important nature of the matters, which were expected to come up for discussion before the Working Committee the members made it a point to come up to Lahore. The members were very uncommunicative and even the most vocal among them resisted all attempts of the waiting Pressmen to say, even a word about their own views regarding the matters which were to come up before them before the meeting started. The members became even more uncommunicative after the meeting.

Mr. Jinnah, on coming out of the meeting, was surrounded by the waiting journalists, including two Australian War Correspondents.

Replying to the question asked by the journalists as to what transpired at the Working Committee meeting he said: "Gentlemen you must wait till to-morrow." He added that he would say nothing more.

A Press representative asked the League President if he had received any communication from Gandhiji asking him to place the "C.R." formula before the Working Committee as had been broadcast by the All-India Radio. Mr. Jinnah was evasive in his reply and remarked: "Do you want to convey that information to me?"

It appeared the members of the Working Committee were administered special oath of secrecy before the proceedings started.

The League Working Committee re-assembled after lunch and rose after a couple of hours' deliberation.

It is learnt that Mr. Jinnah was the main speaker or perhaps the only speaker because he reviewed the whole political situation as it had developed ever since the last meeting of the committee. Mr. Jinnah, it is learnt, placed before the Working Committee Mahatma Gandhi's letter regarding "C.R.'s" formula and his request for meeting him.

It is learnt that this unexpected development changed the whole trend of events and the Working Committee itself was left with very little to do.

The Nawabzada, unlike his Chief, admitted to the journalists that a letter had been received from Mahatma Gandhi but he seemed to think that Gandhiji was responsible for having revealed the information about it, as the information had emanated from Bombay.

The impression created by his remark was that the Nawabzada appeared to think that the revealing of the information was rather inopportune.

Apart from this the members of the League Working Committee were jubilant over what they regarded as a "victory" for their chief.

Mr. Jinnah is expected to make a statement before the League Council where he would place all these matters.

The Working Committee is expected to meet after the council's meeting. In view of these developments provincial autonomy is bound to recede though it is stated that Provincial Leaguers are bent upon having the Unionists punished.

The application of the local representative of the "*Hindustan Times*" for attending the meeting of the League Council for reporting its proceedings tomorrow was rejected by the League office and even on the intervention of local journalists the General Secretary of the All-India Muslim League, after referring to the old Delhi incident, said that he could not go against the Working Committee's resolution which had decided not to issue a pass to the "*Hindustan Times*" representative.

Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatullah, Premier of Sind was closeted with the League President for a long time today.

Council Meeting—Lahore—30th. July 1944

Mr. Jinnah's Criticism of the Formula

The half-yearly session of the Council opened that Barkat Ali Hall, Lahore on the 30th. July in the morning under the presidency of Mr. M. A. Jinnah. Besides the Premiers of Bengal, Sind and N. W. F. Province, members of the Working Committee and representatives from all parts of the country, including a large number of women, were present. The hall was packed to overflow and the public outside were restrained with great difficulty at the entrance of the hall.

The proceedings commenced with the recitation from the Holy Quran. Mr. Jinnah then rose to make his statement on Mr. Rajagopalachari's formula, which was frequently punctuated with cheers. It took him full one hour to read the statement, which had been approved by the Working Committee at its meeting yesterday.

Reviewing the political developments in India with particular reference to Mr. Rajagopalachari's formula Mr. Jinnah said: Since the release of Mr. Gandhi there has been a flood of statements, press reports and comments, and I have tried to follow all these as carefully as it is possible for me to do so, particularly with reference to what is called by Mr. Rajagopalachari as his formula for Hindu-Muslim settlement, and for the moment, I wish to deal with the matter. Burying the past and starting from that point, let us examine the position.

On May 18, 1944, Mr. Gandhi's letter to me from prison on May 4, 1943, was released because, it was stated *Dawn* had asked for its publication and that it was owing to the public that the letter should see the light of day. Hence the release of the letter under Mr. Gandhi's instruction. In that letter, Mr. Gandhi says: "I have followed the proceedings of the League as reported in the *Dawn* columns. I noted your invitation to me to write to you. Hence this letter. I welcome your invitation. I suggest our meeting face to face rather than talking through correspondence. But I am in your hands. I hope that this letter will be sent to you, and if you agree to my proposal, that the Government will let you visit me. One thing I better mention. There seems to be an 'if' about your invitation. Do you say I should write only if I have changed my heart? God alone knows men's hearts. I would like you to take me as I am."

I knew the substance of this letter because the Government had furnished me with it at the time, and in my statement I pointed out that it was not the kind of letter that I expected from Mr. Gandhi in response to the appeal which I made in my speech in April 1943, in my presidential address to the Muslim League. It has now fully borne out without a shadow of doubt that Mr. Gandhi understood that there was an 'if' about my invitation, which was evaded, but nevertheless, as usual, the entire Congress press accused me of having gone back on my word, and did everything in their power to misrepresent, vilify and mutilate my speech. That 'if' still remains and the letter still remains undelivered to me. While Mr. Gandhi was busy and there had been a plethora of correspondence between him, from the Aga Khan's Palace at Poona, and the Viceroy, and since his release, he has been well enough to see numerous prominent men from day to day and carry on correspondence with the Viceroy and others, he has not, however, thought it proper to send me even a copy of the letter, being the addressee of the original, but thought fit to release it to the press.

Then comes the next chapter. After all his effort had failed to establish contact with Lord Linlithgow to negotiate with him over the head of the Muslim League completely ignoring and by-passing it. He sought an interview with Lord Wavell, his dear friend, conveying to him *ad nauseam* that he was a friend of British nation and a loyal son of the British Empire and that he should be allowed to meet the members of the Working Committee in prison or they should be released, and for that purpose he said: "I plead now as a free man for such permission. If you will see me before deciding, I shall gladly go wherever you want me to." This request of his was refused by the Viceroy by his letter of June 23. This "No" to Mr. Gandhi, it was reported, cast gloom at Poona. But even the final effort of Mr. Gandhi through the British Journalist, Mr. Gelder, as a go-between to link him up with Lord Wavell was misfire.

O. R.'s Move

At this psychological moment, Mr. Rajagopalachari was at Poona, and suddenly I received a telegram from him on June 30, as another go-between, complaining without any reason that his letter of April 8, remained unanswered, although he knew perfectly well that it required no answer, as the answer was already given

to him, and threatening me that he would like to publish the formula and my rejection. He said he had sent the telegram with Mr. Gandhi's approval, and further warned me that he would like me at this juncture to reconsider my rejection. In my reply, I pointed out to him that his version that I had rejected the formula was wrong and I am glad that he does not contradict the true facts as stated by me but confirms them. The correspondence was, however, abruptly released to the press, so that I should stand on my trial before the bar of the public opinion of the world, and of India and especially of the Muslims. Immediately the word had passed, and the Congress press had framed various grave charges against me. To give a few instances in some of the so-called responsible newspapers: "Irresponsible and ill-considered reply from one who claims to speak for his community is nothing short of a betrayal of his community and the country at large. It is now up to the Muslim community to judge the offer on its merits and find the leader or leaders who will play the game." There were charges like "intoxicated with ego and vanity", "uncompromising attitude", "a block in the way of freedom of India." It was urged that I should be sacked or made to retire by Muslim India and so on and so forth. It is surprising that even Mr. Gandhi, at this juncture, had encouraged this propaganda both in this country and abroad by the enemies of the Muslim League by stating in his interview on July 13, that the British Government is using me as a cloak, and that this "diabolical conspiracy to stifle India's aspirations must be broken." This is the background of the so-called negotiations for a Hindu-Muslim settlement started by Mr. Rajagopalachari with the approval of Mr. Gandhi and from the mass of varying statements and contradictions to-day only one essential issue emerges, namely that I am put on my trial and that I have now to defend myself. Thus the private negotiations ended. My only sin was that I requested Mr. Rajagopalachari to allow me to place his proposal before my Working Committee and that as Mr. Gandhi was no longer in prison, I requested that he should directly communicate to me whatever proposals he may choose to put forward, assuring him that I would place them before my Working Committee. What was the objection to such a course? I failed to appreciate the line adopted by Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Rajagopalachari, and I am willing to face the verdict of the Muslim League and any other independent and impartial men in India or abroad.

FORM OF THE FORMULA

This is so far as the procedure adopted is concerned. Now we come to the form of the formula. These proposals were not open to any discussion or modification. It was on the basis of "take it or leave it". It seems that the Congress philosophy goes on better than British Imperialism. Even the Cripps proposals had the sanction behind them of His Majesty's Government, and His Majesty's Government sent one of the members of the Cabinet all the way to India to personally approach the Congress and the Muslim League. Not only that, Sir Stafford Cripps was closeted with the Congress leaders and the Working Committee for more than two weeks in explaining and clarifying whatever points were raised by the Congress and the Muslim League. True, there also was that rigidity, that the fundamentals of the Cripps proposals were not open to any modification, and that was the reason why he failed. But Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Rajagopalachari are out-Heroding Herod. This is pure and simple dictation and not a sincere desire to negotiate. In the first place, Mr. Rajagopalachari is an expelled member of the Congress. Whatever individual efforts he may have made were by virtue of the approval of Mr. Gandhi to his proposals during Mr. Gandhi's incarceration. But once Mr. Gandhi is released and is a free man, it is up to Mr. Gandhi personally to deal with this grave problem of the settlement of the Hindu-Muslim question, and there is no need of any go-between. But Mr. Gandhi is too ill and in his recent interview, when any question was put to him, he directed the questioner to Mr. Rajagopalachari and the press representatives have been told that he had personally subscribed to Rajaji's offer when he was fasting in the prison camp. "It is now sixteen months old. For the rest of the offer, I must carry out the contract between Rajaji and myself. He is to bear the brunt of all criticism that might be made about that offer." It is a pity that he gave no indication of this in his famous letter dated May 4, 1943, which still remains undelivered to me, and it has got a new name now, it is not a "formula" but an "offer".

As regards Mr. Gandhi, who says he has subscribed to this offer, but according to Mr. Rajagopalachari, it is "a joint contribution" and "formula", the question arises, in what capacity can Mr. Gandhi's association be urged, for he also is not even a four-anna member of the Congress. He has not so many capacities—his

personal capacity, his capacity as the dictator of the Congress, and above all, his Mahatmic divine authority, which is guided by his inner voice, and he is a satyagrahi and the sole interpreter of what it means and stands for. He is not a Hindu but a "Sanatanist," and he follows a Hinduism of his own. It is rather difficult to know as to what capacity Mr. Gandhi will use at a given time. Mr. Gandhi, I hope, will be good enough to study the constitution, rules and regulations of the All-India Muslim League and then he will understand better my position as the President of a really well-organised and democratic body, viz., the All-India Muslim League. I remember when Mr. Gandhi met Lord Linlithgow in September 1939, after the outbreak of the war and he broke down and tears rolled down from his eyes when he visualised the possible destruction by bombing of the Westminster Abbey and the Houses of Parliament and said: "What was the use of Indian freedom if England and France were defeated?", and in a statement, declared his whole-hearted and most enthusiastic support for the prosecution of the war. But hardly a week afterwards, the Congress Working Committee decided to non-co-operate if their demand for immediate independence etc., was not met, and as a first step, the Congress members of the Central Assembly were ordered to withdraw, Mr. Gandhi turned round and said they were right. He was only in a minority of one, and advised Lord Linlithgow to come to terms with the Congress approving of their decision.

MERITS OF THE PROPOSAL

Now we come to the merits of the proposal. In this case we are told by Mr. Rajagopalachari to quote his own words of the series of telegrams which were released by him:

"Mr. Gandhi, though not vested with representative or special capacity in this matter, definitely approved of my proposal and authorised me to approach you on that basis. The weight of his opinion would most probably secure Congress acceptance."

Mr. Rajagopalachari, in his statement of July 16, from Panchgani, starts with an absolutely untrue and misleading statement. He says that "it is now two years since I started work, even though I had secured Gandhiji's unqualified support to the scheme, and it conceded all that the Muslim League had ever demanded in its resolution of 1940." If this is so, why not say we accept the League resolution of 1940? His formula is a parody, a negation of, and intended to torpedo, the Muslim League's resolution of March 1940, and when he says that his formula concedes all that the Muslim League had ever demanded by its resolution, it is the grossest travesty. First of all, where does he find any mention of "plebiscite" of any kind in that resolution? Then why this ridiculous proposal of a plebiscite districtwise? But let me take clause by clause some important points of Mr. Rajagopalachari's formula.

First take the preamble, the basis of the terms which, if accepted, will completely bind the Muslim League, whereas the Mahatma may withdraw his blessings as he is not speaking, according to Mr. Rajagopalachari, with the authority of the Congress or in his representative capacity, whatever that may mean. Then, we come to the first clause, "subject to the terms set out below as regards the constitution." I do not see "the constitution" in this formula; which constitution does he refer to? Then comes the demand for our endorsing the Indian demand for Independence. It implies that we are against the independence of the peoples of India and both Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Rajagopalachari know that it is an un-called-for insinuation to make, and they are casting an unwarranted reflection upon the Muslim League.

PLEBISCITE PROPOSAL

Next comes the condition that we should co-operate with the Congress in the formation of a Provisional Interim Government for the transitional period, thereby arrogating to the Congress a dominant and superior position and requiring our co-operation as a subordinate body with this leading organisation and as to the kind of provisional interim Government for the transitional period that is to be formed, no indication is given as to its powers, etc. After the termination of the war, a Commission shall be appointed for demarcating contiguous districts in the north-west and east of India, and a plebiscite of all the inhabitants would be held districtwise, where the Muslim population is in absolute majority. It is not stated who will appoint this Commission, what will be its personnel and its powers, and who will enforce its findings. Really, how can Mr. Rajagopalachari stand unabashed and make a public statement that his formula concedes all that the Muslim

League's resolution of March 1940 demands. It would be open to all parties to advocate their point of view before a plebiscite is held, although this agreement is intended to be only between the Congress and the League. Next, in the event of separation, mutual agreements shall be entered into for safeguarding defence, commerce, and communications and for other essential purposes. The question arises, safeguarding these matters from whom, and what does it mean? These mutual agreements are made obligatory and it is not very easy to understand the significance of this clause. Then comes the last clause which is the height of ingenuity. These terms shall be binding only in case of transfer by Britain of full power and responsibility for the Government of India. But it does not say to whom, how and when.

MUSLIMS AND AUGUST RESOLUTION

According to the latest statement by Mr. Gandhi, the August Resolution is "absolutely innocuous," and that while his authority has lapsed, the August Resolution has not lapsed. Let it now collapse, for the Muslims do not regard it as innocuous, as both the demand and the sanction for it to force this demand are inimical to the Muslim ideals and demands. Let Mr. Gandhi join hands with the Muslim League on the basis of Pakistan in plain and unequivocal language and we shall be nearer the independence of the peoples of India, which is so dear to the heart of not only Mr. Gandhi but of millions in this country. Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Rajagopalachari are putting the cart before the horse when they say that all these clauses can have any value or can become effective only if Great Britain transfers power to India, save and except acting on his latest seven points and immediately establishing a National Government of Mr. Gandhi's conception. There is no chance of it unless the Hindus and Muslims come to a settlement and unite and thus by means of a united front wring out our freedom from the unwilling hands of the rulers of Great Britain.

I am sorry if by expressing my views honestly and freely and in self-defence, I have hurt anybody's feelings. I purposely did not wish to say anything when Mr. Gandhi was good enough to release to the press his famous letter to me dated May 4, 1943. I refused to say a single word throughout the period commencing from the release of Mr. Gandhi upto date. I refused to say anything when abruptly the correspondence was closed and released to the press by Mr. Rajagopalachari. I had expected, along with millions of people in this country, that Mr. Gandhi would review and revise the entire situation and give a correct lead, having regard to the realities and conditions prevailing in India. But I think, in fairness to the Muslim League and to myself, I must now put our case before the bar of world opinion, and particularly, the public opinion of Hindus and Muslims in this land, as by the tactics of Mr. Rajagopalachari and approved by Mr. Gandhi I am forced to do so. But out of evil cometh good. I do not mind all the vilification and mis-representation and the base campaign that is carried on against me. But at last, and it is to the good and conducive to further progress that Mr. Gandhi has, at any rate in his personal capacity, accepted the principle of partition or division of India. What remains now is the question of how and when this has got to be carried out. Mr. Gandhi knows and understands the position better than any living man, for in one of his articles in the *Harijan* he puts the question of Pakistan demand in a nutshell. This was what he said: "I hope the Quaid-e-Azam does not represent the considered opinion even of his colleagues. Pakistan, according to him in a nutshell, is a demand for carving out of India a portion to be wholly treated as an independent and sovereign State."

I am glad that Mr. Gandhi realises that 1944 is not 1942. It is in more senses than one and he may further take into consideration that 1939-40-41 is not 1944.

I hope I have made it clear that the procedure and method adopted is hardly conducive to friendly negotiations and the form is pure dictation as it is not open to any modification. This is not calculated to lead to fruitful results, or a solution and settlement of the problem which concerns the destiny of a nation of hundred millions of Muslims and their posterity and as regards the merits of the proposal, Mr. Gandhi is offering a shadow and a husk, maimed, mutilated and moth-eaten Pakistan and thus trying to pass off having met our Pakistan scheme and Muslim demand.

Gandhi's Letter to Mr. Jinnah

But since all these happenings I have received a letter from Mr. Gandhi dated July 17 and I have already replied to him on July 24 from Srinagar before my departure. They are as follows. Let us, therefore, wait and see, hoping for the best.

Mr. Jinnah then read out the English translation of Mr. Gandhi's letter written in Gujarathi. The following is the text of the letter:

"Dilkush"

Panchgani, July 17

Brother Jinnah,

There was a day when I could induce you to speak in the mother-tongue. To-day I take courage to write to you in the same language. I had invited you to meet me while I was in jail. I have not written to you since my release. But to-day my heart says that I should write to you. We will meet whenever you choose. Don't regard me as the enemy of Islam or of the Muslims of this country. I am the friend and servant of not only yourself but of the whole world. Do not disappoint me.

I am enclosing herewith a translation of this letter in Urdu.

Your Brother,
Gandhi.

MEETING IN MIDDLE OF AUGUST

The League President then proceeded to read his own reply which is as follows:

H. B. "Queen Elizabeth"
Srinagar, Kashmir,
24th July 1944.

Dear Mr. Gandhi,

I received your letter dated July 17 here on July 22 and I thank you for it.

I shall be glad to receive you at my house in Bombay on my return, which will probably be about the middle of August. By that time, I hope that you will have recuperated your health fully and will be returning to Bombay. I would like to say nothing more till we meet.

I am very pleased to read in the press that you are making very good progress, and I hope that you will soon be all right.

Yours Sincerely,
M. A. Jinnah.

Resolutions

The Council adopted a resolution of condolence on the death of Maulvi Bahadur Khan Nawab Bahadur Yar Jung, President of the All-India States Muslim League. Mr. Jinnah described his death as a "terrific blow to Muslim India" and paid a tribute to his qualities.

The Council next passed unanimously a resolution moved by Maulana Karam Ali urging the Government of India to make arrangements for "Haj" pilgrimage. The resolution expressed the view that the pretexts of insecurity of the voyage were absolutely unacceptable in view of Allied victories.

The Council decided to observe a "Haj Day" throughout the country to voice their demand.

Syed Zakir Ali then moved the resolution recommending the collection of "Zakat" (charity) from Muslims through the agency of the League. After a heated discussion in which Nawab Mohammed Ismail, Chaudhri Khaliquzaman, Maulana Abdul Hamid Badayuni and Maulana Karam Ali participated, the resolution was not pressed to a vote, as Mr. Jinnah gave an assurance that the matter would receive the attention of the Working Committee.

The Council authorised Mr. Jinnah to fix the dates and venue of the next annual session of the All-India Muslim League and adjourned for lunch.

The Council concluded its session at 8 o'clock in the evening after adopting two resolutions relating to recent developments in the Punjab.

DEMAND FOR RECALLING PUNJAB GOVERNOR

Maulana Abdul Hamid Badayuni (U. P.) moved the following resolution:

"This meeting of the Council of the All India Muslim League declares that the Governor of the Punjab has, by his improper interference in the case of Sardar Shaukat Hyat Khan Sahib and by dismissing him from Ministership without obtaining his reply in regard to the charges levelled against Sardar Sahib, acted in contravention of the basic principles of Democratic Government and has severely injured the feelings of the Mussalmans of India."

Mr. Ohundrigar (Bombay) moved the following substitute resolution, which was accepted by the mover and unanimously passed by the Council: "This meeting of the Council of the All-India Muslim League condemns the action of the Governor

of the Punjab in dismissing Sardar Shaukat Hyat Khan, as apart from the question of his power to dismiss an individual Minister by virtue of the power conferred upon him under section 51 of the Government of India Act, he never furnished the particulars of allegations or charges against him, nor did he allow him any opportunity to give his explanation or defence, which is the inherent right of every citizen, according to the rules of natural justice before dismissing him, thereby casting grave reflections on his honour and in spite of repeated demands calling upon him to place the full facts of the case, the Governor has declined to do so.

"This Council, therefore, calls upon the Government of India and the British Government to recall the Governor as he is no longer qualified to hold this office of great responsibility and has been guilty of abusing his extraordinary and reserve powers vested in him by the constitution embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935.

Moving the resolution, Maulana Abdul Hamid Badayuni said that the dismissal of Sardar Shaukat Hyat Khan had released new forces in the Punjab and had roused the Mussalmans of the Punjab to a high pitch of political consciousness. The resolution put in a plea for the recall of the Governor as he had proved himself incapable of holding this high office. The speaker said that it was surprising that Shaukat Hyat Khan was not given any chargesheet nor was any explanation asked. The Governor, he said, did not even consider it fit to make a show of justice in this case.

Nawab S. M. Jamali (Bihar) said that Shaukat Hyat Khan had been dismissed primarily because he was loyal to the Muslim League. Even *The Statesman*, he added, had commented against Sir Bertrand Glancy's action and had asked him to give reasons for the dismissal. The speaker asked for the intervention of the Viceroy and the British Government in the matter.

The resolution was adopted.

EXPULSION OF PUNJAB PREMIER

Syed Abdul Rabaman (Bangalore) then moved the following resolution :

"This Council of the all-India Muslim League approves and endorses the action taken by the Committee of the Action in expelling Malik Khizr Hyat Khan, Premier of the Punjab, from the Muslim League for his utter disregard of the wishes of the Muslims of India in general and the Muslims of the Punjab in particular, and for having acted in contravention of the rules, aims and objects of the All-India Muslim League and also contrary to the decision of the League authorities that a Member of the Muslim League cannot owe allegiance to two political parties and notes with contempt that Mr. Khizr Hyat Khan had not even cared to place his case before the Council of the All-India Muslim League, which is the highest national tribunal, consisting of several able and eminent judges, and instead, desires to refer his case to a judge outside the National Council, which evidently means that he is ashamed of facing the Muslim nation on this issue and takes its verdict."

The mover said that the expulsion of Malik Khizr Hyat Khan was due to his acts of gross indiscipline and felt that the interests of the Mussalmans of the Punjab were not safe in his hands. He added that the Punjab Premier had taken shelter behind the so-called Jinnah-Sikandar Pact, which had no official recognition from the all-India Muslim League. He asked whether there could ever be a pact between an organisation and one single member of the organisation and declared that Malik Khizr Hyat Khan had joined the League not out of conviction but for his own personal convenience. The speaker concluded by saying that Unionism must be completely wiped out from the soil of the Punjab.

Raja Ghazanfar Ali, ex-Parliamentary Secretary, Punjab, seconding the resolution, said that he was one of those who tried his best until the last moment to avoid this unpleasant episode in the Punjab. If Malik Khizr Hyat Khan had been a real well-wisher of the Mussalmans, he would not but have accepted Mr. Jinnah's orders.

The speaker said that Malik Khizr Hyat Khan's profession of loyalty to Pakistan was an absurd attempt to befool the Mussalmans. He and all his supporters would not be able to stem the rising of League forces in the Province. The Mussalmans of the Punjab were behind the Quaid-e-Azam and were prepared to make all sacrifices.

The resolution was unanimously carried.

Winding up the proceedings, Mr. Jinnah thanked the members of the Council for having travelled long distances to attend the Council session and expressed his gratitude to them for their support. "Insha Allah: Pakistan is coming," he concluded.

The Sind Provincial Muslim League

Working Committee—Karachi—7th. July 1944

Ministers Asked to Resign

The Working Committee of the Sind Provincial Muslim League, at its meeting held at Karachi on the 7th. July 1944, passed a resolution calling on the Sind Ministry as at present composed to resign from office forthwith. Premier Sir Ghulam Hussein Hidayatullah was present at the meeting.

The resolution adds that the Muslim League accepted office as an experimental measure to see how far and to what extent it is able to safeguard and promote the interests of the masses of Sind. The experiment has gone on for a year and three-quarters and nothing substantial has been done in the constructive field. The Working Committee has before it a long list of the misdeeds of some of the Ministers. The following is the full text of the resolution passed by a majority of 23 against 2:

"Faced with the alternatives of having Sind ruled either under Section 93 of the Constitution Act or under a Council of Ministers enjoying popular support, the Muslim League accepted office in October 1944, as an experimental measure to see how far and to what extent it was able to safeguard and promote the interests of the masses of Sind. For years prior to this crisis, the Muslims of Sind had groaned under the regime of unstable Ministries, which had no constructive policy or programme for the betterment of the masses, and, one of the primary reasons that moved the League to choose the Treasury Benches was to free the Muslims of Sind from this nightmare. A new hope was born and all over the villages and towns of Sind the Muslims looked forward to their Ministers to inaugurate a regime that could be broadbased on the co-operation of the people, and inspired by a zeal for their welfare and to carry out the Muslim League programme.

"The experiment has gone on for a year and three quarters and nothing substantial has been done in the constructive field. Corruption has become the order of the day. The Working Committee has before it a long list of the misdeeds of some of the Ministers. It is unnecessary to draw a detailed indictment, but the Committee cannot help putting on record the unsatisfactory character of the foodgrain policy of this Ministry. After enhancing land assessment by 200 to 300 p. c. and giving no return of the same to the people in the shape of nation-building activities the Ministry has brought into being various syndicates whose operations have robbed the cultivators of their dues. One of the most unfortunate results of this policy has been that the poor Muslim agriculturists are compelled to sell their wheat at Rs. 7 per maund, in spite of the control price being Rs. 9-8 per maund.

"What justification will the Muslim League have for its existence if it will not actively and energetically advance the cause of the Hari—the Sindhi cultivator—who is the backbone of our Province and whose welfare is the first charge on the Muslim League? The Ministry, by adopting delaying tactics, has so far enacted no tenancy laws. Not only that, but they intend to introduce modifications in the Jaigirdari Act, which is bound to prove of little benefit to several thousands of poor Muslim cultivators. The only honourable course therefore, for the Working Committee of the Sind Provincial Muslim League is to record its definite findings that it is in the interests of the Province and the Muslims of Sind that the Council of Ministers, as at present composed, should resign. The Working Committee accordingly urges the President to ensure that the above resolution is implemented and to take all the consequential steps."

The All India Hindu Mahasabha

Working Committee—New Delhi—9th July 1944

Text of Resolutions

The Working Committee of the All India Hindu Mahasabha at its meeting at New Delhi on the 9th July 1944 adopted a resolution requesting that as 92 per cent. of the population of Jaipur State are Hindi-speaking and as the rest of the Rajputana States have Hindi as their Court language, the Maharaja should adopt Hindi as Court language in the Jaipur State to the exclusion of Urdu.

The Committee urges that officials who were not conversant with Hindi be ordered to pick up the script and language within a year and pass an examination in Hindi.

The Committee requests His Highness to appoint a Hindu Prime Minister.

A further resolution condemned the Jaipur State ban on the entry of Mr. V. G. Deshpande, Secretary, All-India Hindu Mahasabha.

The meeting congratulated Hindu Sanghataniets in Maharashtra on their action in attending the pilgrimage at Pandharpur in spite of the ban imposed by Government.

"In view of the reports received about the working of the Muslim League Ministries in different provinces that not only legitimate rights and interests of the Hindus and other minorities have suffered, but such administration has proved generally detrimental to the interests of the provinces as a whole, the Working Committee calls upon the Hindus and other non-Muslim members of the Provincial legislatures to withdraw their co-operation with the Muslim League.

"The Working Committee feels convinced that so long as the present ideology of the Muslim League of vivisectioning India and establishing Pakistan is not given up, there is no common ground for co-operation between the Muslim League and the Hindu Mahasabha. With a view, however, to avoiding a constitutional deadlock in provinces, the All-India Hindu Mahasabha will favour the formation of Coalition Ministers where such co-operation may be possible between Hindus and other political parties other than the Muslim League on the basis of an agreed programme, suitable to the needs of the provinces concerned."

In another resolution on Bengal Ministry, the Committee says:

"This meeting of the Working Committee of All-India Hindu Mahasabha view with concern the situation in Bengal and the attempts of the Muslim League Ministry in that province to pass, in the teeth of Hindu opposition, the Secondary Education Bill which is primarily designed to facilitate the establishment of a regime of Pakistan and strike at the root of the cultural life of the Hindus of the province. The Committee notes with surprise that though the opposition to the Bill has been amongst unanimous amongst the Hindus both inside and outside the Legislature, the League Ministry should have persisted in rushing it through the Assembly. The Committee finds that the Hindu Ministers who are supporting the Bill, have no following whatsoever inside the Legislature and have ceased to represent Hindu opinion in the country and that their continuance in the Council of the Ministers as representatives of the great Hindu community of the province is helping to create the false impression that the present Bengal Ministry is being run with the support of the representative Hindus. The Committee demands in view of the specific provisions in the instrument of Instructions that the Governor should call for the resignation of these unrepresentative Hindu Ministers and reconstitute the Council of Ministers with Hindus who have the support of the Hindu members of the Legislature."

The Committee in another resolution, condemns "the communal policy" of the Sind Government and calls upon all Hindus of the province to unite under the Hindu Mahasabha's banner and present a united front to this aggressive and communal policy."

The meeting approved of the Sind Provincial Hindu Sabha's decision withdrawing its support from the present Ministry and requested the Governor of Sind to protect the rights of Hindus in the province as his special responsibility.

The Committee demanded that Hindu religious books should be exempted from the operation of the Paper Control Order.

A delegation had come from the Sind Provincial Sabha and explained in detail the move of Sir Gulam Hussain Hidayatullah to reshuffle the composition of the ministry keeping out Khan Bahadur Khuro against whom a motion of no-confidence has been tabled. As regards the North-West Frontier Province there is a possibility of Sardar Ajit Singh resigning in view of the undertaking given by the Hindu members that they would not covet seats in the Ministry. In Bengal, according to conversations in the Mahasabha circles, Mr. Casey, Governor, will summon a session of the Assembly in August. Interesting developments are expected, especially because of the precarious position of the Ministry. To what extent the Bengal Governor's talk with the Viceroy will relate to subsequent developments in that province, cannot be anticipated. From the Punjab Mr. Brijlal, Secretary of the Hindu Vigilance Committee, had come to report on the position of the Mahasabha Working Committee.

Working Committee—New Delhi—6th October 1944

Text of Resolutions

The following comprehensive resolution was passed at the meeting of the Working Committee of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha at Delhi on the 6th Oct. 1944.

I. In view of the facts—

(1) That the system of excluded and partially excluded portions of India was devised by the Government with the object as set forth in the Simon Commission Report of—

(a) Preserving for them the simple form of administration of patriarchal dispensation which is indigenous to the aboriginal tribes.

(b) Keeping them aloof from competition, with what are described perhaps in a spirit of derogation as "subtler minds of the Aryan Races" and from the "wiles of the money-lender," so that they may not be made helpless subjects of 'exploitation'.

(c) Seeing that "these races" remain, as they are, 'amongst the most picturesque in the world' and that their energies are not sapped by contact with civilisation and that they remain amongst the most light-hearted and virile.

(d) Maintaining their sense of "innate self-respect" and "confidence in their war-like prowess," their "Belief in their tribal Gods" and their "unfettered enjoyment in their patriarchal or matriarchal customs", and the freedom in the pursuit of their traditional methods of livelihood.

(e) Giving them "protection from economic subjugation by their neighbours ; and

(f) Giving them "security of land and tenure" and "good administration" on which, "the progress and protection of the inhabitants of these excluded areas almost entirely depend ;"

2. That, notwithstanding, the above objects of the Government, "the greater part of the unskilled labour at the Industrial Centres—Jharia and Jamshedpur Tata Iron—are allowed to be drawn from the local aboriginal tribes who also form an important recruiting ground for labour on Tea Estates in Assam," thus allowing them to set sail on the wide ocean of human civilisation, good or bad ;

3. That the Government is not prepared to assume the burden of educating them so that these people may stand on their own feet, as envisaged by the Simon Commission ; and

4. That Christian Missionaries of various denominations have been allowed and helped financially and with Government prestige to work amongst them unfettered with their usual wiles in proselytisation ; so that more than two lacs eighty thousand of them of Chhota Nagpur as mentioned by the Simon Commission Report, have already been converted to Christianity ;

The Hindu Mahasabha strongly urges on the Government :

(1) The need of doing away with this system of excluded and partially excluded areas and of incorporating them into the non-excluded part of the Province, so that the people of the province be enabled constitutionally to look after their interests.

(2) That for reasons mentioned above, all help, moral and material, that is being given to the missionaries should forthwith be withdrawn, and that whatever help Government be prepared to give to start schools for them, should be given to Hindu agencies such as the Hindu Mahasabha, Arya-Samaj, Arya Hindu Dharma-Bewa-Bangha of Shriman Sheth Jugal Kishore Birla, the Hindu Mission of Bengal and so on ; for the animism which these tribal tribes profess is part and parcel of

Hinduism and Christianity is quite contrary and even antagonistic to both animism and Hinduism.

(3) That if Government were in fact to desire to make provision, in the spirit of his Imperial Majesty's Instrument of Instruction for the protection of their religion and culture, proselytisation in the case should be made a crime under the Indian Penal Code.

(4) That money-lending by the Missionaries should be stopped.

(5) That if Government be not prepared to encourage the Hindu agencies to undertake their education, all schools established by the Missionaries, should be acquired by the Government and they should be conducted by the Educational Department of the Government.

II. The Hindu Mahasabha calls upon all Hindus and the Hindu Associations to concentrate their attention and energies on counter-acting the proselytising activities of these missionaries and to release these tribal tribes from their clutches.

The Hindu Mahasabha has noted with great pain and resentment that in the Census Report of 1941, the Aboriginal Tribes which were till then included in the Hindus as in the Census Report of 1931 and were shown separately as amounting to only 7,611,803 in 1931, have now been taken away and shown separately from the Hindus as amounting to 25,441,489.

The Open Session of the Sabha

26th. Session—Bilaspur—24th. to 26th December 1944

The 26th annual session of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha met at Bilaspur on the 24th. December 1944 under the presidency of Dr. *Shyama Prasad Mookerjee*.

The biggest gathering ever assembled in Bilaspur attended the session. Over fifty thousand persons present included prominent Hindus from all over India.

After the arrival of Dr. *Mukherjee*, and Mr. *Savarkar*, amidst deafening cries of 'jais' the gathering sang "Bandemataram", all standing.

Mr. *Savarkar*, inaugurating the session, said he was glad that Hindus were no longer discarding their emblems to please Muslims. Even the national song composed by Tagore was dropped and that composed by Iqbal was accepted by the Hindus. The more they tried to please the Muslims, the more the demands of the latter increased. He was glad that among Hindus the spirit of regeneration was developing. At present there were at least one crore of Hindus who took pride in being called Hindus. This spirit would show best results among their sons.

Welcome Address

Mr. *P. C. Bose*, President of the Jubbulpore Municipality and Chairman of the Reception Committee, welcoming the delegates, supported the fundamental right which democracy gave to each and every citizen of the nation. It was beyond his comprehension why any particular minority should be pampered with special privileges and rights in excess of what that minority was entitled on the basis of numerical strength. Moreover, it was really a unique feature in the annals of world history to advocate the existence of a new nation within the parent nation simply on the ground of religion and fanaticism. Mr. Bose condemned the banning of the Fourteenth Chapter of "Satyarth Prakash" by the Sind Government and urged the Hindus to undo the mischief.

Referring to the move for codification of Hindu Law, Mr. Bose said: "This is not the time to discuss the two sides of the picture, but it is my contention that a proper and a more favourable time ought to have been chosen for amending the Hindu law. The present structure of Hindu society has been evolved and perfected after the experiences of countless centuries. The Hindu outlook and traditions are not static. They are always liberal and receptive to the progressive ideas and truth. But the legislators, who are out to amend the Hindu law, forget in the moment of their enthusiasm that they are not the sole custodians of the Hindu religion and that social reforms are not the creation of a day. The Central Legislative Assembly is not a real representative body of the people of this country. The country is being governed by the war time reactionary elements who represent none but themselves.

Under these circumstances, it is practically impossible to secure the true verdict of the country on the proposed amendments to the Hindu laws."

Mr. Bose drew the attention of the public to yet another grave problem threatening the Central Provinces in the shape of an organised agitation launched by the Muslims for the restoration of Berar, the richest part of the Province predominantly inhabited by the Hindus to the Nizam of Hyderabad. He said: "It would be a political blunder of the first magnitude to hand over the millions of Hindus without taking their referendum to an alien ruler. If Berar were restored to the Nizam, it would make a Sind Province of a worse type in the O. P. This move must be opposed most vigorously."

Presidential Address

Dr. Moonje proposed Dr. Mukerjee to preside over the session. He was the fit person to create mass awakening among Hindus. After the proposal was seconded and supported, Dr. Mukherjee sat on the silver chair amidst cries of "Jais".

Dr. Mookerjee then delivered his address in course of which he said:—

"India's voice must be heard at the Peace Conference, not through hired Indian agents of British Imperialism but through her chosen spokesmen. It is for this reason that I feel it urgent that there should be a cessation of hostilities among the Indian political parties themselves. It will be an act of supreme statesmanship if to-day there can be a combination of all the nationalist elements in the public life of opposition to the continuance of the imperialistic designs of Britain."

He challenged the Viceroy to prove his *bona fides* by releasing all political prisoners and allowing a board of disinterested representatives of America, Russia and China to settle the Indian problem in consultation with Britain and India.

At the outset, Dr. Mookerjee paid a tribute to the services of Mr. Savarkar who had been the President before him. Dr. Mookerjee said: "To be called upon at any period of time to occupy the Presidentship of the Mahasabha is a sacred trust and a privilege, which are all the more enhanced when one succeeds a President so patriotic, so devoted and fearless as our leader, Veer Savarkar. His dynamic personality and his career of suffering and sacrifice gave a new life and vigour to the Hindu Mahasabha and indeed to the entire nation. While he brought into relief the peculiarly difficult problems concerning India, he filled the country with a new message of hope and aspiration. If he steps aside from the formal headship of the organisation, he remains our leader, ever ready to give us and the country the benefit of his advice and guidance."

Dr. Mookerjee then went on to trace the history of British exploitation of India and said that India's economic slavery was due to her political subjugation and Swaraj was the first and essential remedy for Indian poverty.

Dr. Mookerjee continued: "Mr. Churchill says to Hitler, 'Hands off Britain', we appreciated it. But if we say to Britain, 'Hands off India' we become guilty of treason. If Burma and Ceylon demand, 'Hands off our countries', Mr. Churchill will pose as the God-gifted trustee in whose hands alone power must rest. But it is not the Asiatic people only that need the continued protection of Britain's self-constituted guardianship. Abyssinia may free herself from Mussolini but must surrender to Churchill. Liberated Greece, Italy, and France must also pay their price to Britain. Let us say unhesitatingly that, should British policy continue as it is, even if the war is won, the peace will be lost and a third World War will become inevitable. It is for the British public to assert itself, to avoid the disaster and declare if its post-war reconstruction will be based on the Churchillian theory of imperial dominations and exploitation. The treatment meted out to Indians in South Africa is another glaring example of racial arrogance that still fills the minds of short-sighted partners within the so-called British Commonwealth of friendly nations. India's claim for freedom cannot be challenged at the bar of world opinion. How can the world be safe if one-fifth of the total human population is denied its freedom which is its birth-right? India is not and cannot be the private affairs of Britain. Indian freedom is the acid test of the sincerity of purpose of America and Russia as well."

CONSPIRACY TO HARM HINDUS' RIGHTS

"A survey of the constitutional changes that have come from time to time will disclose how the powers given to the people of the country have been limited by restrictions so that, in the case of an ultimate clash between British and Indian interests, the former may prevail at the will of British representatives. Further, a deliberate policy has been pursued by Government to weaken and cripple the Hindus

because it is they, more than anybody else, who have raised their standard of revolt against foreign rule. The interest of Hindus are identical with those of the nation itself. Hindus want that their country should be politically free. They recognise that their country has been the home of many sects and religions and they are anxious that there should be a common right of citizenship for one and all. They stand for one undivided India. Government knows that if Hindus can be crippled and divided, India's national strength will be weakened considerably. Our enemies attack us as Hindus but we have not the realism and courage to defend ourselves as such, and thus allow the base of our national life to be shattered to pieces."

Criticising the Congress policy as 'barren non-co-operation' at all stages, Dr. Mookerjee said: "In the Indian Provinces where Hindus are in a majority, the Congress by its deliberate action in 1939 has been responsible for arbitrary bureaucratic rule under Section 93 of the Government of India Act of 1935. In the Provinces where Hindus are in a minority, predominantly Muslim Ministries are functioning, mainly with the support of European votes and other reactionary elements. It is remarkable that in almost all the Provinces there is an unconcealed conspiracy to carry out the administration in a manner which is specially harmful to the legitimate rights and interests of the Hindus. Fresh fetters are being forged to weaken them in every sphere of life and their power of resistance is being systematically curbed."

Stating that he did not for a moment suggest that acceptance of office under the present constitution could ever be the be-all and end-all of any political organisation, the Mahasabha President said: "Nevertheless a boycott of the constitutional machinery is sometimes more harmful to the interests of the people than its utilisation as a weapon for fighting reactionary forces and for preparing the field for wresting larger powers. We must carry on our struggle both inside and outside the Legislature. Every seat of power has to be captured and the whole machinery worked in a team spirit backed by popular support so as to prevent avoidable mischief and to advance the good of the people whenever possible."

THE PAKISTAN DEMAND

Referring to the Muslim League demand, Dr. Mookerjee said: "Pakistan can never be won by the Muslim League by its own strength, nor does its leader expect that it will. He counts on British support to divide India. If British sword is to be perpetuated for defending Pakistan, it becomes a colossal hoax and a badge of unbroken slavery. If British rule is with-drawn after a forcible division of India who will prevent the free state of Hindustan from re-establishing its authority over the entire Indian territory? Hindus regard this country as their sacred and holy land. Irrespective of provincial barriers of the diversity in faiths and languages, there exists a remarkable economic and cultural unity and inter-dependence which cannot be destroyed at the will of persons and parties who think it beneath their dignity to regard India as their motherland. The provincial boundaries must be redistributed; powers, given to provincial units may be enlarged; but there must always remain a strong central government in charge of those essential departments on whose efficiency will depend the safety, progress and welfare of India as a whole. Internationally India will cease to exist once she is broken up into small independent groups and fragments. Our past history has shown that whenever disruptive tendencies developed in different parts of India, her liberty disappeared and her gates were thrown open to foreign invaders.

SOLUTION FOR MINORITY PROBLEM

"The constitution of the country will provide for ample safeguards to protect the religious and cultural rights of minorities wherever necessary. Fullst possible facilities will be given to all backward sections of the Indian people irrespective of caste, creed or community so that they may attain a higher standard of thought and living. Our attitude towards Muslims as such is not one of hostility or domination. When we attack the policy of the Muslim League we do so because it is actuated by considerations hardly beneficial to the welfare of India. One can understand the natural anxiety of any important community to have its rights duly protected and to demand that it will be given full equal chance in every sphere of public service. Indeed the Mahasabha asks for no special privilege for Hindus in any part of the country. It demands that the constitution should be based on adult suffrage and on national electorates with reservation of seats for such minorities as may ask for it. Each community and class must be prepared to surrender some of its narrow individual claims, if the welfare of the country as a

sacrifice will pave the way for fuller understanding and consolidation in the interest of the entire nation. Pakistan is no solution of the communal problem. It will make them more pronounced and can only end in civil war. Let us not delude ourselves by ignoring the fact that the urge for Pakiathan is to see Islam re-established in India as the sovereign power. To placate it is to let loose the worst type of fanatical zeal. The Congress sometimes dares not speak out the truth lest it should be dubbed as pro-Hindu and communal in outlook. The Mahasabha, on the other hand, can afford to point its finger towards the history of India and of the world and organize public opinion throughout the country to oppose ruthlessly any scheme that may lead to the dismemberment of the Indian nation. Three hundred millions of people are not a negligible number and if even a quarter of them can be roused and trained, if their minds are moved by a passionate longing for tearing off the shackles of servility, if they have the correct state-consciousness—*rastra-chetana*—in accordance with the sacred traditions of Hinduism, no power on earth can ever stand in the way of our final achievement. What is needed is a revolution in the working of the Hindu mind which will uproot all sense of defeatism and instil a new faith and an undying vigour based on the grim realities of the political situation of the country.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE COMMUNISTS

"It has become the fashion and tendency of a section of Indians, the majority of them being Hindus, to bring their guiding inspiration from foreign countries, specially Russia. It is suicidal to suggest that we should remain in complete isolation and refuse to be moved by the currents and cross-currents of the modern age. But there is one fundamental condition which we must never ignore. Our society and State must be based on an Indian pattern and on the rich heritage that we proudly claim to be ours. A nation must exist and freely function as such with dignity and self-respect before it can participate in any real internationalism. We have much to learn from the heroic example of Russia. Her amazing strength and vitality, her power of assimilation of diverse interests, her gigantic preparation for fighting illiteracy and disease, her achievements in utilising her inexhaustible raw material and in equalising the rights of her citizens cannot but invoke the admiration of the whole world. She has not however run after internationalism by minimising or discarding any important Russian interest nor has she failed to recognise the importance of stimulating the culture and civilization of the Russian people. She is intensely realistic in her attitude towards problems which may affect either her own interest or that of her partners. The ideology of one single party dominates her affairs and she tolerates no rival. It is clear therefore that every country must settle its attitude towards the war and other nations primarily in relation to its own problems and interests. And yet we have a party in India which swears in the name of Russian communism that expects us to believe that the present war is people's war simply because Russia has taken part in it. To us the first and foremost consideration must be how far this war helps the cause of India's liberation. If India remains subjugated against her will in respect of much vaunted Allied war aims and peace aims, the war has but little significance for us.

BAN ON 'SATYARTHA PRAKASH.

Dr. Mookerjee referred to certain acts of oppression of Hindus in Provinces where League-Ministers were in power. In Assam, a Hindu-majority province, the recent immigration policy of the present League Ministry was calculated to convert the province into the eastern zone of Pakistan. In Bengal, the Ministry which had practically no support from the Hindus, and dependent on the European block and on a carefully planned distribution of patronage to its supporting members, interference with religious rights continued unabated and, recently, worship with music even inside a private house had been prohibited on the ground of its proximity to a mosque. The ban on a portion of the "Satyarth Prakash" under the D. O. I. Rule was an outrageous act and a challenge not only to Sind, but to the whole of India. It was a matter of deep regret that, when the ban was discussed in the Central Assembly, the Congress members with a few exceptions remained neutral. Dr. Mookerjee also referred to nearly two crores of tribal population being entered in the last census as a separate entity and not as Hindus as in previous censuses. "Was it to facilitate further disruption in Hindu society and indirectly encourage Christian proselytisation?" Dr. Mookerjee asked.

Dr. Mookerjee wanted that the caste system should go, and that all Hindus should enjoy equal status. He wanted the Mahasabha to make mass contact,

especially with Labour and Kisans. He commended Sir M. Visweswarayya's scheme towards the solution of the nation's economic backwardness. Dr. Mookerjee stressed the main principle of nationalisation of the major industries of the country. He also called attention to the cattle position in the country, which was getting worse because of slaughter for military purposes. He stressed the importance of Hindi as the national language and condemned the anti-Hindu policy of the All-India Radio. He wanted the Mahasabha to examine the draft Hindu Code on its merits and make constructive proposals. He advised the Mahasabha to train whole-time workers to undertake the Mahasabha's programme.

WAVELL'S 'QUACK' REMEDY

Alluding to Lord Wavell's recent address at the Associated Chambers of Commerce in Calcutta, the Mahasabha President said: "The soldier-poet Viceroy wants to assume the role of a medical adviser for curing the political ailments of India. But he forgets that any suffering patient, however humble, has the inherent right to choose his own medical adviser, or to decide whether he needs any advice at all. The British quack, instead of curing the Indian patient, has already load-d him with dangerous maladies and has charged fees which are bleeding the patient to death. What India suffers from is a slow but dreadful poisoning and the doctor thrives on the patient's misfortune. I agree with Lord Wavell that the patient needs fresh air, but that air must be pure and free. To prove his *bona fides*, let him first tackle the prison-houses which often lead to slow death. Why should not a consultative board of disinterested medical advisers from America, Russia and China two of whom at least have saved the collapsing of the British patient himself, be called in immediately? If they sit along with the Indian patient and the bungling British doctor and proceed with their task on the basis of the four-Freedom prescriptions, the Indian patient will immediately recover and be a good and strong ally. Lord Wavell is right when he says that India needs a faith cure. But this must be faith in her own capacity to rise and recover her lost liberty and not a faith to lean eternally on the charity of others, specially those who have already been guilty of numerous breaches of faith with him."

"TOTALITARIAN VICEROY"

Analysing the Viceroy's comments, Dr. Mookerjee says that His Excellency was not prepared to have any modification of the present constitution during the war; this meant that India's destiny must completely remain in the hands of the "totalitarian Viceroy and Governor-General." If formal changes are not possible, why can he not create a convention and trust a national cabinet consisting of representative Indians whose services will be readily available for organising national defence with the willing co-operation of the people and for the economic regeneration of the country?"

Referring to the Cripps scheme, Dr. Mookerjee said "that portion in the Cripps offer referring to a possible partition of India should be withdrawn immediately and, as he himself says, there will be other means of solving the communal problem. The Cripps Scheme, thus amended, may well form a basis for Indo-British settlement so far as the future constitution is concerned. But the impasse during the war will even then remain unsolved. The British Government is the party that holds in its hand the power that it has to part with and deliver to India. The Viceroy, therefore, cannot take shelter upon the plea that two previous offers have been rejected by India. Complete communal unity on the main political issues is impossible so long as the British Government does not undo the mischief it has itself created. Initiative for a settlement must, therefore, come from Britain and a failure in the direction will be nothing but a breach of faith and a regrettable shirking of responsibility and duty."

"In the course of the next two or three years", he said, "great changes are likely to be made affecting the future of India. It is no use our merely blaming others for our own backwardness and unpreparedness. If there is an Indo-British settlement by peaceful means, steps for framing schemes for the future constitution of India will be taken and the Hindu Mahasabha is the only political organisation which can and will see to it that such constitution is not built on the ashes of the Hindus. On the other hand, if no peaceful settlement can be achieved, a political struggle on a gigantic scale improving the fate of millions of our countrymen will become inevitable. No party or nation ever plunges into a struggle without the fullest possible preparation. That preparation must be the result of active and ceaseless organisation consolidating the disruptive factors that are breaking the unity of Hindus to-day. If an occasion comes for undergoing sacrifices and

suffering on a nation-wide scale for upholding the political or religious rights of the Hindus, the Mahasabha will not lag behind but will take its proper place in such a struggle.

INDIAN POLITICAL PARTIES SHOULD UNITE

"Meanwhile," Dr. Mookerjee continued, "my appeal is for unity amongst all ranks and amongst as many Indian political parties as possible. Gandhiji committed a fresh Himalayan blunder by trying to placate Mr. Jinnah who is out to destroy the very soul of India. Our supreme task is to wrest power from the unwilling hands of our British masters and that power is to come not to this community or that, but to India as a whole and for the ultimate good of all classes and conditions of 400 millions of her children. Why should it be impossible for all political parties who are united in the national demand to put aside, for the time being, their other differences and to concentrate in a spirit of harmonious co-operation for strengthening the will-power of the Indian people?"

"Let us not forget that much as we may demand that the Indian deadlock should be immediately brought to an end, the British Government will not transfer power easily. But the more the repression, the greater the resistance of the people. We have demanded the immediate release of all political prisoners. Our rulers ignore the unprecedented distrust and bitterness that are burning in the minds of all patriotic Indians against the oppression that they are subjected to".

Dr. Mookerjee said: "One of the reasons why we have demanded immediate transfer of power is that we want that at the Peace Conference when the destinies of all the countries of the world will be determined, India's voice must be heard not through the hired Indian agents of British Imperialism but through her chosen spokesmen. If this does not happen, then the real voice of India must remain sufficiently mobilised and made known to the world with as much unanimity as possible. It is for this reason that I feel it urgent that there should be a cessation of the hostilities among the Indian political parties themselves.

"PRESENT A COMMON DEMAND"

"Let us meet on a common platform and present a common demand on the most fundamental problems of Indian liberty and reconstruction. Let us pave the way for educating the masses of India on mutually accepted lines of national reconstruction. It may be that the Muslim League will not join in such a demand but there will be other Muslims who have been stabbed in the back by the O. R. formula who are prepared to stand for Indian Nationalism with rights of minorities duly protected. It will be an act of the finest Indian statesmanship, if to-day there can be a combination of all the nationalist elements in the public life of India for the preparation of an invulnerable national opposition to the continuance of the imperialist designs of Britain."

DRAFT CONSTITUTION FOR INDIA

Apart from fifteen resolutions which will come up before the Subjects Committee of the Hindu Mahasabha there is a sixty-five-page book containing "Constitution of Hindusthan Free State". This constitution has been drafted by the Bhopatkar Satkar Nidhi, a Committee appointed by the Bhopatkar Mandal, an institution which holds primarily a sum of Rs. 24,000 which the public of Maharashtra gave to Mr. L. B. Bhopatkar in recognition of his public services. In the foreword it is explained that, before the war ends, there must be an agreed constitution which should be placed immediately in the hands of the framers of India's future.

The Committee, in which Mr. L. B. Bhopatkar himself is a member and Mr. D. V. Gokhale of Poona, is the Chairman, has framed a constitution on the following basis:— The name of India be Hindusthan. India should be a free State and no servant member or even partner to any other State or commonwealth but could enter into a defensive or offensive alliance with Britain or any other free State in the world. Hindusthan should remain an indivisible entity. The form of Government be a democratic republic and federal one with residuary power at the Centre. The legislature should be bi-cameral both at the Centre and in the Provinces. The executive will be responsible to the legislature and both are to be responsible to the people. People should have the right of calling a referendum on any subject. Even if the President of India differed from the legislature on any matter, he could also ask the people for a referendum. And lastly, the constitution has a provision regarding training in the army, navy and airforce without distinction of martial and non-martial races.

Resolutions—2nd Day—Bilaspur—25th. December 1944

AMENDING OF CRIPPS' PLAN

Resolutions discussed at the forenoon sitting of the Subjects Committee, were considered when the first business session of the Hindu Mahasabha opened at 3 p.m. to-day with Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukerjee in the chair.

Messages wishing success to the session were received among others from Mr. Jambadas Mehta, Kumar Ganganand Sinha, Mr. Anandlal Poddar, Mr. N. O. Kelkar and Bhai Parmasand.

A condolence resolution on the death of Mr. C. Vijayaraghavachariar, Sir P. C. Ray, Mr. S. N. Banerjee, Mr. Manindranath Mitter, Raja of Tirwa, Mr. V. Kale of Bilaspur, Rao Sahib Deshmukh of Ellichpur and Major Prannath Narang, Maharaja of Mymensingh, Mr. N. N. Chakrabarti, Dr. Tejurikar and Mr. Jyotirmay Ghosal was moved by the chair and was passed.

Mr. G. Khaparde moved the next resolution which expressed the opinion that the "spirit of compromise and co-operation" demanded from Hindustan and the condition of production of an agreed scheme of reforms which would solve her political problems and present a united front were the pretexts which were being put forward by British politicians to enable Britain to defeat Hindustan's claim to freedom in the interests of British Imperialism. The resolution authoritatively declared that "a major surgical operation like Pakistan" was not in the best interests of Hindustan and the Hindu-Mahasabha without prejudice to its demands for complete independence and rights to frame its constitution calls upon the British Government to prove their *bona fides* by taking immediate steps to implement the Cripps Scheme shorn of clauses giving power of secession to provinces and to dissolve without delay the present legislatures as the first step to the direct formation of a Constituent Assembly, holding elections not on the basis of the Communal Award but on the basis of joint electorate with reservation of seats where necessary."

Mr. Khaparde said that the British Government repeated persistently their promises to give India freedom but the promise was not being implemented. In order, therefore, to create trust in our mind the British Government should at least make a beginning towards the grant of Self-Government.

Mr. B. H. Apte said that if Britain did not give freedom it would be wrested out of their hands. In one breath, Britain said they were pledged to the Cripps Proposal and in another, they said a major surgical operation of India was not right. That diplomacy was not correct. Britain should tell Indians in a straightforward manner what their intentions were."

Mr. Asutosh Lahiri, who was introduced as "an old revolutionary who had lived in Andamans with Parmasand", observed that Indians accepted the Cripps Offer because it gave them the right of severance from the British Empire but rejected the offer because it had the germ of Pakistan in it. He explained that they were ready to accept the Cripps Offer minus Pakistan for the duration of the war, only keeping intact their demand made in an earlier resolution of the Hindu Mahasabha.

Mr. Rama Rao Pantulu said that they must oppose the division of India, otherwise India would have the same fate as the Europe of to-day. Kunwar Gurunarain, supporting the resolution, said that Muslims had no primary interest in India and if they said that they did not want Sawraj that could not be the view of Indians. Mr. Pindi Das characterised the Atlantic Charter as a great hoax ever committed on subject nations. Mr. Ramnarain Singh also supported the resolution which was passed unanimously.

Resolutions—3rd day—Bilaspur—26th. December 1944

PRINCIPLES FOR FUTURE CONSTITUTION

The Mahasabha adopted to-day the resolution of a Free India and the fundamental rights of citizens as passed by the Subjects Committee. Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherjee presided. The Committee's resolution on the constitution of future Free India enunciated following principles:—

"Hindustan shall be a free State and her constitution be styled "The Constitution of Hindustan Free State." Historically, politically, ethnologically and culturally Hindustan is one whole and indivisible and so shall she remain. The form of Government shall be democratic and federal. The federal legislature shall be bi-cameral in structure. Elections to legislatures, whether federal or provincial, shall be on the basis of adult franchise and of one man one vote. The federal government shall be distributed between the central and provincial legislatures in a

manner to give a measure of autonomy to the provinces adequate with the residuary powers at the Centre.

"The power of the government, whether federal or provincial, shall be divided into legislative, executive and judicial, with the executive responsible to the legislature and both responsible to the people and with the judiciary independent of the executive. Distinction between martial and non-martial races shall no longer exist and the military strength of Hindusthan Free State shall, as far as possible, be equally-balanced amongst its various provinces, consistently with its standard of discipline and efficiency.

"The States should be brought into the Federation of Hindusthan. Responsible government should be introduced on principles stated above.

"The resolution lays down the fundamental rights of a free State, namely, that all citizens domiciled in Hindusthan shall in general enjoy rights and privileges and be subject to the obligations of citizenship and shall in particular enjoy fundamental rights as under :

"Citizens shall be equal before the law and shall enjoy equal civic rights. There shall be no law of a discriminative nature. All citizens shall enjoy the fruits of their toil and shall be entitled to the necessities of life without exploitation of man by man. The State shall make suitable law for the maintenance of health and and fitness for work of all citizens for securing a living wage for every worker, protection of the mother, welfare of children and provision against the economic consequences of old age, infirmity and unemployment. All citizens shall have the rights of free elementary education. All citizens shall have the right to keep and bear arms in accordance with regulations made.

"No citizen shall by reason of colour, caste or creed be prejudiced in any way in regard to public employment, office or power or honour or exercise of any profession, sequestered or confiscated save in accordance with law.

"No citizen shall be deprived of his or her liberty of person except in due process of law. All citizens shall enjoy the right of free expression of opinion as also the right of assembly peacefully and to form associations or unions for purposes not opposed to public order or to public morality. All citizens shall be subject to public order or morality, enjoy freedom of conscience and free profession and practice of religion and protection of culture and language and no law shall be made either directly or indirectly to endow any religion or prohibit or restrict free exercise thereof or give any preference or impose any disability on account of religious belief or religious status.

"The provinces of Hindusthan may, where necessary, be redistributed on a linguistic basis. Religion, language and culture of the minorities shall be respected and guaranteed.

"The Press shall be free and no measures shall be taken to hinder publication, sale and distribution of any writing or news-paper subject to the rules of morality and public order."

When the open session began to-day, Mr. *Shyama Prasad Shastri* moved a resolution which *inter alia* urged the Working Committee to appoint a sub-committee for the propagation of language in Devanagiri script and to counteract the activities of other institutions against Hindi. The resolution condemned the action of Government using Urdu on the All-India Radio and B.B.C. He said, in order to preserve and protect the Hindu religion and culture it was essential to protect the Hindi language.

Professor *Shrimati Lukshmi* of Aryakanya Pathshala, Baroda, said that Hindi was built on Sanskrit, a language in which Hindu scriptures were written. Therefore it was the duty of every Hindu to propagate Hindi.

The resolution was passed.

SETTLEMENT OF MUSLIMS IN ASSAM

Mr. *K. C. Chaudhury* moved a resolution about "dumping of unwanted Muslim population of Eastern Bengal districts on the comparatively virgin soil of Assam with a view to converting that Province into a Muslim majority province." Moving the resolution, Mr. Chaudhury said that Assam was a Hindu majority province but to help the creation of Pakistan, the League Ministry was importing hordes of Muslims from Eastern Bengal in order to make Assam a Muslim majority province. In this the present League Ministry of Bengal had an unholy alliance with the League Ministry of Assam. This policy was already proving disastrous to the economic well-being of the people of Assam.

Mr. *N. Ghose*, *Indrakumar Dutt* supported the resolution which was passed.

BAN ON "SATYARTHA PRAKASH"

7

The resolution regarding the Sind Government's ban on the fourteenth chapter of "Satyarth Prakash" was moved by *Captain Shekhar Chand*. The resolution characterised the ban as a gross abuse of the Defence of India Rules to serve some ulterior motive. It said, the Mahasabha was convinced that the Sind Muslim League Government's order amounted to religious persecution and was a forerunner of their conception of Pakistan and urged the Hindu Ministers and M. L. A.'s of Sind to exert their utmost to see that the ban was removed. Government has a serious responsibility in the matter and they must not permit their policy of allowing religious liberty to be abused in this way." The Mahasabha strongly urged the Governor of Sind and the Viceroy to see that this wrong was righted before it was too late. The resolution also condemned the action of those M. L. A.'s (Central) who did not vote in favour of the resolution for removal of the ban. Finally, the resolution authorised the Working Committee to take all necessary action for the removal of the ban. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Prof. Ghosh said that the policy of the British Government of designating certain territories as 'tribal' and classifying them as "Excluded and Partially excluded areas", followed by tribal enumeration in the Census of 1941, had resulted in an unwarranted decrease in the number of Hindus to the extent of 1,75,00,000. This would cause far reaching repercussions upon the future solution of political complexities. He also advocated sending Hindu missionaries to tribal areas. Mr. Ramnath Kalia supported the resolution in this connection which was adopted.

MISSIONARY ACTIVITY IN MANDLA DISTRICT

Mr. K. Shastri moved the next resolution which expressed alarm at the conversion activities of foreign missionaries especially in Mandla District. The resolution expressed the view that these large-scale conversions were bound to create political problems which would introduce tension in the political fabric of Hindustan in general and this province in particular. The resolution recommended the arrest of the further growth of missionary activities and the reconversion of such of them as were willing to come back to Hinduism and setting up of agencies for this purpose. The resolution authorised the Working Committee to deal with this problem. The resolution was passed.

OPPOSITION TO DRAFT HINDU CODE

Mr. Rabindranath Mookerjee's resolution, opposing precipitate enactment of the Draft Hindu Code, stated that the Hindu Mahasabha was not for the maintenance of the *status quo* and blind adherence to existing rules, laws and traditions and that it always welcomed suitable changes which promoted the welfare of Hindus. But the present Legislature which had been kept in office for 10 years was not representative of Hindu opinion and should not deal with this measure. A really representative Legislature in the democratic constitution could frame the Hindu Code in consultation with a board of Hindu jurists, the resolution said.

Mr. V. V. Kalikar, supporting the resolution, said that the Code made many encroachments on the rights of the Hindus. The resolution was passed unanimously.

On a motion from *Mohant Naindas*, the Conference adopted a resolution declaring that Satnamists were Hindus and denying that they followed the tenets of Islam.

RETROCESSION OF BERAR OPPOSED

"In view of the impending visit of the heir-apparent to the Nizam of Hyderabad to Berar and the possibility of the visit being utilised for strengthening the demand for retrocession of Berar to the Nizam," *Mr. B. G. Khaparde's* resolution on Berar said, "This session reiterates its firm resolution that Berar shall not be ceded to the Nizam, but remain part of British India, and that nothing should be done against the wishes of the people of Berar."

Mr. Khaparde said the resolution was not against the person of the Nizam or his Heir-apparent, but was moved in order to maintain the rights of the people of Berar. They did not want to suffer the same disabilities in Ceded Berar as the Hindus in the Nizam's Dominion were suffering at present.

Dr. B. S. Moonje said that the people of Berar should not boycott the visit.

The Conference passed the resolution, which had proved the most controversial in the Subjects Committee, when some speakers made allegations regarding the distribution of monies among institutions.

ECONOMIC PLAN FOR INDIA

Mr. *Bhopatkar* then moved a long resolution enunciating an economic plan for India. Among other principles the plan advocated State ownership or control of key industries and protection of nascent industry and market by tariff walls or preferential treatment. The resolution was passed unanimously.

For want of time, the remaining resolutions were moved by the Chair and accepted. One resolution requested the Viceroy to exercise his prerogative of clemency in respect of political prisoners sentenced to death and particularly, in the cases of the accused sentenced to death in the Chimur and Ashti cases in the Central Provinces.

A second resolution urged the repeal of the Criminal Act. Another resolution decided to appoint a committee of renowned historians for writing the history of Hindustan from the point of view of the Hindus.

PRESIDENT'S CLOSING REMARKS

In the course of his closing remarks, Dr. *Shyama Prasad Mookerjee* thanked every-one for making the session a success and especially Mr. V. D. Savarkar, the retiring President, for the great work he had done. He had been a source of great inspiration to millions of Hindus, including Dr. Mookerjee himself.

Referring to the resolutions of the Hindu Mahasabha, Dr. Mookerjee said that the Mahasabha placed before the country a programme which could worthily be pursued by any organisation. Those who dubbed the Mahasabha as a communal body would get their answer in the resolutions passed to-day. The plan and programme laid before the country were, however, subject to a very important condition. "We have asked Hindus to be prepared to make some sacrifice, but that sacrifice is to be made on the supreme condition that it will lead to complete liberation of the motherland." He advised the Hindus not to be depressed if success did not come immediately, for success would come in the long run.

Mr. Savarkar's attack on Gandhiji

The following statement was issued to the Press from Bombay on the 14th. August 1944 by Mr. *Savarkar*, President of the Hindu Mahasabha :—

The Gandhists have observed a day of repentance. I have deliberately used the word 'Gandhists' instead of the word 'Congressites' as the Congress camp is at its sixes and sevens and influential sections there are reported to be enunciating Gandhiji's latest metamorphosis.

But, for what political 'errors',—which in Gandhiji's vocabulary mean 'sins'—committed by them have the Gandhists observed this day of repentance or self-purification ?

The Congress has really committed political errors, that is, sins of such a magnitude that the Congressites deserve to go in sackcloth and ashes. Taking into account even the war-period alone, the notable Congressite leaders, Gandhiji, Pandit Nehru and others were guilty of the 'sin' of declaring at the very outset of the war that the Allied powers were out to fight for restoring democracy all over the world, for liberating the enslaved and that, therefore, it was the duty of the Congress to help unconditionally the Allied cause. The second 'sin' committed by Gandhiji was the melodramatic interview which he had with the Viceroy where he, on his own confession, wept over the fancied destruction of the Westminster Abbey and assured the Government, to quote his own words, "I am not thinking of India's deliverance now, what is the worth of the freedom of India, if England and France were to fall victims to brute force." The third sin which was committed by the Congressites all put together, in spite of the warning of the Hindu Mahasabha to the contrary and rejecting the most patriotic, just, democratic and statesmanlike terms proposed by the Mahasabha's accredited leader, was when they passed the most untimely, muddled, self-contradictory and ill-fated resolution on the 8th August, 1942 and launched a movement which they styled in a spirit of bravado 'an open revolt' against that very British power whom, in the same breath, they requested to keep the British Army in India to save her from alien invasion. Had they stopped there, one could have admired them for their highly patriotic motives, though their foresight would have remained as questionable as ever. But on that very eve, Gandhiji in the name of Congress and as its dictator wrote a letter to Mr. Jinnah 'assuring him in all sincerity' that Congress wished that even a cent per cent transfer of power might be made to the Moslems by the British. The high-spirited men in their camp took the revolt in its real sense as it was understood all over the world and started the struggle, as they had been instructed to do after the arrest of

their leaders, by all the means within their reach at the discretion of their individual or group conscience. But, while the movement was going on outside, Gandhiji, hardly within a month of his incarceration, began to carry on the most humiliating correspondence with that very Viceroy whom he wanted to "quit India" —'bag and baggage'. When the Viceroy condescended to reply a letter of his, Gandhiji felt so flattered that he wrote back to the Viceroy how delighted he was to see that he had not fallen so much from the grace of His Excellency as not to receive even a reply to his letters. Then he wrote to the Viceroy expressing his view most emphatically that Mr. Jinnah should be called upon to take charge of the whole Indian Government including Indian India i.e. even the Indian States and so form his own Government. The Congress, he assured in that letter, will not only acquiesce but support such a cent per cent Muslim Government. Monarchical fit can hardly go further, nor a sin could be darker. But the blackest sin of vivisectioning our Motherland and holy land is still going to crown his political career.

But it was not to repent for these most grievous political errors that the Gandhists observed the day of penance and prayers. For they still pursue the same path and look upon it as a glorified mission. The naked truth must therefore be plainly told that this day of repentance was observed with the only motive of throwing the whole blame for the miserable fiasco in which the Gandhist "Quit India" slogan has ended on those very men who alone carried on the movement at the risk of their lives and victimise them to save the Gandhist group to secure Gandhiji's freedom to enable him to regain the confidence of the powers that be, as the life-long friend of the British, and to pursue his anti-national and anti-Hindu fad of bringing about Hindu-Muslim unity even at the most revolting cost of vivisectioning our Motherland and only land,—all this in the name of non-violence, truth and God. The Prince of evil is reported to say to himself :

"With a smile and a nod:

"The best way to work my will

"Is to call it the will of God."

The All Parties Hindu Conference

Lahore—13th August 1944

Proceedings and Resolutions

A resolution declaring emphatic opposition to the Rajagopalachari formula was passed by the All-Parties Hindu Conference held in Bhopendra Hall, Lahore on the 13th. August, 1944. The resolution was moved by R. B. Durga Das, Advocate.

R. B. Ram Saran Das, Member, Council of State, presided over the conference which was attended by over 200 Hindus from all over the province representing various sections among the Hindus. The Congress was of course not represented because almost every Congressman who counts in the Congress circles in the Punjab and is outside jail is restricted and is not allowed to participate in any meeting.

Messages received from Sir Chhotu Ram, Sir Manohar Lal, Sir Tek Chand, and others were read out by Lala Brij Lal, Secretary, Hindu Vigilance Board. Among these messages was one from Lala Duni Chand, M. L. A. (Congress) who had said that vivisection of India should not be tolerated under any circumstances because it would create condition like those in Balkans and would lead to perpetual foreign domination. Partition of India into independent sovereign State would be as equal an evil as the present subjugation of India. He further wrote that he was prepared to give an honourable position to the Muslims in India as equal partners with all the blessings of free India but he could not be a party to the rights of majority being denied to them if communalism was to remain.

Among those present at the conference were R. B. Durga Das, Mahashey Rattan Chand, Mr. Keshab Chander, Prof. D. C. Sharma, Thakur Ripudaman Singh, M.L.A. Ch. Sumer Singh, M.L.A., B. B. Ganga Saran, L. Kudan Lal Vij, Captain A. N. Bali, Malik Arjan Das, L. Kudan Lal Lamba and Lala Hari Chand Puri.

Goswami Ganesh Dutt read a letter from Mahashey Krishna who was one of the conveners but was unable to attend being under restrictions. Mahashey Krishna warned the Hindus against the coming communal strife which was bound to result from the vivisection of India and would make the freedom of India an unrealised dream for ever.

Pandit Hardutt Sharma read out the "C. R.'s" formula and the opinions of the various prominent public leaders.

Lala Brij Lal quoted facts and figures to show the implications of the "C.R.'s" formula.

Lala Purshottam Lal, Joint Secretary of the Zamindara League and a former President of the Hindu Sabha, Khanewal wanted to move a resolution suggesting that no opinion should be expressed until the Gandbi-Jinnah meeting, because nothing should be done which might mar the prospect of the coming meeting of the communal settlement. His resolution, however, had no objection to the expression of the opinion by the Hindus. Lala Purshottam Lal was hooted and there were protests against such a proposal being allowed because they had been invited to protest against the "C. R.'s" formula. The president had already disallowed the resolution and the mover resumed his seat.

At this stage Mr. Keshab Chander asked the press representatives to show their reports before the publication to someone authorised by the conveners.

The press representatives intimated Mr. Keshab Chander that they were not prepared to submit their reports to new "censorship" because the conference was open to the press. What press representatives were prepared to do was to go away and let the conference be held in "camera" and then the authorities of the conference could issue any statement they liked.

The suggestion made was at once withdrawn.

After this R. B. Lala Durga Dass moved the main resolution which was seconded and supported among others, by L. Kundan Lal Lamba, Mr. Nanak Ohand Pandit, Ch. Sumer Singh, M. L. A., Dewan Sarab Dyal, Bar-at-Law, Gujranwala, Dewan Inder Lal, Advocate, President Sargodha Municipal Committee, Malik Devi Dyal, Advocate of Jhang, L. Bhagat Ram Pleader, Jullundur, Mr. Rama Nath, Pleader, Sheikhpura.

Lala Brij Lal, while explaining the implications of the 'C. R.'s' formula, said that the formula had two effects, one that concerned the present, and the other that concerned the future. The present related to the conditions which had been laid that the League would subscribe to the ideal of Independence and side with the Congress in its struggle for independence of India. There were some other conditions which related to the future and they were with regard to the commission to be appointed for demarcation, etc. He knew that there were people who believed that for the sake of India's independence the Punjab should make some sacrifice. The effect of the provision in the 'C.R.'s formula would be that the Punjab would be divided into 17 districts in the Pakistan and 12 districts in the Hindustan. Districts in Pakistan would include districts in Rawalpindi and Multan Divisions and all the districts in Lahore Division excepting Amritsar where non-Muslims were in a majority. Of course there was the Gurdaspur district where Muslims were in majority of about 24,000. Taken altogether the population of the Punjab is 2,84,18,819 of whom 1,62,17,242 are Muslims, 84,44,176 Hindus and 37,57,401 Sikhs. Of these in the 17 contiguous districts which would pass into Pakistan the total population would be 1,68,70,900 of whom 1,23,63,669 will be Muslims; 28,23,276 Hindus and 16,83,955 Sikhs and likewise in the 12 districts where Muslims are not in a majority the population would be 1,15,47,919 and of these 38,53,593 will be Muslims, 56,20,800 Hindus and 20,73,546 Sikhs.

In the whole area including 17 districts of the Punjab, N. W.F. Province and Sind the total population would be 2,44,43,975 and of these 1,33,60,791 will be Muslim and 60,84,184 non-Muslims giving a percentage 75.2% to the Muslim and 24.18% to the non-Muslims.

It was impossible to conceive, said Mr. Brij Lal, that 24.18% would be able to persuade 75.20% or any majority from among them to vote with the non-Muslims.

He further stated that more of canal irrigated land would pass into western (Pakistan) Punjab. The total land under canal irrigation was 1,14,57,098 acres of which 17 districts would possess 88,80,746 acres and only 25,25,052 acres would be with the Eastern Punjab.

VIVISECTION OF INDIA CONDEMNED

Mr. *Keshab Chander* and Mr. *Deshpande*, General Secretary and Secretary of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha addressed the conference and spoke in condemnation of the 'C. R.' formula.

R. B. Durga Das, Advocate, moved the following resolution :—

"The representative conference of the Hindus of the Punjab records its strong and emphatic protest against the vivisection of India as contemplated in the formula of Mr. Rajagopalachari.

"The conference is definitely of opinion that since the enforcement of the communal Award the political situation in the country has immensely deteriorated.

"This conference is, therefore, convinced that the solution of the present political or communal deadlock in the country does not lie in yielding to the ever-increasing demands of Mr. Jinnah and the Muslim League but in boldly and strongly resisting it by all available constitutional means.

"This conference further believes that the political salvation of India can only be achieved by freeing its future constitution from the virus of separation and communalism and basing it on truly democratic principles.

It further declares that Mr. Rajagopalachari's formula strikes at the root of the fundamental geographical culture and historical oneness, national integrity and administrative unity of India by proposing the dismemberment and vivisection of the country. The said formula, by virtually accepting the two-nation theory of Mr. Jinnah on the basis of religion, tends to destroy the noble achievements towards the evolution of one common Indian Nation on the basis of racial identity, historical tradition and patriotic sentiments.

"The offer of Mr. Rajagopalachari is wholly un-authorised, most inopportune and absolutely unjust, adversely affecting the cultural, economic and political life of Hindus. The conference declares that no body has the right to barter away the rights of the Punjab Hindus, and declares that any such proposal shall be strictly resisted."

In moving the resolution *R. B. Durga Das* made a vigorous speech and said that Rajaji's formula was bad in principle and it should not be accepted, even if it had the support of the biggest man in the country. He regretted that men who had made immeasurable sacrifices for the freedom of their country had chosen a wrong path. He had no objection to the Muslims getting everything on grounds of some principle. The Hindus did not want any favours but looked for sheer justice. He maintained that the Hindus were being crushed under communalism which had played havoc in the Punjab. He asked if any other country knew of such disgraceful form of communalism under which admission to the educational institutions, even the Medical College and Engineering College, were not made on any merits but on grounds of religions.

He pointed out how Hindus were creaking under communalism. He said that a society or any administration based on communalism could not live for long. He had no hesitation in saying that they were already living in Pakistan.

Lala Kundan Lal Lamba, who seconded the resolution, asked the people not to show any disrespect towards Gandhiji or Rajagopalachari. He wanted them to do something constructive in order to prevent the establishment of Pakistan. The present border line was beyond the N.W.F. Province and they could not afford to bring that line near about Amritsar which would mean perpetual danger.

Mr. *Nanak Chand Pandit*, Bar-at-Law, in supporting the resolution, maintained that unless Hindu leadership would be prepared to suffer and sacrifice, they would not be able to forge ahead. Gandhiji and the Congress were great because they were always found willing to suffer and sacrifice. He had no doubt that even if an agreement was reached between Gandhiji and Mr. Jinnah, there would be no swaraj so long as communalism remained. He suggested the need of sending out deputations to America, Britain and Europe for representing the Hindu point of view to the people of those countries. He also suggested the formation of a committee to study the whole situation arising out of the 'C.R. Proposal.

Ch. Sumer Singh, M.L.A., (of Sir Chhotu Ram's group), in supporting the resolution, warned the Hindus against being frightened, by the Mahatma's fast. He asked that they must put up a strong and stout opposition to the C. R. formula.

The resolution was further supported by Mr. *Amrit Lal*, Pleader, Municipal Commissioner, Multan, Mr. *Inder Lal*, Advocate, President, Municipal Committee, Sargodha, L. *Bhagat Ram*, Pleader, Jullundur, Dewan *Sarab Dyal*, Bar-at-Law,

Municipal Commissioner, Gujranwala, Malik Devi Dyal, Pleader, Jhang, L. Amar Nath, Advocate, Daska and L. Gyan Chand, Advocate, Amritsar.

The main theme of the speeches was that India shall not be allowed to be cut into pieces and thus weakened. The speakers generally expressed their sorrow over Jinnah having been given a fresh lease of life by Gandhiji when the League leader had come to the beginning of his decline.

There was some excitement and unpleasantness when one gentleman Mr. Ram Nath of Moga wanted to speak in opposition but he was not allowed on the ground that he had not come as a representative of any organisation. He asserted that he had a right to speak as a Hindu.

Mr. Prem Prakash, Pleader, Lahore, opposed the resolution.

When Mr. Phaggo Mal, B.A., LL.B., wanted to speak in opposition there was some noise and disturbance also but he was allowed to speak for a few minutes ultimately.

The resolution was adopted by the conference, a few voices dissenting.

The conference also decided to depute L. Brij Lal and Mr. Keshab Chander to go to Gandhiji to represent the Hindu view-point to him.

Mr. Keshab Chander, however, changed his mind and would not be going to see Gandhiji. The Hindu Vigilance Board was requested to take up the movement and give a lead to the opposition movement.

The conference adopted a resolution moved from the chair asking the authorities to change the route for carrying beef in front of the Durgiana Temple. It further demanded the release of Pandit Prakash Dveshwar who had been detained under the Defence of India Rules.

Goswami Ganesh Dutt gave his blessings to the movement, and while condemning the growing tide of communalism in the Punjab, asked the Hindus to unite and face the danger that awaited them and let no one divide their country. He was sorry Gandhiji in his proverbial goodness had been instrumental in reviving Jinnah's dying leadership.

R. B. Ram Saran Das expressed the hope that the Punjab Hindus would not sit quiet but would carry on a strong agitation against the 'C.R.' formula.

The Sikh Polity

The All Parties Sikh Conference

Working Committee—Amritsar—1st August 1944

Formula Detrimental to Sikhs

The Sikhs' determined opposition to the "O. R." formula was declared by the Working Committee of the All-Parties Sikh Conference which discussed at Amritsar on the 1st. August 1944 the situation arising out of the "O. R." formula for communal settlement. The meeting over which *Sardar Baldev Singh*, Development Minister and President of the All Parties Sikh Conference presided, was held behind closed doors at the Queen's Road and was attended by most of the Sikh leaders, including many M. L. A. s.

After the meeting the following resolution passed by the Working Committee was issued to the press by *Sardar Harnam Singh*, Advocate :—

"This meeting of the Working Committee of the All Parties Sikh Conference resolves that the basis of communal settlement outlined in the Rajagopalchari formula which had been approved by Mahatma Gandhi is manifestly unfair and detrimental to the best interests of the country and the Sikh community. The Working Committee regards the proposed scheme as breach of faith on the part of the leaders of the Congress which had assured the Sikhs at its Lahore Session in 1929 that no communal settlement will be acceptable to the Congress which does not satisfy *inter alia* the Sikh community."

"The Working Committee further declares that any communal settlement reached without the express consent of the Sikh community shall not be allowed to work in this country and under the circumstances calls upon the Sikh community

to initiate and carry on a country-wide and effective agitation for the rejection of the formula."

The Working Committee adopted another resolution by which it was decided to approach Master Tara Singh who retired from active politics to come back and lead the Sikh community in its struggle.

By another resolution the Working Committee expressed concern at the proposed share to be given to the Sikhs from out of the share fixed for smaller minorities in the services under the Central Government as reported in the "Tribune" and demanded that at least five per cent share in the services under the Central Government be reserved for the Sikhs.

Some prominent Sikh leaders, including Sardar Baldev Singh, Development Minister, S. B. Sardar Wasakha Singh, S. Surjit Singh, S. Santokh Singh, M. L. A., S. Mangal Singh, M. L. A. (Central), S. Pritam Singh Sidhu, M. L. A., S. Tara Singh, M. L. A., S. Uttam Singh Duggal, M. L. A., Gyani Kartar Singh, M. L. A., Sardar Kapur Singh, M. L. A., S. Sber Singh, M. L. A. S. Sampuran Singh, M. L. A., Sodhi Harnam Singh, M. L. A., S. Raghbir Singh, S. B. Prabh Singh Chawla, S. Harnam Singh, Advocate, S. Basant Singh Moga, issued the following statement:— We declare that Sjt. Rajagopalachari's formula for communal settlement which has been approved by Mahatma Gandhi is manifestly unfair, inequitable and detrimental to the best interests of the country in general and the Sikhs, in particular. Any communal settlement without the expressed consent of the Sikh community shall not be binding on them and we expect that the Sikhs will oppose with all their might any such arrangement.

The All Parties Sikh Conference

Amritsar—20th. August 1944

Sikh Demand for Independent State

A representative Sikh gathering was held at the Teja Singh Hall, Amritsar, the headquarter of the Sharomani Gurdwara Prabandhak Committee, and the Sharomani Akali Dal on the 20th August 1944.

Master Tara Singh, who convened this conference, did not want it to be described as the Sikh All Parties Conference. He asserted that to the conference had been invited every individual and every organisation that had anything to do with Sikhism. Masterji was cheered when he declared that he had even approached his bitter opponents—the Central Akali Dal—without any hesitation and he went personally to the Acting President of the Central Akali Dal, S. Amar Singh of the Sher-i-Punjab, in spite of the long-standing differences, and requested him to bring any number of the people to the conference he and his friends liked. He was sorry that the Central Akali Dal decided not to attend it for reason best known to them. He had no hesitation in saying that for obvious reasons he did not have the courage or the heart to go to Baha Kharak Singh or send him an invitation because he was afraid lest Baba Sahib should feel insulted by his invitation. Of course, no invitation had been sent to any Communist because, he declared, with the approval of the conference he did not regard Sikh Communists to be Sikhs. That, he said, was because of the declaration made by the Sikh Communists which showed utter lack of faith in the tenets of Sikhism and their Gurus.

Apart from that, Master Tara Singh, in the course of his speech, while proposing the name of Sardar Mohan Singh, Jatbedar of Akal Takhat Sahib—the most authoritative seat among the Sikhs from where orders could be issued to the Sikhs, said that every body had been invited and he was glad there had been a generous response.

Of the 741 invitations issued 561 Sikh individuals and representatives of various Sikh organisations including members of the Sharomani Gurdwara Prabandhak Committee, Singh Sabhas, Sharomani Akali Dal, Chief Khalsa Dewan, the Sikh Defence of India League, Sikh M. L. A.'s, Sikh moderates, Nirmalists, Namdharis had responded to the invitation.

Among those present at the conference, which started at 12 noon, were S. Baldev Singh, Minister of Development, Punjab, S. Ajit Singh, Minister N.-W. F. Province, Sardar Buta Singh, Member of the Council of State, S. Sampuran Singh, S. Ujjail Singh, S. Mangal Singh, M. L. A. (Central), Gyani Kartar Singh, S. Kapur Singh, S. Jogendra Singh Man, S. Tara Singh, S. Gurbaksh Singh, S. Lal Singh, S. Mula Singh, S. Inder Singh, M. L. Aa, S. Kartar Singh, Campbellpur.

The conference, which continued for more than five hours, adopted five resolutions which were moved by various Sikh leaders and were adopted unanimously excepting the main resolution where there was just one dissenting vote. As the gentleman was given opportunity to speak sometime after the resolution had been passed, he expressed his views, which the organisers took as being the views which showed that he had withdrawn his opposition.

A walk-out was staged by the Sikh representatives from the Rawalpindi Singh Sabha as they thought that the meeting was not representative of the Panth as only pro-Akali people had mostly been invited. Their objection was that the conference not being Panthic could not invest all powers in Master Tara Singh. An invitation for such a conference where someone was to be empowered on behalf of the Panth should have been issued from the Akal Takhat Sahib and then if Baba Kbarak Singh had not come he could be blamed. No notice was, however, taken of the walk-out.

The following resolutions were passed by the conference:—

The Panthic gathering emphatically condemns the Gandhiji-Rajaji formula for communal settlement and rejects it because as a result of its enforcement, the Sikhs will be divided into two sections to be held in perpetual bondage. Further this formula which would vicesect the country will undermine the unity and combined strength of the country and create conditions of permanent disunity and anarchy in this land. This Panthic gathering further declares that no communal settlement reached without the previous consultation with and without the consent of the Sikhs will be binding on them.

The second resolution ordered Master Tara Singh to lead the Sikh community in order to oppose the C. R. formula and authorised him to formulate a programme and appoint a sub-committee for the execution of the programme and carry on negotiations with various organisations in the country so as to safeguard the claims and rights of the Sikh community.

The third resolution expressed the opinion that the present political dead-lock is highly detrimental to the interests of the country and should be resolved by releasing unconditionally all political prisoners any by the establishment of a National Government. The resolution declared that the Sikhs were always ready for an honourable settlement.

There was another resolution moved by *Sardar Mangal Singh, M. L. A., (Central)* which declared the Sikh opposition to the division of India but wanted the creation of a position wherein the Sikhs would remain neither under the domination of the Muslim majority nor the Hindu majority and that they would get the same rights in all the provinces as had been given to other minorities.

By an amendment which was moved in the resolution, a demand was made for the creation of an independent Sikh State.

On a further amendment being moved by *S. B. Ujjal Singh*, who was supported by *Gyani Sher Singh* the whole matter related with the demand for the establishment of a Sikh independent State, its scheme, etc., was left to the committee which is to be appointed by Master Tara Singh. The committee was asked to enquire into the matter and with the consultation of all Sikh interests evolve a scheme for the establishment of an independent Sikh State in case India was to be divided among the Hindus and the Mussalmans.

Master Tara Singh appealed for greater unity among the Sikhs and asked them to shed off their personal prejudices and create a Panthic feeling within themselves and learn to sacrifice everything for the Panth. If they were united and disciplined they would be able to make themselves heard by those including Mahatma Gandhi who were refusing to listen to them or even care for them.

The "C. R." formula, said Master Tara Singh, was not acceptable to them as it would result in dividing the Punjab by putting 17 districts in the Pakistan and 12 districts with Hindustan. This would place the Sikhs under perpetual slavery of the two, namely the Hindus and the Mussalmans. That, he asserted, the Sikhs did not want. The Sikhs also wanted political power. The Hindus did not want division of India because it suited them to maintain their power in the centre. Mr. Jinnah was now trying to placate the Sikhs by offering them what he described "better terms". The Sikhs would refuse to live on anybody's charity.

Master Tara Singh declared that the Sikhs were already tired of the Muslim Raj in the Punjab. They were not fighting against it because of the circumstances due to war as the British Government would not tolerate any agitation to-day. The present Premier was slightly better than the late Premier who was very clever. But the Sikhs were tired of the Muslim Raj in the Punjab. They were only waiting for an opportunity and they may have to give a fight very soon.

Explaining his attitude towards Sikh recruitment, Master Tara Singh said that he wanted the Sikhs to join the army for the sake of the Panth as the Sikhs in the army would be their great support. Moreover, when the struggle came they would be able to get moral support from a section of the Military officers as they got during the Gurdwara movement.

Master Tara Singh revealed that while he had almost despaired of receiving a reply from Mahatma Gandhi to his letter, he received one from him to-day in which Mahatma Gandhi explained how the letter which was posted at Amritsar on August 5 reached him on August 10 and he could not reply before August 15. The letter however assured Masterji that Gandhiji would be glad to know any flaw. But Masterji said that Gandhiji having given his offer to Mr. Jinnah would not be able to go back from it, even though their offer was given contrary to the assurance which was given to the Sikhs at the Lahore Congress. He added that he would not mind if Gandhiji did not fulfil his pledged word to the Sikhs. The Sikhs, said Masterji, must now learn to stand on their own legs and look up to no one. He wanted them to formulate their own demand and let not the history of 1917 be repeated when settlement was arrived at between the Hindus and the Muslims without any reference being made to the Sikhs. The Sikhs were a nation and they wanted to live in this country as honourable people and if there was to be a division they must not be made slaves of a Pakistan and Hindustan.

Gyani Sher Singh moved the first resolution condemning C. R. formula and rejecting it. The mover said it was significant that no Sikh had supported the C. R. formula. Under the scheme in the area consisting of 6 districts of the N. W. F. P. 8 districts of Sind and 17 districts of the Punjab the Muslim population would be 76 per cent and the remaining 24 per cent non-Muslims, mostly in rural areas, would be under the thumb of the 76 per cent Muslims. His apprehension was that if the border line districts or talukas or tehsils were to be allowed Amritsar might also go into Pakistan because depressed classes may join with 46 per cent Muslims in the two district Tehsils of Ajnala, Nakodar, Zsra, Batala, Shakargraph would also go into Pakistan because of the Muslim majority. This would result in giving away two-thirds of Punjab to Pakistan.

He declared that Sikhs must have equal rights, like brothers and they could be placed under nobody's domination. If a common rule of all the communities was not possible in India the Sikhs would also like to see their own flag flying some where in their own territory. Before the British rule the Sikhs were rulers of the Punjab and they did not want to be put under perpetual subjugation of any community after the British go away.

Sardar Santokh Singh, Leader of the Opposition in the Punjab Assembly, seconding the resolution said that the Sikhs would fight to the last man against the establishment of Pakistan. The Sikhs had always stood for democracy and suffered for India's freedom. But no one, not even the British, had a right to barter away the Sikhs. He regretted it most that Gandhiji came to the rescue of Mr. Jinnah when he was drowning after his defeat at the hands of the Unionists. Pakistan meant Muslim majority Raj and they could not tolerate it.

S. B. Sardar Ujjal Singh, supporting the resolution, said that the brave Sikhs were no stumbling block in the way of freedom-loving people. They were not selfish but they did not want to live in perpetual slavery. He envisaged a constitution for India where no one community would dominate over others and suggested composite cabinet of all communities. The right of self-determination was given to a nation only for, otherwise, in a country like India it would lead to its complete vivisection. If Mr. Jinnah's demand was conceded, he would then ask for a corridor after India becomes like Balkans and for the defence of that corridor perhaps British soldier might be required. Did the Muslims want to lose 1½ crores of the pensions of the military men who would go into Pakistan. He maintained that Sikhs had more financial interests in the districts of Lahore, even though the Muslims were in majority. Out of 18 lakhs of revenue the Muslims paid only Rs. 6,16,193. The minority problem always remains. He therefore did not want to appease Mr. Jinnah for nothing. *Sardar Basant Singh*, Moga, a member of the A. I. C. C., supported the resolution as a Congressman and said Gandhiji should not ignore the Congress resolution of May 1942.

S. Kapoor Singh, M. L. A. (Congress), speaking in his individual capacity, wanted Sikhs to wait and not give their verdict before placing their point of view before Gandhiji to whom they should represent their case. He stood for unity of India and said that they must arrive at some settlement to get rid of foreign rule.

There were interruptions while S. Kapoor Singh spoke. *Gyani Kartar Singh* opposed S. Kapoor Singh and expressed the apprehension that Gandhiji may do his best for arriving at a settlement and the only thing that could avert such a catastrophe was their united opposition which he wanted the Sikhs to carry on strongly. If an agreement was reached, the formula would become worse.

He said that the Sikhs favoured the division of India in order to save the Panth only, but others wanted a division to crush and finish the Sikhs. While in the 12 districts there would be 33,38,327 Muslims and 18,40,112 Sikhs, in all being 51,78,439 whereas the Hindus would be 55,12,435 thus giving them majority in those districts also. The Sikhs were prepared to agree to division only out of compulsion. If Pakistan was to come of compulsion because Mr. Jinnah's demand could not be resisted, why not give an independent State to the Sikhs also. He asked that no appeals should be made in the name of the country as henceforth there would be no India after division. If the Sikhs did not oppose the establishment of Pakistan now they would never be able to fight it out. The Sikhs had forced the last citadel on the Indian border to be the Jamrud fort. They did not want the border, but to be in Amritsar. He had no objection in going to Gandhiji but beggar, he said, cannot be chooser. The Sikhs had been reduced to the present state of helplessness because they always went with folded hands to Gandhiji. It appeared that Gandhiji was thinking of appeasing only Mr. Jinnah. The result of begging again and again could be nothing but what they had seen in connection with Gandhiji's correspondence with the Viceroy.

Gyani Kartar Singh thought that the Viceroy's reply had been an eye opener to Gandhiji and it was on that account that he had thought of writing to the Sikhs that he would like to know of any flaw; otherwise he might not have cared for them at all. The resolution was passed, only one Dr. Gour Saran Singh dissenting.

Sardar Kartar Singh Campbellpuri, Advocate moved the second resolution regarding the establishment of National Government.

The resolution was seconded and supported by S. Har Charan Singh and S. Balwant Singh. The resolution was passed.

The resolution regarding the "order" of the Panth to Master Tara Singh to assume the leadership for carrying on the agitation against "O. R." formula was moved by S. B. Jijal Singh M. L. A., and seconded by S. Mangal Singh, M. L. A., (Central), S. Jaimal Singh (Jhelum) and S. Prem Singh Sodhbans.

Tributes were paid to Masterji and he was described as the most incorruptible man.

The speakers asked Masterji to lead them to victory and they wanted the people to know that Masterji's voice was the voice of the Panth. S. Mangal Singh asked the Sikhs to remember that on them would fall the responsibility of protecting the Hindus and they would be duty bound to do so.

By a resolution moved by S. Pritham Singh (Jathedar, Sharomani Akali Dal) it was decided to observe September 3 to voice the Panth's protest against the O. R. formula.

Sardar Mangal Singh, M.L.A., (Central) in moving his resolution, regretted that by Gandhiji's blessing the O. R. formula and his agreeing to appease Mr. Jinnah, his (*Sardar Mangal Singh's*) conception of India and her freedom for which so much sacrifices had been made had received a rude shock. Muslims wanted to have a territory from Constantinople to Delhi and it was pity that Gandhiji was trying to appease Mr. Jinnah. Countries and territories could not be given on paper, he said. He added that Swaraj could not be won by correspondence. He complained that a cultured man like Mr. Rajagopalachari had asked if the Panjabee Hindus and Sikhs wanted Mr. Amery to decide for them their matters and rule over India. He reported by saying: "Does Rajaji want to force the Panjabee Hindus and the Sikhs to agree to Pakistan with the help of Amery's bayonet". He did not want Punjab to become another Poland. He suggested that Gandhiji should declare that he would not agree to any communal settlement unless the Sikhs accepted it also.

S. Mohindra Singh moved an amendment asking for an independent Sikh State.

Master Tara Singh, in course of his concluding remarks, while accepting the order of the Panth said: "I have decided to obey you because my heart is in the work which you have entrusted to me." He regretted that Hindus were not realists and declared that he had nowhere said that Hindus and Sikhs could not unite in their opposition to the O.R. formula. Of course, for a common cause

being made by the Hindus and the Sikhs the time had not yet come. He, however, declared that the Sikhs would not agree to any such division of India—among the Hindus and the Muslims. If Muslims could not be prevailed upon to remain in a united India, the Sikhs could not be forced to go out of a United India—into Pakistan”.

Central Akali Dal's Statement

Baba Kharak Singh, President, Central Akali Dal, issued the following statement to the press on the 20th. August:—

The so-called All Parties Sikh Conference, which is being held at Amritsar to-day, on the invitation of Master Tara Singh, is atmiionomer, because in fact it is only a meeting of the Akali party, to which some others, who are expected to say yes to the Akalis, have also been invited. The Central Akali Dal decided yesterday not to participate in the said meeting, I also understand that the Chief Khalsa Diwan and many other influential Sikh societies and organisations have also likewise boycotted this meeting. It is clear from this that the said meeting cannot by any stretch of language be called "All-Parties Conference." nor can the decisions arrived at this meeting be called the voice of the Panth.

The Secretary of the Central Akali Dal wrote:

A representative meeting of leading Sikhs from all over the Punjab and the N. W. F. P. was held at Lahore on Sunday under the auspices of Central Akali Dal. *Baba Kharak Singh* presided.

The meeting adopted a lengthy resolution rejecting the Gandhi-C.R." formula and declaring that the Sikhs would not accept any scheme of India's vivisection and will oppose Pakistan tooth and nail. Sardar Amar Singh the "Sher-i-Punjab moved the resolution which was seconded by Sardar Pritam Singh, Bedi Gurcharan Singh of Campbellpore and others.

The meeting also passed some other resolutions including one for the immediate release of political prisoners.

The Sikh Communists' Conference

Amritsar—11th. September 1944

Faith in Gandhi's Leadership

Support to Gandhijee in his efforts at bringing about a settlement of the communal tangle was voiced by a conference of Sikhs held near the Queen Victoria Statue at Amritsar on the 11th September 1944. This meeting had been invited by *Baba Waakha Singh*, *Baba Sohan Singh Bhakna*, both communist leaders, and *Sardar Sarmukh Singh Jhabal*, a Sikh Congress leader. About 250 Sikh workers belonging to various parties among the Sikhs responded to the invitation. The communists were predominant and there were present some Congressmen who were free to come and representatives of the Central Sikh Youth League, Progressive Akali Party, and Malwa Khalsa Durbar. Entrance to the shamiana where the meeting was held was regulated and none excepting those invited were allowed to go in. The Akalis were prominent by their absence and so was the Central Akali Dal.

At the conference the name of *S. Amar Singh Jhabal* was proposed by *S. Jagit Singh* for the chair.

Babu Dan Singh opposed the proposal but he did not press his proposal and ultimately *S. Amar Singh* was voted to the chair.

SIKHS BORN TO SUFFER

Sardar Amar Singh Jhabal, in the course of his opening remarks, said that it was a pity that those who had no hesitation in declaring their faith in Amery's assurances did not want to accept the assurances given to them by Mahatma Gandhi. Otherwise there was no reason why a storm should have been raised in the name of Sikhism. Master Tara Singh, by asking the Sikhs to unite against the Congress, was merely strengthening the foot-hold of British imperialism in India. Opposition to Gandhijee's effort at setting the Hindu-Muslim differences was nothing short of betrayal of the country and the rights of her people. He condemned the action of those Sikhs who held a demonstration in Bombay against Gandhijee. These Sikhs had not raised the name of Sikhism by doing that. The speaker said that he hung his head in shame at the doing of those Sikhs.

Continuing *Sardar Amar Singh Jhabal* maintained that the Sikhs were born to suffer and do sacrifice for the freedom of India and the protection of the poor and

down-trodden. It was nothing short of treachery to ask the Sikhs to keep away from the freedom movement. It was cowardice to frighten the Sikhs in the name of Sikhism and division of their homeland. What of lakhs even if one Sikh was left in the Pakistan he would remain secure there because every true Sikh knows how to protect himself. Attempts were being made to mislead the Sikhs once again and barter them away for loaves and fishes of offices instead of freedom of India which was nearest to the heart of every Sikh. He warned the Sikhs against being once again thrown at the feet of British imperialism which had been holding India fast now for years.

FAITH IN GANDHIJEE

S. Amar Singh declared that they had gathered to give a lie to the propaganda which was being carried on against the Punjab Sikhs that none of them was with the Congress and had no faith in Gandhijee's leadership and support his efforts at bringing about a communal settlement.

S. Amar Singh Jhabal, maintained that they would not be frightened by the "Huknamas" issued by Master Tara Singh and others against the nationalist Sikhs and they did not care if they were called atheists or non-Sikhs.

The messages received from many Sikh workers who could not attend were read out.

Several workers coming from various districts delivered messages which they had brought from workers who could not come having been restricted. Many of these restricted workers were old workers who had suffered imprisonments in the Gurdwara movement. In their messages these old workers, some of whom made touching references to the days when they suffered imprisonments in the Akali movement, had declared their full support to Gandhijee in his efforts for achieving Hindu-Muslim unity and the 'O.R.' formula.

A number of workers presented documents with thumb impressions of villagers signifying support to Mahatma Gandhi and faith in his leadership.

It was announced that a letter had been sent to Gandhijee bearing signatures and thumb impressions of Sikh ladies expressing faith in his leadership.

Sardar Sarmukh Singh Jhabal, moving the main resolution, expressing faith in Gandhijee's leadership, said that to-day the Sikhs were faced again with a critical situation. Outwardly alluring terms were being offered to keep away the Sikhs from doing the right thing and supporting the freedom movement. Those in power in the Akali Party were behaving just in the manner in which the chief Khalsa Dewanwalas behaved in 1914 in declaring patriots as being non-Sikhs. Efforts were being made to keep away the nationalist Sikhs from the Shiromani Gurdwara Prabandhak Committee with the official help on lame excuses. The name of religion was being exploited, religion which was like nectar was now being exploited to lull people into slumber. That is why religion to-day was being described as opium. The Sikhs need not be frightened away by the name of Pakistan, he added. Sardar Sarmukh Singh Jhabal asked the Sikhs to declare their faith in the leadership of Gandhijee who was the only leader who would lead them to victory. He said, "Let us win freedom for the sake of freedom."

SAFEGUARDING GADDIES

S. Autar Singh Daler, President Central Sikh Youth League, seconding the resolution said that Mr. Savarkar and Master Tara Singh were conspiring together to keep the British hold on India. They were creating a new block in the way of forces of freedom in India. They were only looking for safeguarding their "gaddies". The Akalis were already co-operating with the League in the N. W. F. Provinces to remain in power. They were doing the same thing in the Punjab. Was not that exploitation?

Sardar Hira Singh Narli, supporting the resolution further said that the anti-nationalist forces among the Sikhs were raising their head and those who till yesterday were nationalists were doing the same things as their predecessors Chief Khalsa Dewanwalas did. He felt that by Gandhijee's present move nationalist cause would certainly be strengthened. If Mr. Jinnah would not settle he would be exposed and the nationalist Muslims would be once again in the forefront. But if agreement was reached and British Government would refuse to concede the national demand they would be exposed also. He criticised the Hindu Sabhais also.

Sardar Teja Singh Swatantra M.L.A. supporting the resolution said that to-day the League ideology has come to stay and there was hardly a Muslim who did not have faith in that. He declared that there could not be unity without

establishment of Pakistan. Sardar Teja Singh criticising the Sikh leadership said that they had given no right lead to the Sikhs.

He had no doubt that the Akalis were sitting on the fence and were playing that game to retain power in the Punjab and in the Centre. If Gandhi-Jinnah talks succeed the Akalis might jump back among the nationalists and would declare that they were with them.

Sardar Durlab Singh, General Secretary of the Progressive Akali Party moved an amendment requesting Gandhijee to consult nationalist Sikhs before making any final commitment. *Sardar Durlab Singh* said that Akalis got a Ministership in the Punjab on the promise to help in the recruitment. To-day the Akali leadership was supported by knights and titled gentry.

Sardar Duleep Singh supported the resolution. He regretted that the Akalis were bargaining everywhere and were sacrificing principles for small gains.

Sardar Sarmukh Singh Jhabal accepted the amendment adding that Mahatma Gandhi had already given an assurance that he was willing to hear everyone and he would see that justice would be done to every community.

The following resolution as amended was unanimously adopted amidst repeated shouts of "Sat Sri Akal".

"This meeting welcomes Gandhiji's efforts to end the political deadlock through Congress-League unity, and wishes that his efforts be crowned with success at the earliest.

"The Gandhi-Wavell correspondence makes it absolutely clear that the Government is neither prepared to release national leaders nor to end the political deadlock and grant national Government to India. The basis of this unbending attitude of Imperialism lies in the disunity among Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims. Only by accepting the right of self-determination of Sikhs and Muslims, can this disunity be liquidated. Therefore, a Congress-League-Sikh agreement is the only way to liquidate disunity, to end the deadlock and advance towards National Government.

"This meeting has full faith in Mahatmaji's assurance to the Sikhs. Mahatmaji has given a lead to end the deadlock by accepting the principle of the right of self-determination for the Muslims,

"The conference declares its full faith in Gandhijee's leadership and requests him to consult nationalist Sikh opinion before committing himself to any final settlement.

"This meeting appeals to all Sikhs to side with the forces of freedom and to participate in the freedom movement."

S. Amar Singh Jhabal, in the course of his concluding remarks about the Indian army said that men would be forthcoming to join the army to fight India's battle for her defence from any external aggression, when India has her own Government.

Sardar (Babu) Dan Singh Wacchoa moved a resolution condemning the Punjab Government's attitude in keeping many detenus in jails and imposing restrictions on those who were released and demanding the release of all political prisoners and the removal of all restrictions on them. The mover said that it was for the Government to decide whether it wanted to befriend the nationalist sections or continue bitterness by continuing to detain workers and restrict them.

S. Deva Singh seconded the resolution and said that the patriots who suffered for freedom's sake deserved all praise.

S. Sohan Singh Josh supported the resolution and said that there were several detenus in jail who were in jail before even the war started.

The Unionist Government was not releasing those patriots in the Gujrat jail because it was afraid that they would give strength to the nationalist forces.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

Another resolution was moved by *Baba Sher Singh* advising that in public speeches no strong words should be used in criticising either religion or individuals. The resolution was, however, not pressed when an objection was raised and it was suggested that only a circular should be issued to that effect.

The conference then adjourned.

The All India Akali Conference

Fifth Session—Lahore—14th. October 1944

Presidential Address

"The Sikhs are opposed to the establishment of Pakistan and they cannot tolerate India's vivisection. But if India is to be divided and cut into pieces, the Sikhs must have a State and they must be given a homeland on the basis of the land now in their possession and their political importance," said *Sardar Pritam Singh*, President (Jathedar) of the Shiromani Akali Dal, in the course of his presidential address at the 5th All-India Akali Conference, which opened in Lahore on the 14th. October 1944.

The conference was held in a huge pandal, the entrance to which was through Gyani Sher Singh Gate underneath which was hanging a motto: "Beware of the Russian agents."

The President-elect and some important Akali leaders, including those released during the last two or three days, were accorded a warm reception at the Badami Bagh railway station and were conducted in a procession to the pandal in the Minto Park. There were scores of Akali Jathas in their blue turbans and the Akalis carried Nishan Sahibs.

Before the conference opened, *Master Tara Singh* unfurled the Sikh flag, amidst the tunes of the bands and shouts of Sat Sri Akal. *Masterjee*, while unfurling the flag, said that the Sikhs at present were threatened with two very great dangers. One danger, he said, were the communists and the other danger was from Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah. *Masterjee* asked his community to beware of both the dangers which he described as "strong storms blowing against us."

Master Tara Singh, while declaring that the Sikhs were not prepared to suffer the British, who had denied them their freedom, they were equally unprepared to suffer the doings of tyrants like (Mahatma) Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah both of whom wanted to impose Hindu and Muslim majorities on the Sikhs by dividing India. He made an appeal to the Sikhs to be united under the Sikh flag which was a symbol of self-respect. It was for the Sikhs to maintain their self-respect and refrain from being led astray.

There was a general sense of pleasure expressed by those who addressed the conference and attended it on the release of patriotic Akali leaders like *Sardar Ishar Singh Majhale*, President of the Darbar Sahib Committee, Amritsar, *S. Udhram Singh Nagoke*, *S. Darshan Singh Pheruman*, and *S. Sohan Singh, Jalal Oaman*, who came to Lahore to-day.

They were all greeted by the Akali workers and a hearty welcome was extended to them by the President and the other speakers at the conference.

Hope was expressed that those left behind in jail would also be released soon.

References were made to the sad death of *Gyani Sher Singh* by the President and other speakers and tributes were paid to him.

Gandhiji mostly, the communists and Mr. Jinnah and Mr. *Rajagopalachariar* to some extent, were the main targets of the main speaker, after the President at the conference and one or two poets. The "C. R." formula was the basis of all the severe condemnation. *Gyani Kartar Singh* was credited with having excelled Mr. Jinnah in his attempt to ridicule *Gandhijee* and throw mud on him and levelling charges on the Congress Ministers in some of the provinces and accusing them of the "injustice" done to the Sikhs. His speech looked like an impeachment of *Gandhijee* and he employed some of the strongest epithets "to express resentment at what great sin *Gandhijee* has committed" by what he described as "going back from his word given to the Sikhs" who he said "have never been treated with any such disrespect and discourtesy during the past one hundred years by any political leader."

Gyani Kartar Singh also described Mr. Jinnah as the "political enemy of the Sikhs," who, he said, "if succeeds in his plan, would ruin the Sikhs." He, however, paid a tribute to Mr. Jinnah's political sagacity. He described the idea of democracy as foreign and unacceptable to him. He condemned communists also.

Jathedar Pritam Singh, in the course of his speech, while making an appeal

to the Sikhs to stand united, in view of the dangers confronting them, condemned the Communists as being the immediate danger to Sikhs. He described the Communists as weather cocks, who were playing a double game. Voicing the Sikh opposition to the vivisection of India, Sardar Pritam Singh said that the Sikhs were opposed to Pakistan and they would not tolerate the slavery of the Hindu majority or the Muslim majority. If India was to be cut into pieces, the Jathedar demanded a State for the Sikhs who, he said, if Pakistan was to be established, must get a homeland on the basis of their importance and the land which they held in the Punjab. The Hindu or Muslim majority, he pointed out, could not be foisted upon the Sikhs either by the combination of Hindus or Muslims or by the British bayonet. He hoped that the British would not lend the support of their bayonet for, if they did, it would not be the reward of the services the Sikhs were now rendering in the war? The British took the Punjab from the Sikhs and they must not make them slaves of others. Numbers, he said, did not matter for when the Sikhs ruled the Punjab they were only 60,000.

The President complained that Gandhijee had not consulted the Sikhs and therefore not kept his word given to the Sikhs in 1929. Gandhijee, he said, did not seem to care for the Sikhs who he thought were non-existent. Gandhijee wanted to sell the Sikhs to Mr. Jinnah. Congress, said Mr. Pritam Singh, could ill afford to sacrifice the Muslims and therefore it was prepared to sacrifice the Sikhs. In 1915-16 the Sikhs were in the pocket of the British and they used them and now Gandhijee thought that the Sikhs were in his pocket and wanted to use them. The Sikhs, he said, have refused to be used.

The President criticised the Sikh States whom he accused of not giving fair treatment to the Sikhs. He said that time was coming when the Sikh masses would make some of the rulers feel that they must adhere to Sikhism. More Sikhs should be employed in the Sikh States. He also complained of injustice being done to the Sikhs in the non-Sikh States.

Resolutions—2nd Day—Lahore—15th. October 1944

The Sikh demand for an independent Sikh State was not pressed at the second open session of the Conference. *Master Tara Singh*, who was the mover of the main resolution, declared that, though the Sikhs wanted an independent Sikh State for themselves, the demand was not being pressed and was being held back in order to keep the door open for negotiations.

S. Mangal Singh, who supported *Master Tara Singh*, in an equally forceful speech, referred to the decision not to press the demand to remain what he called "flexible", in order that it may fit in anywhere if and when an attempt was made to do justice to the Sikhs.

The Sikh position, as explained by all the existing "big guns" of the Akali Party, on the same main resolution, was that the Sikhs were prepared for any kind of settlement but they would in no case tolerate division of India or the establishment of Pakistan.

In case the Hindus and Muslims were to part as brothers and share the country, the Sikhs, as youngest of the three brothers, would also ask for their share, said *Principal Ganga Singh*, who had no hesitation in saying that he would like the Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs to remain together as one man in a free India. Pakistan, in the very candid opinion of these Sikh leaders, would benefit the Muslims and, to some extent, the Hindus but it would prove ruinous to the Sikhs.

Master Tara Singh, while maintaining that India should not be divided, said that if division was to take place, then they would have no objection if the Mussalmans, who were now asking for 50 per cent in the centre, would give to the Sikhs 50 per cent in the Pakistan or even agree to give 33 per cent to each one of the three communities living in the Punjab viz., the Hindus, the Muslims and the Sikhs.

Sardar Mangal Singh, M.L.A. (Central), who has always been credited with holding balanced views, while claiming to speak as a Congress Sikh, said that there was hardly a Sikh who had greater respect for Gandhiji, but in their opposition to the establishment of Pakistan the Sikhs would resist all attempts, including the British bayonets by all weapons. He added, "But let it be understood that now the Sikhs would not employ the weapon of non-violence but use all weapons which our great Guru Gobind Singh had given to us."

The general tone of the speeches at the conference, though expressive of Sikh annoyance at Gandhijee's alleged breaking of the promise held out to them in 1929,

provided a healthy contrast to the tone of the main speaker at the opening session last night. Masterjee's speech even though punctuated with one or two "harsh" words—hesitatingly uttered—was undoubtedly conciliatory.

The Communists, especially the Sikh communists, were greatly criticised and every speaker asked the Sikhs to beware of them. They were described as Muslims.

Master Tara Singh moved the following resolution:—

I (a) This session of the All-India Akali Conference is of the opinion that the last eight years' working of the Provincial Autonomy set up under the scheme of the Government of India Act 1935, with an unalterable statutory Muslim majority as a result of the Communal Award, has adversely affected the vital Sikh interest and has seriously injured the Sikh community. The Sikh interests have suffered greatly in economic, political, religious and cultural spheres. Even the reserved powers of the Governor given to him under the constitution have failed to protect them. It is for the first time after the annexation of the Punjab by the British that the Sikhs have been reminded that their home-lands are being again passed over to the Muslims under the protection of the British bayonet. The Sikh masses feel very keenly that they have been sacrificed at the altar of political expediency to appease the Muslims.

(b) Mahatma Gandhi's offer of Pakistan to Mr. Jinnah and subsequent talks for communal settlement without taking the Sikhs into confidence notwithstanding the assurance given to the Sikhs by the Congress in its resolution of 1929, have greatly perturbed them. When the proposal to vivisect their very home-lands is under active consideration, it is an undeniable fact that in this matter the Sikhs are the most vitally affected community in India. They should, therefore, be treated as major party in the negotiations, but they are nowhere in the picture. Neither in his offer to Mr. Jinnah, nor in his long correspondence with the Muslim League leader, any reference has been made to the Sikhs. Thus they have been completely ignored. Mahatma Gandhi has also followed the policy of Muslim appeasement at the expense of the Sikh community.

(c) As regards the communal settlement this session of the All-India Conference wishes to unequivocally declare on behalf of the Sikh Panth that the Sikhs are prepared and willing to support any scheme of communal settlement which provides for them ample scope for their political, cultural religious development to their satisfaction. The Conference further declares that along with the Hindus and Muslims, they are prepared to live like brothers as equally free community in a free united India and that they shall not submit to the domination of any other community.

(d) This Conference after full consideration of the various terms of the Raja-Gandhi formula, as well as the proposal of Mahatma Gandhi contained in Gandhi-Jinnah correspondence have come to the conclusion that this scheme of communal settlement is greatly detrimental to the interests of the Sikhs in particular and country in general, therefore, this Conference rejects it, and calls upon the Sikhs to carry on ceaseless agitation unless the scheme is finally dropped and the Sikhs are assured that no similar proposal will be put forward.

This Conference further declares no communal settlement will be acceptable to the Sikhs unless it is approved by the Shiromani Akali Dal.

Master Tara Singh, began by condemning the present mentality which, he said, was swaying the whole fabric of the administration of the province since the advent of provincial autonomy.

While during the Moghal Raj there were only one or two rulers, now every Mussalman, said Masterjee, regarded himself a ruler. He had no hesitation in saying that there was "Aurangzeb Raj" in the Punjab, even without the establishment of Pakistan. The pity was that in the name of war no one was allowed to speak out. Masterjee expressed the view that Malik Khizar Hayat is better than Sir Sikander whom he held responsible for communalism in the Punjab.

While referring to Gandhiji and his recent negotiations with Mr. Jinnah, Masterjee said that Gandhiji had not treated the Sikhs justly by not keeping up the assurance given to them. He said he would hesitate to go to the Mahatma now, even if invited, because he felt that the self-respect of the Sikhs had been wounded. The Sikhs would be affected the most, if Pakistan was established and, therefore, it were they alone who should be consulted before Pakistan was established in the Punjab. The plea that the Sikhs were smaller in number was described by Masterjee as futile because, he said, the Sikhs were 57 lakhs but in Ireland, with a population of 43 lakhs, two States had been formed. The Sikhs did not want to rule but wanted freedom and they were prepared to suffer for it.

Their opposition to the Communal Award did not succeed because the Government, he said, broke their opposition and it could do so even now. He, however, hoped that the Sikhs would not let Pakistan take its birth.

Masterjee, who described Gandhiji's letter to him as unsatisfactory, said that an effective programme to oppose Pakistan would be placed before the 'Panth' soon. Master Tara Singh declared that if the Congress would remove Mahatma Gandhi from all his positions in the Congress for having acted against the Congress resolution he would bear no hesitation in jumping back into the Congress fold.

Principal *Ganga Singh* hoped that their power would not turn into mustard again and he warned the Sikhs against their internal enemies. Sikhs had trusted Gandhiji and suffered greatly in following him and they were neither beggars nor bargainers.

Gyani Kartar Singh, M.L.A., supporting the resolution, referred to the injustice which he said was being done to the Sikhs in the matter of services. The resolution was passed unanimously.

Gandhiji's Assurance to the Sikhs

Mahatma Gandhi, replying to a letter from *Sardar Durlab Singh*, General Secretary of the Central Sikh Youth League, requesting a general assurance to nationalist Sikhs that their interests are safe in his hands and that they will not be sacrificed at any cost, says: "I could never be guilty of blessing anything which is contrary to the national interest. You can certainly have the assurance that the interests of the nationalist Sikhs as also of all nationalists are safe in my hands and also, I presume, in the Congress hands, though, as you know, I have no authority to speak on behalf of the Congress."

Concluding his letter Mahatma Gandhi says: "There are many inventions about me going the ground. I would warn friends against giving credence to any of them without reference to me."

Mr. *Pyarelal* released the following correspondence that passed between Mahatma Gandhi and *Sardar Durlab Singh*, General Secretary of the Central Sikh Youth League:

Letter from *Sardar Durlab Singh*, dated Lahore November 12.

Respected Bapuji,

I believe you are aware of the developments that are taking place in the Sikh politics everyday. Several misunderstandings are being created and the mind of the Sikh public is being poisoned constantly against the Congress. The Sikh Youth League and other nationalist Sikhs, who are working among the Sikhs for the cause of nationalism, have to face several difficulties and I would therefore request you to kindly clarify the following points and remove the misunderstanding as far as possible.

The Congress had promised in its Lahore resolution of 1929 that no constitution would be acceptable to the Congress which does not give the fullest satisfaction to the Sikhs. You know a large number of Sikhs are perturbed over *Rajaji's* proposals. Supposing Mr. Jinnah had accepted the proposals in full, or in an amended form, what would have been the position of the Sikhs in that?

Even the Akalis feel very indignant because you did not touch the question of meeting the Sikh deputation as suggested by Master Tara Singh in his letter. Can you please make it clear why it was not considered desirable to invite the Sikh leaders before proceeding to Mr. Jinnah for the talks?

Mr. *Jagat Narain Lal's* resolution clearly states that the Congress would be no party to the vivisection of the country. Is it not a fact that *Rajaji's* proposals run counter to that resolution? The Sikh public is made to believe that Gandhiji does not favour the idea of the Sikhs remaining in the Congress because of their belief in the sword.

The Sikhs have always made the greatest possible contribution to the cause of India's freedom and they are prepared to do that in future also, but such an attitude on your part is likely to discourage them. Will you very kindly throw some light on this issue?

Master Tara Singh and other responsible Akali leaders have often declared in the press and on the platform that the *Sikander-Baldev Singh Pact* was enacted with the consent and blessings of the Congress High Command and *Sardar Patel's* special representative who was present in the Punjab throughout the negotiations and that the *Sardar* was kept informed of all the developments. Further, it is said that the *Azad Punjab scheme* was introduced with your consent and blessings. The

nationalist Sikhs regard both the schemes as anti-national and opposed to the interests of the country and the community. Can you kindly guide us in the matter?

In the end I will request you, Bapuji, to give a general assurance to the nationalist Sikhs that their interests are safe in your hands and that they will not be sacrificed at any cost. The heart of the Sikh masses is with the Congress and nationalism and patriotism are their proud heritage. They cannot depart from these principles, but let them have this satisfaction at least that the Congress will do no injustice to them and that they will have their proper place in free India.

Praying for your long life.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) Durlab Singh.

GANDHIJI'S REPLY

The following is Mahatma Gandhiji's reply dated, Sevagram 14th November 1944.

Dear. Sardar Durlab Singh,

This is my answer to your questions: (1) My association with Rajaji in his formula could not affect the Sikh position in the slightest degree, even if Qaid-i-Azam Jinnah accepted it. The Lahore resolution of the Congress referred to by you stands. The result of Qaid-i-Azam Jinnah's acceptance would have been that both of us would have gone to the Sikhs and others interested to secure their acceptance. I had made this clear in my letter to Masterjee.

(2) I cannot understand the Akali indignation. My meeting a deputation was unnecessary in view of my absolute assurance. If Masterjee had wanted to bring his friends to me, in spite of my assurance, I would have gladly seen them as I did other friends who sought clarification from me.

(3) Maulana Sahab explained the implications of the Jagat Narainlal resolution which please see. But supposing that it is inconsistent with the Rajaji Formula and the Congress accepts the latter, there is nothing to prevent the Congress from rescinding the resolution.

(4) How could I favour a contrary opinion when I have always given the closest collaboration to Sikh friends? Those Sikhs, who do not accept the Congress creed, naturally refrain, like many others, from joining the Congress.

(5) I know nothing about the Sikandar-Baldev Singh Pact, much less about the Congress High Command's association with it. Nor do I know the details of the Azad Punjab scheme.

I could never be guilty of blessing anything which is contrary to the national interest. You can certainly have the assurance that the interests of the nationalist Sikhs, as also of all nationalists, are safe in my hands and also, I presume, in the Congress hands, though as you know I have no authority to speak on behalf of the Congress.

There are many inventions about me going the round. I would warn friends against giving credence to any of them without reference to me.

Yours sincerely,
Sd. M. K. Gandhi.

The Akali Jubilee Conference

1st Session—Jandiala—25th. November 1944

Presidential Address

"I should admit that during the war several allegations have been made against the Akali organisation. I cannot call all of them 'false,' but the ideal of the Shiromani Akali Dal has always remained 'to serve the Panth, the country and the oppressed, and to work for the management and reform of the Gurdwaras,' said *S. Ishar Singh Majhail*, in the course of his presidential address at the first Akali Jubilee Conference held at Jandiala, District Jullunder, on the 25th November 1944.

He added: "The Akalis have stood steadfast by the Congress in all the movements launched at by this national organisation for the emancipation of the motherland. During the Nagpur National Flag Satyagraha, the Martial Law days, 1921 Movement, 1930 Movement and then in 1940 and 1942 the Akalis did not lag behind any one else. To name only a few of our leaders, Sardar Partap Singh, M.L.A., General Secretary, P.P.C.C., Sardar Darshan Singh Pheruman, Giani Gurmukh Singh Mussafir, Baba Labh Singh of Jullunder, and Sardar Basant Singh of Moga were all arrested after August 8. In this Illaqa of Doaba numerous Akali workers were put behind the prison bars and many of them are still there. It was the Akalis, again,

who offered themselves for arrest by taking out processions in the Anarkali, Lahore, and the Hall Bazar, Amritsar. On the other hand, what have the Communists done? At a Kisan Conference held at Bhakna Kalan, Comrade Sohan Singh Josh, the Communist Leader, proudly said: "If there have been no disturbances in the Punjab it is because of our influence with the people."

"These traitors (Communists) to the country who talked of bringing about a revolution through this war," he said, "have turned turtle and given out the cry that it is a People's war. This, however, is not very curious because in their unpatriotic attitude they have consistently opposed every move of the Indian National Congress. Their opposition to the Symbolic Satyagraha movement of 1940 and then to the idea of Mass Movement which had been contemplated in the resolution of August 1942 is only recent history. In fact, these Communists do not consider India as their motherland. Their source of inspiration and shrine of homage is the Soviet citadel of Moscow. Mother India should not expect any good from them."

"The Communists and the Unionists," the Sardar continued, "are the chips of the same block. They vie with each other in maintaining the power of the foreigners in this land but I wish to declare that the Shiromani Akali Dal will continue to stand by the Congress in every struggle launched to achieve India's freedom, as the S.A.D. has always done in the past."

Referring to the Pakistan and the C.R. Formula, Sardar Ishar Singh said: "We have been under subjection for a very long time but the domination of the British is different and worse than all previous dominations in that the Mughals identified themselves with the people of India and ultimately adopted India as their homeland. But the policy of the British has created so many warring sections in the body politic of India that the Muslims belonging to the Muslim League are demanding 'Pakistan,' viz., a sovereign State of their own."

"The arrogant attitude adopted by the Government since 1942 has greatly disappointed our countrymen. The C. R. Formula is a symptom of this sense of frustration. This formula has strengthened the hands of Pakistanists and has hit those countrymen hard who stand for an Akhand Hindustan. Although several Congressmen have expressed their opinion against the formula, yet there is an apprehension in certain quarters that the Congress may accept it under the influence of Gandhiji's great personality. This is as probable as it is improbable. The Congress position, so far as I understand, is that it adheres to the Jagat Narainal Resolution. I may, however, express my opinion that the C.R. Formula is no solution of the present complicated political situation of the country."

"One thing is clear," the Sardar declared, "and that is that we will never accept Pakistan and will fight it to the finish." Sardar Ishar Singh concluded by saying: "Our ideal is a Free India where the Sikhs are also free like all other communities. We stand for a noble idea and we will succeed in attaining it."

The Punjab Hindu Mahasabha Conference

Presidential Address—Ludhiana—10th November 1944

"There can be no compromise with any fantastic claim for cutting India to pieces either on communal or on provincial considerations," declared Dr. *Shyama Prasad Mookerjee*, presiding over the Punjab Hindu Mahasabha Conference, which met at Ludhiana on the 10th November 1944.

On alighting from the train, Dr. *Mookerjee* and Dr. *B. S. Moonje*, who accompanied him, were profusely garlanded. The platform was thronged with several thousands of persons who cheered them as they were conducted under an archway of numerous saffron-coloured Mahasabha flags. Seated in a two-horse driven carriage they passed through crowded streets.

The presidential procession, originally planned, was not taken out as it had been banned by the authorities. The organisers had also instructed the Mahasabha volunteers not to wear uniforms.

Addressing the Conference, Dr. *Mookerjee* said: "India has been and is one country and must remain so whatever self-constituted exponents of so-called Hindu-

Muslim unity may declare. It is a most dangerous pastime to try to placate that section of muslims who think it beneath their dignity to live in India as such and, therefore, demand a territory of their own, sovereign and independent, carved out of our Motherland a territory where crores of Hindus will continue to live bereft of their Indian nationality. It is nothing short of stabbing Indian liberty and nationalism in the back. India must have a strong and effective Central Governments to remain in charge of departments such as defence, foreign relations, finance, India's commercial and industrial expansion, communications and any other subject that may affect India's welfare as a whole. While each zone based on linguistic and cultural affinity will develop in its own way nothing will be allowed to happen which will weaken India's progress and solidarity or lower her dignity, prestige and power in the international sphere.

"WEAKENING OF HINDUS PART OF BRITISH POLICY"

"The Hindu Maha Sabha looks at India's political problems with complete realism. Its aim is full independence of India based on a constitution that will give due protection to minority rights, whenever and wherever necessary. It opposes political pandering and patronage of particular communities and interests merely on consideration of caste or religion though it readily acknowledges the imperative need for strengthening, by every possible means, all the weaker links by giving them facilities for raising their standard. It realises that weakening of Hindu rights and liberties is part of a planned policy of the British rulers, who act in close, though probably implicit, understanding with a section of aggressive Muslims and use them as a cloak for their imperialistic purposes. To resist this attack on Hindus is a sacred and patriotic duty which must be boldly performed. The Hindu Maha Sabha at the same time deems it essential that proper communal relationship should be fostered and developed at every centre. Muslims who regard themselves as sons and daughters of India, who are prepared to share with Hindus and others the joys and sorrows of a common national struggle should be helped to organise themselves so as to resist the suicidal activities of some of their co-religionists who under British patronage are to-day spreading the poison of fanaticism. So long as separate electorates continue this virus will not abate."

NEED FOR UNDERSTANDING WITH SIKHS

Referring to the situation in the Punjab he said: "I have always felt the need for complete understanding between Sikhs and Hindus in the Punjab. The menace of Pakistan strikes at the root of our national existence in the Provinces, where Hindus and Sikhs are in a minority. It is obvious that the situation may become grave if there is disunity between them at this critical juncture in the history of their Province. I hope the Provincial Hindu Sabha will do everything possible to unite these two communities and also to strengthen its relationship with those patriotic Muslims in the Punjab, who believe in the unity and integrity of India."

He continued: "Let us realise that India is faced to-day with a supreme political crisis. Her rulers who hold the country against the will of her people feel intoxicated by the apparent success of their repressive policy and their temporary economic conquest. They realise not that Indian Nationalism is no extinct volcano. The seismic forces are gathering more and more in strength. The spirit of an enchained India rebels silently and no power, however mighty, can hope to hold by force one-fifth of the human race under subjugation for all time. Britain will not willingly part with power in India and, indeed, without India, both Britain's position in the international world and her plans for post-war recovery will alike be seriously jeopardised. At this crisis, we have to play our part worthily so that posterity will have no cause to blame us for betraying the country or for selling our birth-right for a mess of pottage or for lack of clear foresight and determination."

UNITED FRONT OF HINDU MINORITY PROVINCES

Suggesting a united front of Hindu Minority Provinces, Dr. Mookherjee said, "Such a united front will not only help to strengthen the power of resistance of each but also rouse public opinion throughout India in respect of some major issues affecting the rights of Hindus and India's freedom. To-day, by subtle propaganda it is sought to be made out that the interests of the Muslim minority cannot be safeguarded if majority rule is recognised in India. It is, indeed, amazing, that this so-called love for minorities dwindles away whenever the rights and interests of the Hindu minority are involved.

One can understand deliberate planning on the part of our rulers to curb the political rights of Hindus, because of their patriotism and of their determined efforts

to see the end of foreign rule in this country. One can also follow the attitude of a section of Muslims dreaming of a separate and independent homeland for themselves within India, changing even the name of that portion of Indian territory. They are over-anxious to weaken the position of Hindus and consolidate their own for serving their narrow and selfish ends.

But it is not these open enemies alone we have to struggle against. The most subversive attack comes from false friends; forces within our own community who refuse to look at stern realities and create confusion and dissension within the Hindu fold. The history of Indian Nationalism reveals how religion has been deliberately introduced into the political constitution of the country by shrewd British politicians and every effort made to subdue the Nationalist forces for tightening the bureaucratic hold on Indian administration.

Resolutions—Ludhiana—2nd Day—11th. November 1944

The second sitting of the Conference was held on Saturday night. In the absence of Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee, who was not keeping well, Dr. B.S. Moonje occupied the chair. About 40,000 people attended the session.

L. Brij Lal moved the first resolution: This Conference places on record its deep sense of concern and horror at the way in which the political, religious and economic rights of the Hindus are being sacrificed at the altar of Communal Raj in the province. Since the Hindu Congress members of the Punjab Assembly have failed to attend the Assembly and to protect the interests of the constituency predominantly Hindu, they be called upon to resign. The Conference resolves that public opinion be organised in the province to that effect."

While placing this resolution before the House, Lala Brij Lal said that the present Congress M.L.A.s represented chiefly Hindu votes and it was their primary duty to protect the Hindu interests but the policy of the Congress representatives in the Assemblies was that of appeasement which had miserably failed. As they have failed to carry out the behests of Hindu constituents, it was our rightful demand that they should resign.

The resolution was seconded by Pt. Babu Ram Sharma, Proprietor of "Sandesh" and General Secretary of the Reception Committee of the Punjab Hindu Conference and Dr. Satya Prakash of Rohtak.

The resolution when put to vote, was unanimously carried amidst shouts of "Hindu Mahasabha Amar Rahe", Doctor Mookerjee Amar Rahe."

GANDHIJI SHOULD LEAD MAHASABHA

Lala Kundan Lal Lamba of Lyallpur moved the second resolution that this Conference placed on record its emphatic disapproval of the "C.R." Formula and the standing offer of Gandhiji to the Muslim League for a settlement on that basis as it conceded the principle of division of the country. The Conference announced its belief in the fundamental integrity of India and declared that the Hindus of the province would resist the partition of the Punjab and the establishment of Pakistan at all cost.

Mr. Lamba, while speaking on the resolution, explained how the policy of appeasement adopted by the Congress had failed. Before the disturbances of 1942 Gandhiji stood for Akhand Hindustan and declared that so long as the third party was in power, no communal settlement could be arrived at. Mr. Lamba said Gandhiji had gone back on his past declarations, and still clung to the "C.R. Formula". Through Gandhiji's attitude, Mr. Jinnah again came into the lime-light after receiving a sound beating at the hands of the Unionists.

"I request Gandhiji", Mr. Lamba continued, "to join the Hindu Mahasabha and unite 30 crores of Hindus under one flag in order to achieve Independence. Mr. Lamba related how "Mahmood Ghaznavi Day" was celebrated in the Frontier Province under the presidentship of Sardar Aurangzeb, and said that if that was how the things would assume shape, the less said the better.

The resolution was seconded by Captain Keshab Chander, who said that Swaraj had got no significance if the Hindus had got to be wiped out of existence.

Shrimati Krishna Devi, a prominent lady worker of Hindu Sabha, also spoke on the resolution. She appealed to the Muslims to continue to live as neighbours, and warned them that if the Muslims would not desist from their move, the women would not lag behind and would sacrifice everything for the country.

Gyani Lal Singh Sumandri, Mr. Ram Rakha Mal Ahluwalia, Pleader, Ludhiana, Mahasha Rattan Chand of Amritsar, and Ch. Chandan Singh of Rohtak also supported the resolution, which was unanimously adopted amidst shouts of "Akhand Hindustan Amar Rahe", "Dr. Moonje Amar Rahe".

Dr. Moonje, in his concluding remarks, observed that the Punjab was the sword arm of India and there could be no Pakistan in case only one son was given to the Hindu Mahasabha by parents having four sons. He specially advised the young men to learn riding and handling the gun. The open session terminated after midnight.

Resolutions—3rd day—Ludhiana—12th. November 1944

The concluding session of the Conference commenced this evening at 6-30 p.m. with Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee in the chair. About 40,000 people attended this session. An address of welcome on behalf of the local Arya Samaj was presented to Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerjee by Mr. Pritam Chand, Secretary of the Reception Committee of the conference. Poems were also recited by two small boys.

Mr. A. S. Satyarthi moved the following resolution :

"This conference views with deep concern the present condition of disintegration of the Punjab Hindus in which their legitimate rights and interests are being ignored and sacrificed and opines that there is immediate need of organising the Hindus of the province under the banner of the Hindu Mahasabha. The conference, therefore, appoints a provincial organisation committee consisting of Mr. Keshab Chander, L. Kundan Lal Lamba, Seth Lachhman Das, Mahasabha Kattan Chand, Mr. A.S. Satyarthi (convener), Dr. M.D. Chowdhry, Mr. Bal Raj, Ch. Chandan Singh, Mr. Satya Prakash, Mr. Hardyal and L. Brij Lal to tour the province and establish a net work of Hindu Sabhas to be duly affiliated with the Provincial Hindu Mahasabha."

The resolution was put to vote and carried unanimously.

PRESIDENTIAL PROCESSION

The next resolution was moved by *Pandit Babu Ram Sharma*, General Secretary of the Reception Committee of the Punjab Provincial Hindu Conference by which the conference protested against the indefensible action of the local authorities presumably taken in consultation with the provincial Government prohibiting the taking out of a peaceful procession of the President-elect of the Hindu Conference on the stereotyped plea of preserving peace and tranquility of the town instead of taking action against those from whom there was danger of breach of law and order.

Mr. Keshab Chander of Amritsar seconded the resolution and it was adopted unanimously when put to vote.

SATYARTH PRAKASH CONFERENCE

Mr. *Keshab Chander* then read the next resolution moved on behalf of the Chair by which the conference protested against the arbitrary action of the local authorities in banning the Satyarth Prakash Conference organised to protest against the unfair order of the Sind Government in respect of Satyarth Prakash issued under the Defence of India Rules on the flimsy ground that the holding of such conference was likely to disturb the public peace and tranquility.

This resolution was also adopted without any speech on the resolution as there was a ban placed by the District Magistrate on Satyarth Prakash Conference.

Dr. *Shyama Prasad Mukherji*, winding up the proceedings, declared that the Government had indulged in dangerous practice and created a mischievous precedent by banning the 14th chapter of the Satyarth Prakash. This action was amazing and would not be tolerated. He asked what would the Muslims feel if certain chapters of the Quran were banned by a Hindu ministry.

"Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones at others", he pointed out. He advised the Sind Government to retrieve the step in time before it is too late. He assured support to the Arya Samaj in any action which might be resorted to for the purpose of ban of the Sind Government.

Dr. Shyama Prasad urged the Hindus to organise themselves as he felt that the need for unity in their ranks was never greater than now.

A. I. Akhand Hindusthan Conference

Third Session—Gujranwala—18th November 1944

Presidential Address

The declaration that the Sikhs stand for the complete independence and oneness of India was made by *Sardar Kharak Singh*, the well known Sikh leader, presiding over the third All-India Akhand Hindusthan Conference at Gujranwala on the 18th November 1944.

He said that "only in the unity and oneness of India is the hope and, indeed, the guarantee of India's future greatness and independence. And if it is ever allowed to be partitioned, it will be unfortunate for all. India suffers the same fate as the Balkans suffer today." Sardar Kharak Singh said there could be no peace in the world after the war if the subject countries were not freed.

Sardar Kharak Singh referred to the existence of communalism in the country which, he said, had given birth to the idea of Pakistan.

"I cannot help saying that Mahatma Gandhi's wrong policy of placating the communalist Mohammedans has contributed a lot to the coming into existence of the present conditions. His talks with Mr. Jinnah are a clear proof of that. He has ignored all the previous commitments of the Congress and surprisingly enough he has in the name of the Congress, which had been for the last 50 years working for the freedom and unity of India, blessed a formula, which is based on the principle of partition of India. It is said that Gandhiji did so to win the co-operation of Muslim League. I say that to agree to the partition of India would be too dear a price to pay for the co-operation of the Muslim League. I wish to declare once more that the Sikhs would not let any bargain succeed. Only in unity and oneness of India lies the hope and indeed the guarantee of India's future greatness and independence; and if India is ever allowed to be partitioned, it will be unfortunate for all, because in that case the conditions in India will be the same as they exist in the Balkans to-day. I have studied the Gandhi-Jinnah correspondence with great care and it is my considered opinion that by acting in the manner in which he has done Mahatma Gandhi has been guilty of bringing Pakistan nearer realization and he has thus committed what he himself has been describing as a great sin.

SIKHS STAND FOR INDEPENDENCE

"The Sikhs stand for complete independence and oneness of India. They will be satisfied with nothing less. They have made innumerable sacrifices for the attainment of this goal, and they will continue their efforts till it is realized. They naturally like others to work likewise, but if all others unite against us, then we will be left with no other alternative but to demand that we should be absolutely free of British, Muslim, and Hindu domination because we believe in neither governing others, nor being governed by others.

"I may make it clear that it will be a mistake to ignore us because we are a few. Even though few, we hold the most important position in Northern India and no constitution, which does not do justice to us, can succeed here.

"Mr. Jinnah is trying to give us false hopes. We are well aware of their reality. During the last few years we have sufficient experience of what a Muslim communal Raj will be like. Let Mr. Jinnah be under no misunderstanding about it. The Sikhs are to a man united against the establishment of Pakistan. They will not only not let Pakistan be established, but shall not take rest till the present Muslim majority rule is abolished.

SIKH LEADERS

"The present leadership of the Sikhs is most unsatisfactory. Their alliance with the Unionist in the Punjab and the Muslim League in the Frontier has caused irreparable loss to the Sikh interests. But they have been fully exposed and the way in which their candidates suffered defeat in the Frontier Provinces gives hope that further general elections will prove a hard day of reckoning for them.

"I notice that the Unionist Government is helping them against us. The object of the Gurdwara (amendment) Bill is to make the hold of the Akali party firm on the Gurdwaras. I wish to warn the Unionists that any help given by them in this matter will be regarded as undue interference on their part in the

internal party affairs of the Sikhs and its consequence can never be happy for the Unionists.

RELEASE OF PRISONERS

"I must say a word about political prisoners of 1942 and before. The Punjab has earned notoriety for holding in its jails the majority of these prisoners. The detention of these persons is not at all justified. The Punjab Ministry has adopted a very unsatisfactory policy regarding the prisoners. Against this policy of the Ministry, protest should be made from every nook and corner of the province."

Resolutions

The Conference passed a resolution on the next day, the 19th November, condemning the division of the country as proposed in the Raja-Gandhi formula and declared its firm conviction that even though the British Government agreed the vivisection of the country and handed over the administration to the Hindus and Muslims the Sikhs would not agree to it.

By another resolution the Conference demanded the release of political prisoners and detenus.

The Akhand Hindusthan Conference New Delhi—7th October 1944

Presidential Address

Dr. Radhakumud Mukerjee, in his presidential address at the Akhand Hindusthan Conference held at New Delhi on the 7th October 1944, gave a detailed exposition of the Hindu stand against Pakistan.

The communal problem was a passing problem of Indian politics, said Dr. Mukerji, and such a passing problem should not be allowed to make India's history on new lines on the basis of vivisection and partition. The communal problem was only as old as 1907, when it was first officially recognised by Lord Minto in his reply to the demand for separate electorates presented to him by a deputation led by the Aga Khan. Dr. Mukerji quoted from the report of the Simon Commission the statement: "That there was no spontaneous demand by the Muslims at that time for separate electorates, but it was only put forward by them at the instigation of an official whose name is well-known." "This fact," said Dr. Mukerji, "only reveals the ultimate policy of the British Government to divide and rule India."

Dr. Mukerjee quoted Abraham Lincoln's declaration: "I hold that union of these States is perpetual. No State upon its own mere action can lawfully get out of the union." Referring to Mr. Rajagopalachariar's formula, Dr. Mukerji observed: "Nowhere in history is self-determination applied to a constituted State for the mere fun of disintegrating it, wrenching from it its different parts that are already welded into a whole and making of them separate State."

UNACCEPTABLE SCHEME

"It is thus clear", Dr. Mukerjee went on, "that Pakistan is a totally unacceptable scheme as a solution of the communal problem as it seeks to solve them at the cost of destroying the unity of the Mother Country and the integrity of the parent state. A territorial separation of communities is no solution of communal problems. The communal problems will follow such separation into all the new States to be created by separation. No State can even be a homogeneous social composition made up of only one community. It is bound to be made up of different communities, one of which must naturally be the majority. The process of history has not made possible the evolution or construction of any State as a completely linguistic, religious, racial, or social unity. It has been a physical impossibility that political and national frontiers should also coincide with racial, religious, and social frontiers. Such coincidence is getting more and more impossible in these days of easy, free and speedy intercourse and communication between different nations and peoples, and the expanding facilities for emigration, colonisation and settlement.

"There is no case or any justification for Pakistan if within the framework of the present State, which has been so long existing and functioning, the Muslim minority is guaranteed by the Hindu majority the same protection as is being offered by the Muslim majority in the Pakistan State to come to lure into it the Hindu minority.

ALTERNATIVES

"In fact there are several alternatives to Pakistan, which the Muslim League may very well explore and examine considering that Pakistan has already been in action in all the four Muslim majority Provinces.

"The alternatives are based on the assumption that all Indians owe it to their country to maintain its integrity. There are ways and means by which the largest measure of Provincial autonomy can be made compatible with some kind of Federal control. Subject to that control the units of the Federation may function as sovereign States within their prescribed spheres. This may be affected by so framing the schedules of Federal and Provincial subjects as to make the most of Provincial autonomy, and to render each Province a sovereign State for all practical purposes.

"Then again, within the domain of each such Provincial sovereignty, every community is to be given complete cultural autonomy, on the lines of the scheme which was so elaborately worked out by the League of Nations and embodied later in international Instruments known as Minorities Guarantees Treaties, and is now in actual operation in the U. S. S. R.

"There is, however, a case for the reconstruction of Provinces which have been artificial creations with ill-defined boundaries. These should be reconstituted on a more natural basis as linguistic and cultural units such as Orissa, or the Andhra Province to come, provided they are financially self-supporting or more or less self-contained economic regions. The case of Bengal calls for a revision. At the time of the annulment of its partition in 1912, the King Emperor assured Bengal that her boundaries which were then fixed in a haphazard manner would be properly fixed by a Boundaries Commission promised by His Majesty. That Boundaries Commission is still to come and in the meanwhile, during all these years, Bengal has remained subjected to a partial partition whereby large Bengali-speaking areas have been annexed to the neighbouring provinces of Bihar and Assam, with the consequence that Bengal thus mutilated is looming large in the scheme of Pakistan. A sinister policy has been at work for crippling the power of the Bengal Hindus in Indian politics by distributing them among their neighbouring provinces, so that they may be rendered as a permanent statutory and impotent minority in their own homeland. Even Bengal thus artificially contracted is a majority Hindu province on the basis of a census of adults, though there is a suspicion that the last census was somewhat influenced by the communal attitude of its ministry."

Resolutions—2nd day—New Delhi—8th October 1944

The Conference, with Dr. Radhakumud Mukerji in the chair, passed the following resolution on Oct. 8:—

"This Conference declares its unflinching faith in the oneness and integrity of India and places on record its firm conviction that the partition of India will be fatal to the best interests of the country as a whole and to those of every community of India and it earnestly appeals to all patriotic Indians to resist by all available means any attempt to break the integrity of India as a nation and as a State on any grounds whatsoever."

Moving the resolution, *Dr. Moonje* said that Hindusthan is the land of the Hindus, and the Sikhs, Muslims and the Christians are all Hindus. He expressed the view that Mr. Gandhi did not understand politics. He was a spiritualist and idealist. Politics was essentially an expression of selfishness on the part of one nation as against another. He voiced the determination of the Hindu Youth to do everything to fight for the integrity of India. *Dr. Moonje* added that Mr. Jinnah was preparing for a clash. Hindus were quite ready to meet that challenge.

Seconding the resolution, *Mr. Bhopatkar* said that thinkers in Europe who were formerly advocates of the right of self-determination had now come to the conclusion that such right should be abandoned in favour of a federation of European States. While Europe was federating, it was strange, added *Mr. Bhopatkar*, that Muslims were aiming at Balkanisation. He opposed Pakistan not merely because it would parcel out India into many States, but also because it would subject her to the constant danger of invasion from abroad. *Mr. Bhopatkar* suggested the formation of a body, which should issue a mandate on the question. He also suggested that propaganda should be carried on in the United States of America and Great Britain, for the final word lay with them.

The resolution was passed unanimously.

In his concluding remarks, *Veer Savarkar* said that for nearly 30 years Hindus had been treading the wrong path and he was glad that they were on the right path now. He added: "I believe in Hindusthan, Everyone who lives in India is a Hindu." He also declared that if the Congress did good to Hindus, they would rush to the Congress. "India is not the land of the Quran but the land of the Gita," he continued. *Veer Savarkar* announced that in consultation with the provincial Hindu Sabhas a standing committee would be formed to organise an anti-Pakistan Front.

Promise of whole-hearted Sikh support to the Hindus in their fight for the maintenance of Akhand Hindustan was assured by Principal *Ganga Singh*, a prominent Akali leader, in the course of his speech. Explaining the Azad-Punjab scheme, he said that the Sikhs merely wanted to carve a new province in order to free themselves from the domination of the statutory Muslim majority just as the Muslims had done in the case of Sind.

In a brief speech, *Yeer Savarkar* explained the object of the Conference and dwelt on its representative character. He made it clear that leaders of all schools of thought had the fullest liberty to place their view-points without let or hindrance but he expected that there would be no difference of opinion of the main resolution.

Master Tara Singh claimed for the Sikhs the position of India's 'gate-keepers' who would bear the brunt of the coming struggle. He refused to admit that the Punjab was a Muslim province as the present Punjab included territory conquered by the Sikhs. Again, he added, mere numerical majority was not the sole criterion. This was the land where the Sikh Gurus were born, where their religion was born, and where their heroes had died heroic deaths. It was dominated by the Sikhs before the advent of the British. *Master Tara Singh* continued: "The Punjab is our province, it is Sikh Province. We cannot and shall not be exiled by Mr. Gandhi. We shall once more save the Punjab and save India. I have a right to count upon your support. You cannot and shall not refuse it."

Dr. Sir Gokul Chand Narang said that Mr. Jinnah could never hope to achieve Pakistan, even if he managed to have British support. He, however, thought that Mr. Jinnah did not want Pakistan. He was using this demand to get 50 per cent representation at the centre. *Dr. Gokul Chand* opposed the demand for a 50 per cent share at the centre, as it would convert the whole of India into Pakistan.

Mr. N. C. Chatterji said that Pakistan was a jumping-of ground and was in fact the part of a bigger plan. He made it clear that they were not going to succumb to these methods. He explained how 11 million Hindus would go under Muslim rule in Eastern Bengal, if Pakistan were established. He appealed to the Hindus to join the Mahasabha in larger numbers and to become physically organised and intellectually disciplined.

The A. I. Shia Political Conference

Working Comm.—Lucknow—22nd. October 1944

Text of Correspondence with Jinnah

The Working Committee of the All-India Shia Political Conference, which met at Lucknow on the 22nd October 1944, considered the correspondence that passed between Mr. M. A. Jinnah, President of the All-India Muslim League, and *Syed Ali Zaheer*, President of the Shia Political Conference, for the elucidation of the status of Shias in the scheme of Pakistan. *Syed Ali Zaheer* presided. The following correspondence that passed between Mr. Jinnah and *Syed Ali Zaheer* was released to the Press.

Letter from Syed Ali Zaheer, President of the Shia Political Conference, to Mr. Jinnah:

In the letter addressed to S. Sakhi Husain of Amroha published in the Press, and your reference to the Shia community in your speech at Sialkot, I was required by the last meeting of the Working Committee of the All-India Shia Political Conference to approach you and to request you to elucidate and define the status of the Shias in the scheme of Pakistan, as proposed by the Muslim League. The necessity for this step has been felt because of the following among other circumstances.

(A) Several attempts have been made to propose from the Muslim League platform that the Government in Pakistan should be modelled on the lines of the Government that prevailed in Arabia just after the Prophet's death, (i.e., *Hukumut Ilshiyah*). Although it is realised that it is not possible to put the clock back by so many years, yet it is feared that this may be an attempt to curtail the freedom of religious rights and observances, which has been enjoyed by the Shias heretofore.

(B) During elections for Muslim seats, it is a very common experience of a Shia candidate, whenever he is pitched against a Sunni candidate, to find that appeal is made to the religious fanaticism of the majority of voters, and a Shia

is defeated merely because he is a Shia. It is a common practice on such occasions to allege that a Shia, because of certain peculiarities of his articles of faith, is not a Muslim at all, and as such not entitled to their votes.

(C) The bitter experience which the Shias had during the regime of the Congress in U. P. of the two Congress Muslim Ministers makes them unwilling to trust themselves in future to a similar type of Muslim Minister. They are afraid that although in Pakistan Provinces there will be no Congress Ministries, yet the men who will form the Cabinet may be of the same class and type.

(D) The Shia Political Conference gives considerable importance to its creed of complete independence for India and desires to carry on the struggle for it side by side with other political bodies in the country which have the same creed. The Shias are convinced that with the freedom of the country Pakistan will also be automatically achieved if the majority of the Mussalman so desire.

DEMAND FOR ASSURANCE

Although I have no final authority on behalf of the Shias generally, I feel that if the Muslim League gives them the following assurances they will feel perfectly satisfied:

(1) That there will be no encroachment on their religious freedom and observances in the Pakistan, and no innovations which will hurt their religious susceptibilities will be inflicted upon them.

(2) That during elections, there should be no propaganda directly against the religious beliefs or practices of a Shia, and if there is any such propaganda, then irrespective of the proof whether it has affected the result of the election or not the election will be set aside, at the instance of the Shia candidate. It may be necessary to give a guarantee that the election rules will be amended to give effect to this assurance.

(3) That the Shias should be guaranteed sufficient number of seats in the Ministries, Legislatures, and all elected bodies, as well as to all judicial and executive posts, which should bear a definite proportion to the Muslims who are appointed to these places. The proportion must necessarily vary in different Provinces and will have to be fixed in consultation with the representatives of the Shias in these Provinces.

(4) That the Muslim League, while fighting for Pakistan, will at least simultaneously carry on its struggle for the Independence of the country as a whole, and should be willing to settle its differences with other political parties, in order that the movement for the freedom of the country may not be jeopardised. It should be realised that insistence on the attainment of Pakistan first is likely to delay considerably both Pakistan and Independence.

I may mention in the end, according to me, that these are the most important points which have so far kept the Shia Political Conference and the majority of the Shias outside the Muslim League. I hope that as soon as a satisfactory understanding is arrived at on these questions, there will probably be no difficulty left in the two bodies working in harmony with each other.

Yours Sincerely
(Sd.) Ali Zaheer.

MR. JINNAH'S REPLY

Mr. Jinnah's letter in reply to Syed Ali Zaheer's letter:

Bombay, 31st August 1944.

Dear Sir,

I am in receipt of your letter of July 25th, and I regret I cannot discuss the points raised by you through and by means of correspondence. I enclose herewith a copy of a press report of my interview with a deputation of the Shias of the Punjab dated March 30th for your information. I am confident that the majority of Shias are with the Muslim League, and such of them as are still outside the League under some sort of misapprehension are, in my opinion, unwise in not joining the Muslim League without any reservation in the interests of the Shias as well as of Muslim India, generally. The Muslim League stands for justice and fair-play, and will always stand for these fundamental principles, and there is no need for the Shias to think that they will not be justly treated by the All-India Muslim League. I think it is a great disservice to the Muslim cause to create any kind of division between the Mussalman of India, and I do not see any real cause or occasion for it. Our organisation is now in a position to mete out justice to every individual and recognise the merits wherever we have any voice or

power to do so, and as time goes on, it will grow more and more in that direction. The Muslim League cannot recognise any other political organisation. Besides, most of the points that you have raised are matters for the Mussalmans themselves to deal with internally, and some of them are totally irrelevant and are raised under a misapprehension and not in accordance with facts.

Yours Faithfully,
(Sd.) M. A. Jinnah.

Mr. Jinnah's Reply Unsatisfactory

Shia Committee's Resolution

The Committee, after a couple of hours' deliberations, unanimously adopted a resolution characterising Mr. Jinnah's reply to their President's letter as unsatisfactory. The following is the full text of the resolution:

"This meeting of the Central Standing Committee of the All-India Shia Political Conference is grateful to Mr. Jinnah in so far as he promises freedom for all religions in Pakistan, and assures that the constitution of Pakistan would be framed on democratic lines. The Committee also notes with satisfaction that according to Mr. Jinnah, unity among Muslims and complete toleration is a condition precedent to the achievement of Pakistan, but this Committee regrets to note that while Mr. Jinnah enunciates these high sounding principles, he has done nothing so far to remove the causes which are responsible for disunity in the ranks of Mussalmans, which have kept the Shia Political Conference aloof from the Muslim League. In fact, beyond advising the Shias to join the Muslim League unconditionally, Mr. Jinnah has not taken even the trouble of finding out whether the grievances mentioned by the President of this Conference in his letter do in fact exist or not. He has disposed them of in an airy fashion by the remarks that they are totally irrelevant and are not in accordance with facts. This method of dealing with such vital matters is, in the opinion of this Committee, highly unsatisfactory, and is not likely to bridge the gulf which unfortunately exists between the two major communities of Islam.

This Committee is further of the opinion that the demands contained in the letter of the President of the Conference are the minimum demands of the Shia community and the reply given by Mr. Jinnah is not at all satisfactory."

The A. I. Scheduled Castes Federation

Working Committee—Madras—23rd September 1944

Plea for Separate Treatment

The Working Committee of the All-India Scheduled Castes Federation met at Madras on the 23rd September 1944 at the residence of Rao Bahadur N. Sivaraj, President of the Federation. Mr. Sivaraj presided.

Mr. P. N. Raybhoj, General Secretary, gave an account of the working of the Federation in the various provinces and mentioned that the branches were working satisfactorily. He then gave an account of his visit to the flood-affected areas in the Bombay province.

Resolutions were then considered and passed.

The main resolution passed by the meeting stated in categorical terms that the Scheduled Castes were distinct and separate element in the national life of India and called upon Indian political leaders particularly the Hindu leaders to accept this fact in the interests of peace and good will between the Hindus and the Scheduled Castes and for the speedy realisation of India's political goal. By another resolution it welcomed the declaration made by His Majesty's Government and recently reiterated by His Excellency the Viceroy that His Majesty's Government regards the consent of the Scheduled Castes, among others, to the constitution of a free India as a matter of vital importance and as a necessary condition precedent for the transfer of power to Indian hands.

The meeting declared that no constitution would be acceptable to them unless, amongst others, it recognised the Scheduled Castes as a distinct and separate element and contained within itself provisions for earmarking a definite sum in the Budgets for the educational needs of the community, for representation of the community in the legislatures and local bodies and in the public services.

COMMUNAL UNITY ISSUE

On the communal settlement question, the Committee expressed surprise that Mr. Gandhi should have entered into secret diplomacy to bring about Hindu-Muslim settlement, and stated its emphatic opinion that the proper procedure to settle the communal question which would give a sense of security and ensure fair and equal treatment to all, is to discuss the demands put forth by each interest in public and in the presence of and with the representatives of other interests. The Committee demanded that in view of the fact that the next constitution of India would be 'for India as a dominion', the provisions of the Constitution relating to minorities should be revised and brought in accordance with the principle of equal treatment of all minorities. It also demanded that the system of joint electorates and reserved seats should be abolished and the system of separate electorates be introduced in place thereof.

With regard to the framework of the Executive of Government, the meeting resolved that the Executive in the provinces as well as in the Centre should be constituted in such a manner, amongst others, as to consist of a Prime Minister and other Ministers drawn from the major communities and minority communities in a proportion to be specified in the constitution.

Through another resolution, the meeting opined, that the Constitution must recognise the right of the Scheduled Castes to reservation in the Public services in the same proportion as might be to the claims of Muslim community.

The committee then resolved that it regarded it as essential that a definite liability for the spread of higher and advanced education among the Scheduled Castes, should be imposed on the State and demanded that the Constitution should impose an obligation upon the Provincial Governments and the Central Government to set apart adequate sums, exclusively for advanced education of the Scheduled Castes, in their annual budgets and to accept such provisions as first charge on their revenues.

SEPARATE SETTLEMENT FOR SCHEDULED CASTES

The resolution passed on the 'separate settlement' question and demanded that the constitution should provide for the transplantation of the Scheduled Castes from their present habitations to form separate Scheduled Caste villages away from and independent on Hindu villages and for the establishment of a Settlement Commission, that all Government land which is cultivable and which is not occupied and land which may be reclaimed shall be handed over to the Commission to be held in trust for the purpose of new settlements of the Scheduled Castes, that the Commission should be empowered to purchase the new land under the Land Acquisition Act from private owners to complete the scheme of settlement and that the constitution should contain a provision that the Central Government should grant to the Settlement Commission a minimum sum of rupees five crores per annum to enable it to carry out its duty in this behalf.

The last resolution passed ran as follows: "The Working Committee places its complete confidence in Dr. B. R. Ambedkar and authorises him to negotiate on its behalf and on behalf of the Scheduled Castes with other political parties or their leaders as and when necessarily arises."

Scheduled Castes' Future

Dr. Ambedkar's Advice

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, addressing a largely attended public meeting held at the Memorial Hall, Park Town, Madras on the 24 September 1944 canvassed the view that the Scheduled Castes were a separate element in the national life of India. *Rao Bahadur N. Sivaraj* presided.

Dr. Ambedkar was given a loud ovation as he entered the Hall. Addresses on behalf of the Madras Adi Dravida Workers' Association, the Andhra Provincial Scheduled Castes Welfare Association, the South Indian Buddhist Association and the Scheduled Castes Federation of the Civil and Military Station, Bangalore, were then presented and taken as read. Dr. Ambedkar was then profusely garlanded on behalf of the several organisations. A picture of Lord Buddha was presented to him as a Souvenir by a youth.

The Chairman then extended a welcome on behalf of the Scheduled Castes Federation and requested Dr. Ambedkar to tell them what exactly he would like 'our people to do'.

Dr. Ambedkar addressed the meeting for about seventy minutes, referring in

detail to the political situation, to the attitude of other parties towards the Scheduled Castes and what the demands of the Scheduled Castes were.

ALLEGATIONS AGAINST GANDHIJI

Dr. Ambedkar first referred to certain events that took place at the Round Table Conference in 1930 and the part played by Mr. Gandhi. Mr. Gandhi, Rt. Hon. Sastri and other people, he said, had let down India, not he.

Dr. Ambedkar, continuing, said that it was better that the Hindus reconciled themselves to the fact that for good or for bad, the Scheduled Castes were a separate element in the national life of India, that they were in perfect accord with them that this country should get its freedom and that they would not stand in the way. "But I should like to serve a notice upon them that the Swaraj Government must be a Government in which the Hindus, Muslims and the Scheduled Castes will be heirs to a sovereign power," he added and went on: "We will never allow a Swaraj Government to come into existence in which we have no place, in which we have no power. We shall do anything to achieve this object. There will be no limit to our sacrifices. (Cheers). There will be no limit to the sanctions we may use. The constitution must be a tripartite constitution, a constitution in which Hindus, the Scheduled Castes and the Muslims will have equal place and equal authority. If you want freedom you have to accept these terms. If you don't accept these terms, you will not get your freedom. (Cheers). If you don't get freedom, the blame will be entirely on your shoulders and not on ours. Make no mistake about this." (Cheers).

TALKS WITH MR. JINNAH

Concluding, Dr. Ambedkar referred to the Gandhi-Jinnah talks and said that he did not like these conversations. The communal problem was not merely a problem between the Hindus and the Muslims. It was a vital problem in which not only the Muslims were involved, but the Scheduled Castes, the Christians and other minorities were involved. In a matter of such nature, the wisest and the safest course would be for all representatives of the different minorities to sit together, place their cards on the table so that each one might know what the other was asking and all of them in common consultation, with just regard to the rights of others, give a decision which might be upheld by all. This sectional settlement had a bad odour. He did not know what Mr. Jinnah was demanding from Mr. Gandhi and what the latter was inclined to give to Mr. Jinnah. "If Mr. Gandhi gives Mr. Jinnah something more than what Mr. Jinnah is entitled to, that something is going to come out of my share," he added. The whole aim in the political career of Gandhiji ever since the communal problem had loomed large was "to neglect the Scheduled Castes, to by-pass them and leave them where they were." Mr. Gandhi, the speaker added, had at one time told the Muslims that he would grant them their fourteen demands provided they withdrew support to the Scheduled Castes. He said he had in his possession an agreement which was drawn up between Gandhiji and the Muslims at the Round Table Conference. Fortunately for them the Muslims did not adopt the course suggested.

Concluding, Dr. Ambedkar exhorted his community men to feel that their aim and aspiration should be to become a governing community. If they recognised that they would realise what a tremendous effort they had to make in order to put this scheme through and this time they meant business. It was no use depending upon the goodwill of H. M.'s Government or anybody. They must depend upon themselves and build their own strength. They must remove every cause of disunity amongst themselves for they would never achieve strength if they carried on their local activity in a local manner and in a local spirit. They must come under the banner of a single association, a single political body and towards that end must become members of the All-India Scheduled Castes Federation.

Advice to Justice Party

Speaking at a luncheon party given in his honour by Mr. P. Balasubramania Mudaliar, Editor, *The Sunday Observer*, at the Connemara Hotel, the hon. Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, indicated what he considered were the reasons for the collapse of the Non-Brahmin Party of Madras.

The party was held in the Grill Room of the Hotel and was well-attended by officials and non-officials. After lunch, Mr. P. Balasubramania Mudaliar requested Dr. Ambedkar to speak a few words.

Dr. Ambedkar then spoke. As far as he had been able to study, he said, that the advent of the Non-Brahmin Party had been an event in the history of India. Many people had not been able to realise that the fundamental basis of the Non-

Brahmin Party was not the communal aspect, which the word Non-Brahmin indicated. No matter who ran the Non-Brahmin Party, whether it was what they called the "intermediate class" which lay between the Brahmins at one end and the untouchables at the other, the party could be nothing if it was not a party of democracy. Therefore every-body who believed in democracy had a deep concern in the interests and fortunes of that party. The organisation of the Non-Brahmin Party was an event in the history of this country. Its downfall was also equally an event to be remembered with a great deal of sorrow. Why the party crumbled in the 1937 election was a question which the leaders of the party should ask themselves. After all in Madras they had the regime of the Non-Brahmin Party for practically twenty years before the elections came. Then, what was wrong with the Party to make it fall like a pack of cards, notwithstanding the long period of office? What was it that made the Party unpopular with a large majority of Non-Brahmins themselves? In his view two things were responsible for this downfall. Firstly, they had not been able to realise exactly what their differences were with the Brahminical section. Though they indulged in virulent criticism of Brahmins and Brahminism, could any one say that those differences had been doctrinal? How much Brahminism had they in them? They wore *namams* and regarded themselves as second-class Brahmins. Instead of abandoning Brahminism, they had been holding on to the spirit of it as being the ideal they ought to reach. And their anger against Brahmins was that the Brahmins gave them only a second class degree. How could a party take roots when its followers did not know in clear cut terms what were the doctrinal differences between the party to which they belonged and the party which they were asked to oppose? So the failure to enunciate the doctrine of differences between the Brahminical section and the Non-Brahmins was one of the reasons for the downfall of the Party.

The second reason for the downfall of the Party was its very narrow political programme. The Party had been described by its opponents as a party of job-hunters. That was the term THE HINDU had often used. He did not attach much importance to this criticism, for, "if we are job hunters, then the other side are no less than we are." One defect in the political programme of the Non-Brahmin Party had been that the Party made it its chief concern to secure a certain number of jobs for their young men. That was perfectly legitimate. But did Non-Brahmin young men for whom the party fought for twenty years to secure jobs in public services, remember the Party, after they received emoluments for their jobs? During the twenty years the Party had been in office, it forgot the 90 per cent of the Non-Brahmins living in the villages, leading an uneconomic life and getting into the clutches of the money-lenders. He had examined the legislations enacted during this period and except for one solitary measure of land reform, the Non-Brahmin Party never bothered about the tenants and the peasants. That was why the "Congress fellows stole their clothes quietly."

Dealing with recent developments in the Party, Dr. Ambedkar said that he had been greatly pained by the turn of events. One thing he would like to impress was that a party was the only thing that would save them. A party needed a good leader, a party needed an organisation, a party needed a political platform. Quoting the labour Party debacle in 1934, Dr. Ambedkar said, "let us not be too critical about leaders." Let them look at the Congress. Who would have accepted Mr. Gandhi as a leader in any other country? He was a man who had no vision, no knowledge, no judgment. He was a man who had been a failure all his life in public life. There was no important occasion when India was about to succeed when Mr. Gandhi had brought about anything good. This was the speaker's individual opinion. When Mr. Jinnah raised his Pakistan issue two or three years ago, Mr. Gandhi called it a sin and turned a deaf ear. Ultimately the Frankenstein grew. Mr. Gandhi got frightened. He was grappling with it now by making a complete somersault. Yet he continued to be the leader in this country, because the Congress did not put its leader on his trial. Let them take the case of Mr. Jinnah. He was an autocratic leader. They will be surprised to know that the League was entirely his show. But the Mussalmans had rightly placed their faith in him. The Congress knew that any charge levelled against Mr. Gandhi would mean the disruption of the whole organisation and so tolerated a great deal of what was inconsistent with democracy. Therefore, he would say to the Non-Brahmins "unity is of supreme importance. Learn that lesson before it is too late."

Congress Workers' Informal Conference

Bombay—28th & 29th October 1944

The Bombay Presidency Congress Workers' Informal Conference concluded at Bombay on the 29th October 1944 late at night. A Sub-Committee, consisting of the office-bearers of the Bombay, Gujarat, Maharashtra and Karnatak Provincial Congress Committees, which was preparing drafts of resolutions to be placed before the Conference, considered the proposal to hold a plenary session of the Congress. A point of order was raised whether, in the absence of the Congress Working Committee, a plenary session could be summoned.

Unlike the last occasion, *President Azad* had not delegated powers of presidentship to any this time. Secondly, it was stated that the President had categorically mentioned at the time of his arrest that in the absence of the Congress Working Committee nobody could usurp the powers of the Congress. It was urged by one group that in view of the above views of the Congress President, no plenary session of the Congress could be held without the Congress Working Committee.

Mr. N. V. Gadgil, Chairman of the Committee, ruled *Mr. S. K. Pati's* motion for summoning a plenary session to endorse Gandhiji's offer to the British Government out of order. Opinion among the workers assembled here was friendly to the suggestion of a special session. In view of the Chairman's ruling it appeared that individual Congressmen would discuss it with Gandhiji and take his advice.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolutions laying down their future policy and programme were passed unanimously by the Maharashtra, Gujarat, Karnatak, Bombay and Suburban Congress Workers' Conference at its closing session here to-day. The Conference adopted the A. I. C. C. resolution of 1942 as being still in force and governing Congress policy as interpreted by Mahatma Gandhi.

In one resolution, it was decided that all Congressmen must immediately, and in earnest, start the enrolment of Congress members in large numbers, and set a time-limit for the enlisting of a progressively larger quota.

"Such enrolment is not only desirable in itself", the resolution stated, "but also has it become incumbent on Congressmen, in view of the challenge thrown by the powers-that-be against the right of the Indian National Congress to speak for the nation, and of the necessity to demonstrate that even when the Government intern Congress leaders, the Congress governs the hearts of the people".

Another motion urged the formation of an official Volunteer Corps, based on "unquestioning discipline and unadulterated nationalism", in every Congress province, "for activating the Congress and giving to the young generation an opportunity to train themselves for the service of the country through the Indian National Congress". It added: "The training of these volunteers must be both physical and intellectual. There must be one uniform policy for all volunteer Corps organised by the Congress, both in respect of the efficient working of the volunteer organisation and the restrictions from time to time put on the volunteer movement by the Government in this country. The Conference feels that the principle of a programme with a set quota "can be fruitfully applied to this essential activity of the Congress."

FIFTEEN-YEAR PLAN CONDEMNED

Another motion adopted read: "This Conference feels it necessary to caution the people of the Province in respect of various economic plans which are being sponsored by Government and which are demonstrably intended to distract the public mind from the main political issue of complete national independence. This Conference is of opinion that, viewed in this context, the 15-year plan announced by the Government of Bombay is not only unimaginative and inadequate but also mischievous and harmful, inasmuch as it is planned, in pursuance of the traditional policy of 'divide and rule', to further disrupt the village community, and to introduce new conflicts of interests where they did not exist. As such, the 15-year plan of the Bombay Government must be condemned. The Conference feels that only a National Government responsible to the people can devise and carry out an economic plan in the true interests of the people of this country.

The following resolutions also were passed:

FOOD POLICY

"Whereas the 'procurement and distribution of food' policy followed by the Government in this province is calculated to aggravate the hardships of the people and to encourage corruption, this Conference is of opinion that no Congressman can co-operate with any agency appointed by the Government to carry out the said policy. The Conference, however, considers it necessary that committees of Congressmen, as well as of such others as are prepared to co-operate with Congressmen, should be formed in every taluka, to ventilate and to secure the redress of the grievances of the people arising out of the steps taken by Government and its officers in pursuance of the said policy. The Conference welcomes the efforts already made in this direction by non-official organisations in the province.

COMMUNIST AND ROYIST PROPAGANDA CRITICISED

"Whereas the Congress is an active political organisation fighting a powerful foreign Government, it is necessary that no component element of the Congress and no constituted Congress body should be allowed to work, or carry on propaganda in the country, against the deliberate decisions of the duly-constituted Congress authorities. This Conference notes with regret that several members of the Royist and Communist parties holding elective posts in Congress Committees have acted and carried on propaganda against the A. I. C. C. resolution of August 8, 1942, and is of opinion that disciplinary action ought to be taken against them. This Conference is further of opinion that Congressmen ought to desist from any political association with the above mentioned parties."

CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAMME

"This Conference is of opinion that, while Congress organisations and Congressmen have given their approval to the constructive programme, they have not worked for its fulfilment as vigorously and intensively as they ought to. The Conference strongly urges the people of this province in general, and the Congress organisations in particular, to concentrate their efforts on successfully carrying out the constructive programme, with special emphasis on khadi, gramodyoga, talim-langh, and popularisation of Hindustani, which form the foundation of that programme."

CAMPAIGN AGAINST CORRUPTION

"The Conference draws the attention of the people of Bombay province to the corruption and exploitation which are rampant in the country, and are choking the life of the people and on which Mahatma Gandhi has focussed public attention. The Conference makes a fervent appeal to the people of the province to make serious efforts to mobilise public opinion against the same and further to take all possible steps to eradicate these evils."

Mr. N. V. Gadgil, President, in his speech, referred to Mahatma's fast and expressed the deep anxiety not only of Congressmen but of the people of India. He thought that it was in the hands of the people to avoid the fast if they only carried out their part in the constructive programme according to the instructions issued by Mahatma Gandhi. "It that is done, you are sure that the chances of the fast is postponed, if not altogether avoided", he added, and asked the assurance of the Conference to communicate to Mahatma Gandhi their promise to carry out the instructions to the best of their ability.

Programme for Congressmen

Mahatma Gandhi's Suggestions

"Its wholesale fulfilment is complete Independence," said *Mahatma Gandhi* in a note entitled, "Hints for workers on the Constructive Programme," which he had sent to the Conference of Congressmen meeting at Bombay on the 28th. October. The following is the text of the note :—

Workers should definitely realise that the Constructive Programme is the non-violent and truthful way of winning Poorna Swaraj. Its wholesale fulfilment is Complete Independence. Imagine all the 40 crores of people engaged in the whole of the Constructive Programme, which is designated to build up the nation from the very bottom upward. Can anybody dispute the proposition that it must mean Complete Independence in every sense of the expression, including ousting of foreign domination? When the critics laugh at the proposition, what they mean is that 40 crores of people will never co-operate in the effort to fulfil the programme. No doubt there is a considerable truth in the scoff. My answer is, is it worth the

attempt. Given an indomitable will on the part of a band of earnest workers, the programme is as workable as any other and more so than most. Anyway, I have no substitute for it, if it is to be based on non-violence.

TRAINING IN CONSTRUCTIVE EFFORT

Civil disobedience, mass or individual, is an aid to constructive effort and is a full substitute for armed revolt. Just as military training is necessary for armed revolt, training in constructive effort is equally necessary for civil resistance, and just as the use of arms becomes necessary only when occasion demands it, even so is the use of civil resistance only occasional. Therefore, workers will never be on the lookout for civil resistance. They will hold themselves in readiness, if the constructive effort is sought to be defeated.

To take one or two illustrations: efforts for communal friendship cannot be defeated, political pacts can. But political pacts are required because of the previous lack of friendship. Again, Khadi manufacture and its use cannot be defeated if both become fairly universal. The manufacture and use are not to be brought about by being imposed upon the people, but they have to be intelligently accepted by them as one of the necessary items of the Freedom Movement, when it is worked with the villages as units. Pioneers even in such programmes can be obstructed. They have had to go through the fire of suffering throughout the world.

There is no Swaraj without suffering. In violence, Truth is the greatest sufferer; in non-violence Truth is ever triumphant. If the preliminary observation has gone home to the reader, he will find the constructive programme to be full of deep interest. It should be absorbing as politics so-called and platform oratory.

The detailed constructive programme is to be found in my pamphlet on it, and Dr. Rajendra Prasad's, which is a running commentary on it. It should be remembered that it is illustrative, not exhaustive. Local circumstances may suggest many more items not touched in the printed programme. These are beyond the scope of a treatise on an All-India programme. They are necessarily for local workers to find out and do the needful.

SERVICE TO THE KISANS

In these hints, I have singled out some items for fuller emphasis in the light of experience gained since the publication of the programme. The Kisan or the peasant, whether as a landless labourer or a labouring proprietor comes first. He is the salt of the earth, which rightly belongs or should belong to him, not to the absentee landlord or zamindar. But in the non-violent way the labourer cannot forcibly eject the absentee landlord. He has to work as to make it impossible for the landlord. Closest co-operation amongst the peasants is absolutely necessary. To this end, special organising bodies or committees should be formed, where there are none and those already in existence should be reformed where necessary. The Kisans are, for the most part, illiterate. Both adults and young persons of school-going age should be educated. This applies to men and women. Where they are landless labourers, their wages should be brought to a level that would ensure a decent living, which should mean balanced food, dwelling houses and clothing which should satisfy health requirements.

Land laws should be investigated. The peasants' indebtedness offers a limitless field for research. The problem of cattle too is an integral part of agriculture in India and, therefore, requires the attention of workers skilled in this very intricate and somewhat baffling problem.

WORK AMONG LABOURERS

Closely allied to the Kisan work is Labour and therefore, concentrated and centralised and much more limited in scope. Moreover, it lends itself readily to political handling. Being necessarily confined to critics, it attracts workers more easily than Kisan work. As part of the constructive programme, its primary aim is elevation of Labour to its deserved status. Therefore, a Labour worker's aim should be to raise the moral and intellectual height of Labour and thus by sheer merit to make him or her capable not merely of bettering his or her material condition but making Labour master for the means of production, instead of being the slave that it is. Capital should be Labour's servant, not his master. Labour should be made conscious of its duty, from whose performance rights follow as a matter of course.

In a concrete form: (a) Labour should have its own Union; (b) Education, both general and scientific, or both men and women, should be regularly undertaken through night schools. (c) Children of labourers should be educated after the

Basic Education style. (d) There should be a hospital, a creche and a maternity home attached to every centre. (e) Labour should be able to support itself during strikes. (Labour should be taught the science of conducting a successful non-violent strike).

All the work I have mentioned could be only done through unions mentioned in (a). To my knowledge the Ahmedabad Union is the best managed Union. This does not mean that it has reached my ideal. It is trying to. If all the Unions worked in the same direction, the lot of labour would be infinitely better than it is to-day. Labour united and morally and intellectually trained would any day be superior to capital.

DUTY TO STUDENTS

Next in importance is the student class above the age of 12. Indeed, if we have enough workers of the right type, I would go so far as to say that we should work among them as soon as they begin learning as infants. For they have to be taken in hand from the school-going age. Indeed, I need not say that I have not in mind their political use. For the present, the schools are largely under Government control or are influenced by them. Hence the students' education is defective in a vital matter. They are untouched by the political condition of the country, save what they learn from the newspapers or platform orators. They should have, in a systematic manner, their present education supplemented by Congress workers. How this can be fitted into the present system of education is a serious question. But it has to be tackled. Up to the matriculation standard, co-operation of parents is necessary.

I adhere to the view often expressed by me that the student world should be aloof from the political turmoil. It would be different if there was mass civil disobedience. But that is out of the question for the time being at any rate. But they should have education in national consciousness. It is the duty of an independent State to teach its citizens to be patriotic. The education imparted is by a foreign agency. It runs contrary to the national aspirations. There should therefore, be a body of workers whose duty it would be to undertake the big task of taking in hand the work mentioned above. In this sense, it is a new field, and it is of vital importance to us. We must recognise the fact that the students are not to be weaned from schools and colleges. The rapidly increasing number of entrants is proof positive of it. The best course, therefore, is to supplement their studies in an orderly manner. Deliverance lies through national effort in this direction showing marked superiority over the foreign method.

The Non-Party-Leaders' Conference

Standing Committee—New Delhi—19th November 1944

Committee to Solve Communal Problem

The Standing Committee of the Non-Party Conference decided to appoint a committee to suggest a solution of the communal and political problems. This decision had the wholehearted support of Mahatma Gandhi, who promised full co-operation in the work of the proposed committee. The basic conception of the committee was that the discussion of the communal and political problem should be lifted from the partisan level to the scientific and judicial level. The resolution runs:

"The Standing Committee of the Non-Party Conference, having considered the present situation in view of the breakdown of the Gandhi-Jinnah talks on the communal issue, hereby resolves to appoint a committee which will examine the whole communal and minorities question from a constitutional and political point of view, put itself in touch with different parties and their leaders including the minorities interested in the question and present a solution within two months to the Standing Committee of the Non-Party Conference. The Standing Committee will take all reasonable steps to get that solution accepted by all parties concerned. The Standing Committee authorises Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru to appoint members of the committee and announce their names in due course."

Sir Tej Bahadur speaking at a press conference, stated that he had placed before Mr. Gandhi at Wardha the idea of a committee of the kind now decided upon, and Mr. Gandhi had said:—"I shall unreservedly co-operate with it. You can call me whenever you like; put me any questions you like, ask me for any assistance you like."

Sir Tej Bahadur said he had not yet selected the members of the proposed committee. It was Mr. Gandhi's idea and he agreed with it that there should be on the committee no one who was a partisan or one who had expressed himself violently on political issues of the country. It was also the idea that there should be one or two retired Judges who would bring a judicial mind to bear on the country's problems. Sir Tej Bahadur had received replies from two or three persons who had been approached. He had good reasons to believe that Dr. Ambedkar would be able to help with advice and suggestions, though of course because of his official position, he would not be on the committee.

Sir Tej Bahadur had one or two European names before him, and, if they were prepared to help the committee, he was willing to have them.

In reply to a correspondent, Sir Tej Bahadur said it was his intention to approach Mr. Jinnah in due course.

The committee, as soon as it was constituted, would put itself into touch with every single leader of prominence in the country. Personally, he would not mind any rebuff; or anyone telling the committee: "You are nobody; you have no goods to deliver." It was entirely optional for any person to help the committee.

It was the intention that every document placed before the committee should be published. The whole material, together with the committee's report, would be before the country.

The effort of the committee would be to understand the views of each party, act as a sort of a conciliation board by establishing contact with all parties and recommend some solution that they thought good on their own responsibility.

"It would be open to each party to accept it wholly or partially or to reject it. There is no question of failure or success. When the committee has done its work, it would be for the leaders of the different parties to consider whether at that stage they would not call a bigger conference—either an all-parties conference or a convention."

Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru said he had placed all these points before Mr. Gandhi and a provisional draft of the resolution now passed by the Standing Committee of the Non-Party Conference was prepared.

Sir Tej Bahadur contradicted a report published in Delhi that the Viceroy has expressed tacit approval of this proposal. "I have had no correspondence with the Viceroy for the last three months," Sir Tej Bahadur declared. The proposal had nothing to do with the Viceroy or any other official, high or low.

So far as the Government was concerned, Sir Tej Bahadur's view was that they should smooth the way of the committee by adopting a reasonable attitude to any approach for information or statistics. But, he declared: "In order to smooth the way and create the proper atmosphere, it is very necessary that the Congress leaders behind the bars should be let out, because I see no reason why they should be kept there any longer." He was, however, not putting this forward as a "*sine qua non*."

His own view of the strength of the proposed committee was between fifteen and twenty members.

Sir Tej Bahadur agreed with a press correspondent's suggestion that the basic conception of the committee was that the discussion of the communal and political problem should be lifted from the partisan level to the scientific and judicial level.

Giving an account of his earlier discussions with Mr. Gandhi, Sir Tej Bahadur said that towards the end of October he wrote to the Mahatma and told him that things were taking a rather dangerous turn. Sir Tej expressed regret at the use of the phrase 'civil war' in some of the speeches made following the breakdown of the Gandhi-Jinnah talks.

"I am one of those who do not believe in a civil war or in the possibility of a civil war in this country," declared Sir Tej Bahadur.

He pointed out to Mr. Gandhi that several people had suggested that the time had come for an All-Parties Conference; he knew that Mr. Gandhi's mind was running in that direction; but in Sir Tej Bahadur's view such a conference would not lead to any satisfactory results in the existing circumstances.

Sir Tej Bahadur saw Mr. Gandhi early in November and in the course of discussion Mr. Gandhi expressed himself against a convention, but there was one impression left in Sir Tej Bahadur's mind at the end of the conversations.

"Having very freely exchanged views, I came to the conclusion that if there was one man among the 400 millions who was genuinely and sincerely anxious for a settlement it was Mahatma Gandhi. I shall maintain that in spite of any statement to the contrary."

With that impression he left Mr. Gandhi but as he was leaving, Mr. Gandhi asked him to give thought to the matter further and come back to Wardha. During the two or three hours that he was free, Sir Tej Bahadur tentatively arrived at the idea of the committee and went back to Mr. Gandhi and explained it to him. They discussed it at length and Sir Tej was agreeably surprised that the suggestion found ready acceptance on Mr. Gandhi's part.

The one condition on which Mr. Gandhi laid stress was that the members of this committee should not belong to any political party or have definitely committed themselves to any particular views since the break-down of the Bombay talks.

Standing Committee—Allahabad—3rd December 1944

Statement on Political Situation

The Standing Committee of the Non-Party Conference, which met at Allahabad on the 3rd December 1944, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru presiding, issued the following statement on the general political situation in the country :—

"The Standing Committee of the Non-Party Conference having considered the existing political situation desire to call attention to some of its outstanding features. In provinces such as Madras, Bombay, the United Provinces, the Central Provinces and Bihar for the last five years and more, there have been no Ministries and no legislatures and taxes have been levied and public expenditure incurred by Governors in the exercise of their all-embracing power under Section 93 of the Government of India Act, 1935. In Orissa, the deadlock was broken for a short period but at the present moment there too, there is no legislature and therefore no Ministry. The Committee consider that the framers of the Act could never have contemplated that Section 93, which was really intended to cope with a temporary breakdown of the constitution, should be used and remain in operation for such a length of time as five years continuously.

"The Committee regret to observe that they see no signs of any coming change in the policy of His Majesty's Government in this respect and they fear that until the duration of the war, the end of which no one can yet see, the absolute powers for the use of which no Governor is responsible to the people of his Province may continue to be used indefinitely to the great and growing dissatisfaction and resentment of the people. That there is general dissatisfaction and resentment and that it has been growing from year to year the Committee are prepared to affirm emphatically. The Committee further draw attention to the fact that vast post-war schemes involving huge financial commitments are being accepted with a view to their being put into operation either immediately or after the war without their being submitted to the scrutiny of the legislatures where, representatives of the public would have an effective voice in shaping them and controlling their execution. Any Advisory Committees that have been set up or conferences which are held from time to time cannot be a legitimate or effective substitute for the responsibility of the duly elected representatives of the legislatures on such important matters. The people of this country are vitally interested in the development of industries, large and small, communications, education, public health and other social services and they feel that on constitutional grounds they are obviously entitled to take part in the formation and execution of these big schemes affecting the future of this big country.

"Similarly, the Committee draw attention to the fact that, important decisions have been taken with regard to recruitment of the Indian Civil Service and the Indian police and military officers are being employed in many civil posts without any previous reference to or consultation with the legislatures. In the opinion of the Committee, the proportions fixed by the Lee Committee twenty years ago for the recruitment of Europeans and Indians are already out of date and there does not seem to be any reason why consistently with the aim of Self-Government, the Services should not be manned by Indians of the requisite qualifications, recruitment from Europe being stopped without delay.

APPEAL TO PROVINCIAL LEGISLATORS

"The fact that some Ministries tendered their resignations in 1939, however regrettable or open to criticism, cannot afford any justification for continuing for

such a length of time the irresponsible and autocratic rule of Governors. In the opinion of the Committee, a constitutional form of Government should be restored in the provinces and steps to give effect to that should be taken without further loss of time. The Committee also appeal to the members of the suspended Legislatures to show their readiness to resume responsibility and to accept as a working basis, the principle of Composite Governments wherever possible. In any case, if the members of the majority of the parties in the legislatures should decline to assume responsibility, they should agree to the members of minority parties assuming and carrying on as a temporary expedient the functions of stable Government.

RELEASE OF CONGRESS LEADERS

"In the opinion of the Committee, the release of the members of the Working Committee of the Congress, who have been kept in detention since August 1942, without trial, will help to restore good feeling in the country, and the acceptance of this suggestion will also tend to strengthen the chances of the resumption of responsibility by the majority parties and the settlement of differences between them and the minority parties in the legislatures. Besides, justice and fairness demand that they should not continue to be deprived any further of their freedom. The Committee also think that political situation has so materially changed that there can now be no reasonable fear of the revival of mass civil disobedience.

The Committee note with deep regret that His Majesty's Government still persist in the policy of doing nothing to change the character and constitutional status of the Central Government during the war. The Committee reiterate their belief that, even under the existing constitution, it is possible to so alter the character and status of the Central Executive as to make it approximate to a National Government. In the opinion of the Committee, this end can be achieved without any great changes in the existing Act. Further, the Committee note with much regret that no practical steps have been taken by Government towards giving effect to pledges given in Parliament about Self-Government after the war. Much valuable time has been lost by this policy of inactivity which has only tended to foster a spirit of frustration and resentment among the people. If the pledge of Self-Government is to be translated into reality, steps should be taken now to achieve that end and not only the people but the Government must also play their appropriate parts in moving towards that end."

Punjab Aryan Provincial Conference

Welcome Address—Lahore—26th November 1944

Scenes reminiscent of the Hyderabad Satyagraha days were witnessed at the Gurudutta Bhawan, Lahore on the 26th November 1944 when about 50,000 persons, men and women, young and old alike, expressed their condemnation of the Sind Government's ban on the 14th chapter of the *Satyarth Prakash* and endorsed the decision to appoint a Council of Action under Mr. *Ghanshyam Singh Gupta*, Speaker, C. P. Assembly, who presided over the conference, by adopting unanimously a resolution moved by *Mahatma Narayan Swami* and seconded, amongst others, by *R. B. Badri Das*.

A huge gathering heard patiently, amidst unbounded enthusiasm, the speeches made by some of the most prominent Arya Samajists. These speeches, which were punctuated with enthusiastic slogans, were made at the Punjab Aryan Congress which was held under the joint auspices of the Anarkali and the Wachhowali Arya Samajes at the Gurudutta Bhawan.

This unity among the two sections of Arya Samaj at such a critical time was welcomed by the various speakers. *Mahashey Khushal Chand*, who was the Chairman of the Reception Committee, said: "The first proof of our strength is that those who parted company 60 years back are united again and I can tell you that *Khushal Chand* and *Mahashey Krishan* will embrace each other and work hand-in-hand and if need be and the time comes we will be in the same cell in the jail."

The main theme of the speeches was that the Arya Samajists' present quarrel was not with the Muslim masses as such or with the British Government but they

were fighting against the communalism of the Muslim League and the Sind League Ministry.

LALA KHUSHAL CHAND'S ADDRESS

Lala Khushal Chand, Chairman of the Reception Committee, said that the Arya Samaj was being made a victim of the political game. He condemned the activities of communists and said that though communism was dead in Russia its ghost was even now haunting young boys and girls in India. The *Satyarth Prakash*, he said, was written to tell the truth and spread it; its great author had expressly stated the object of his writing by saying in the book that it was being written for the betterment of humanity and for distinguishing between truth and untruth. But nothing was to be forced on anyone for the object was to preach against evil. The great author of the book had said; "Our main object is to refrain from doing harm to anyone but help mutually."

L. Kushal Chand stated that the *Satyarth Prakash* influenced the life of Tolstoy who left Grihasth Ashram (family) and became a "Ban Prasthi." Maulana Mohd. Ali had described it as a "great work of Swami Dayanand." Maulvi Moorad Ali had said: "Satyarth Prakash is the fountain of food." The Nobel Prize Winner Mr. Ling, on studying the *Satyarth Prakash*, became a theist. The ban imposed by the Sind Government showed that for getting political power religious persecution could be done. The book had been read by crores of people during the last 62 years and not to speak of danger to peace never had even a prick been caused to anyone. The use of the Defence of India Rules for this purpose was political dishonesty and fraud being perpetrated upon the Muslim masses by the Sind Government. He had no doubt that the Arya Samaj would stand that attack. Would they dare use the Defence of India Rules against H. G. Wells' Short History of the World or against the writings of W. Bedwell or the 150 European authors who had criticised Islam and its principle? The Defence of India Rules cannot kill the spirit. Though the League Government was to blame and not the British Government but the weapon had been taken from the British Government's armoury and, therefore, it was the duty of the Government of India to take immediate steps to heal this deep wound.

Presidential Address

Mr. Ghanshyam Singh Gupta then delivered his presidential address amidst loud cheers. In the course of his speech he said:—

"The agitation against the "*Satyarth Prakash*" has been started by the Muslim League—an avowedly political organisation. In this very city, it first passed a resolution demanding proscription of the book. Having failed to get the response from the Central or Provincial Governments the League again pressed for it and this time at Karachi. The result was that the Muslim League Ministry of Sind obeyed the behests and banned the printing and publishing of Chapter XIV of the *Satyarth Prakash*. For this unwarranted and unprecedented measure the Sind Ministry has called in aid the Defence of India Rules. The Defence Rules were never intended to be used in this fashion of banning sacred books of any religion under the pretext of Law and Order. Law and Order was not disturbed for the last 70 years by the wide publication of the book. The Defence of India was not endangered for the past about 5 years that the war was going on. Suddenly the Muslim League resolution has made "*Satyarth Prakash*" dangerous for the Sind Government. The screen is so thin that it can deceive no body. It is the grossest misuse of the Defence of India Rules. It is clear to the poorest intellect that this attack on the religious liberties of Arya Samajists is based purely on political considerations and to serve political ends. What they can possibly be can only be guessed.

"It would appear that this is a link in the chain of Pakistan Programme. Among the opponents of Pakistan, the most uncompromising are the Sikhs and the Arya Samajists. The Muslim League and its leaders are apparently trying to cajole and entrap the former and crush the latter, because of their belief that the Arya Samajists cannot be cajoled or entrapped and the brave Sikhs cannot be crushed. It is devoutly hoped that the leaders of the great Sikh community will understand the game and refuse to be cajoled. I hope your iron determination will make it clear that it will not be an easy matter to crush the Arya Samaj either. But they are playing their game deftly. The Muslim League does not rely on its own strength for the purpose. They are anxious that the Arya Samaj be crushed into submission by the might of the British Government. Whatever one may say, I have not the least doubt that after the Arya Samaj has been dealt with, it will be time for the Muslim League to deal with the Sikhs and other Hindus and give them the foretaste of the Muslim League Government in their would-be Pakistan.

Religious tolerance will give place to religious bigotry and religious freedom to religious persecution. The history of the mediæval period—of which your Punjab had more than enough share—will be repeated. If we fail to understand this essential thing from now, and become divided, it will be too late and our whole future will be doomed.

SAVE INDIA FROM RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION

"I would appeal to all right thinking persons, Hindus, Sikhs and Mohamedans and others, to unite and use all their influence to save India from this religious persecution. Let every body realise that extracts can be quoted from any religious book to make it a ground in support of persecution and if such things are even once allowed, no religious minority will be safe any where. It is, therefore, up to all to fight the danger and maintain civilised Government and civilised life.

"I would also most humbly appeal to the British Government not to be a party to this very clear religious persecution of a very small minority like the Arya Samaj. The British Government have been following the policy of allowing religious freedom since the days of Queen Victoria's memorable Proclamation and this age-long policy should be allowed to remain unimpaired. There is no substance in the allegation that law and order being a provincial subject, the whole responsibility lies with the Muslim League Government of Sind. British rule and British Government exist intact. No Provincial Government must be allowed to ostracise and resort to religious persecutions on the plea of law and order of a small minority. It may be stated at once that the quarrel of the Arya Samaj is not with our Muslim brethren and certainly not with the British Government. The demand against the 'Satyarth Prakash' has come from the Muslim League and the action has been taken by the Muslim League Ministry of Sind. Our grievance is, therefore, against the Muslim League.

"I would in all humility utter a word of warning to the Muslim League. If there ever was a case for Pakistan that case has been knocked to the very bottom by this one act of the Muslim League Ministry. Even before we have full-fledged Pakistan we have got this foretaste of it. God only knows what will be in store for us if and when the Muslim League rules with their full religious fervour and complete religious intolerance in the different areas of their Pakistan.

PAKISTAN—CHILD OF PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY

"This brings us to a constitutional question of a rather major importance. This religious persecution has come from the Provincial Government of Sind as it is to day and not from the contemplated Pakistan Government of Sind. Pakistan is as yet under contemplation and not in being. What should be the position of the Provinces vis-a-vis the Centre? I have no doubt in my mind that Pakistan is in a way the child of "Provincial Autonomy."

There can be no answer to the contention that if the provinces are to be autonomous they have the liberty to federate or not to federate wherever and whenever they like. I hold the formulas of the "Provincial Autonomy and Federation" to one of the greatest dangers of our time. The phrase is a misnomer to the conditions of our country. Our provinces are not the independent and sovereign States as in the U. S. A. Our provinces have been provinces subordinate to and deriving powers from the Centre. India has been one not only geographically but also politically and in all vital ways one, if not in past history at any rate for the last 150 years of the British rule. Now "Provincial autonomy" and "Federation" want to cut this *Bharatwarsh* into pieces and then again gather those pieces and join them. It is like cutting my body, hands, head, feet etc. and then again join them by some magic. I feel that like my body, India will be dead in this process of dissection.

"Those who have given their support to these two formulas must boldly retrace their steps and take a turn to proceed on the right path. It must be proclaimed from house tops that we are opposed to "Provincial Autonomy" and therefore to "Federation". There is absolutely no other way to kill Pakistan. I hold Rajaji's formula to be better than the current idea of "Provincial Autonomy." Rajaji makes the districts and not the provinces as units. The whole question is, under Swaraj where should the sovereignty of the people reside? I hold strongly that it should reside in the people of India as a whole and not separately in the inhabitants of the Provinces. The Provinces must derive their authority from and work as agents of the Centre. This is the only way to escape from religious and other sorts of persecution of the worst type, much more dangerous and all embracing than what was experienced in the mediæval ages.

"The Arya Samaj will not rest until and unless this attack on religion is set right. In this I have no doubt that the Samaj will receive help and support from right-thinking persons of all faiths and professions."

BAN CONDEMNED

Mahatma Narayan Swami, who led the Hyderabad Satyagraha movement, moved the following resolution:—

"This session of the Punjab Aryan Congress expresses its feeling of deep resentment at the order of the Sind Government banning the printing and publishing of Chapter 14th of the Satyarth Prakash under the Defence of India Rules on the pretext of preserving public peace and safety. In the opinion of the Congress the action of the Sind Government is a flagrant abuse of the provisions of the Defence of India Rules and instead of preserving public peace and safety is sure to endanger them by increasing communal tension and bitterness. The said order has deeply injured the religious feelings not only of Arya Samajists but also of all Hindus and is disapproved even by right-minded Muslims. The Satyarth Prakash is a sacred book of the Arya Samajists and they look upon it with the same feeling of reverence as the followers of their religions do with regard to their own books, and will never tolerate any interference thereof.

"This Congress claims that there is nothing in the Satyarth Prakash by way of criticism of other religions the like of which against contemporary religions and sects is not to be found in the sacred books of others. The existence of such criticism in the Satyarth Prakash cannot be any ground for its mutilation and the Arya Samaj cannot allow it. Swami Dayanand did not criticise other religions with the object of unnecessarily offending the religious susceptibilities of their followers but with the sole object of sifting truth from untruth. This session, therefore, strongly urges the Sind Government and the Government of India to put an end to the daily growing unrest and increasing communal bitterness by withdrawing the wholly uncalled for and unjust order of the provincial Government.

"This session of the provincial Aryan Congress fully endorses the resolution dated the 19th November 1944, passed by the representatives of Arya Samaj as assembled at Delhi and expresses its complete confidence in the Committee of Action formed under the presidentship of Shriyut Ghanshyam Singh Gupta, Speaker, C. P. Assembly and assures its leaders that the whole Arya Samajist world is at their back and will regard no sacrifice too great to protect its religious rights.

"This session appeals to the people to exercise self-restraint and give proof of their discipline and calls upon them to keep ready for the utmost sacrifice if and when deemed necessary".

Moving the resolution, *Mahatma Narayan Swami* stated that if Islam was a missionary religion as was claimed by its followers and its preachers could criticise other religions for asking others to embrace Islam, they should be prepared to hear criticism from others. If instead of meeting argument by argument the Muslims take resort to emergency laws or law courts that shows that they are unable to uphold their cause.

WITHDRAW UNJUST ORDER

The Muslim League Ministry in Sind by banning the 14th chapter of Satyarth Prakash had adopted a naive way and there would be every justification for the followers of other religions to demand the imposition of a similar ban or ask for the religious scripts of other religions being proscribed. He had no hesitation in saying that the Quran and the Bible contained criticism and condemnation of other religions in much more fantastic manner but no one had ever asked for the proscription of those books. He hoped that this unjust order would be withdrawn.

A POLITICAL STUNT

R. B. Badri Das, President, Arya Pratinidhi Sabha, Punjab, expressed surprise over the action of the Sind Government. The war, he said, was being fought on the Eastern front of India and the dangers allied with the war were confined to the east. The need for ensuring safety had been felt in the west of India and the Sind Government had employed the Defence of India Rules. The Rai Bahadur described the ban as a political stunt of the Muslim League in order to secure the support of illiterate Muslim masses which was needed by the League and its leader. He had no doubt that all right thinking persons would condemn this game of the League. The Hindus were treated like that because they were regarded weak. But even the weak would not tolerate any interference in their religion.

Mr. Keshab Chander, General Secretary of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha, supporting the resolution said that the Satyarth Prakash was like the Sun which never sets. The Hindus were being crushed in Sind in all spheres of life. The ban on the Satyarth Prakash would prove the last straw in the camel's back. The

Satyarth Prakash was the soul of Arya Samaj. He asked the Arya youth to get ready to break the rock of Muslim League communalism. He declared full support of the Hindu Mahasabha in their struggle to protect the Satyarth Prakash.

Swami Bhagwata Nand, head of the Niranjani Akhara, Harwar (organisation of 50 lakhs of Sadhus), lending his support to the resolution, said that he and his followers had been actuated to lend their support to the movement not out of any malice. The Satyarth Prakash did not contain any attacks on any religion though it contained criticism of bad customs in other religions. That was the right of every one if he was the upholder of truth. Satyarth Prakash was not a book written by an individual but by a Rishi who had brought a new message to the world. The Rishi had written the book with the best of intentions and it was a collection of blooming roses.

The leader of the Sadhus declared that he and those with him would shed their last drop of blood to protect and keep the Satyarth Prakash intact and they would let no one, not to say of banning a chapter, delete even a word from the book written by one of them, a Sanyasi who had faith in the Vedas.

The leader of the Sadhu Mandal declared, amidst loud applause, "I promise before 'Janta' and 'Janardhan' (people and God) on behalf of the Sadhu Mandal that if the ban is not withdrawn, we, Sadhus, who are preachers of non-violence and Shanti, would be in the vanguard of those who would have this injustice ended and we would not be found wanting and God willing success will be ours."

Pandit Gyan Chand appealed to the Aryan Youth to be ready, for the moment of trial had come.

Swami Satyanand, the renowned Sanyasi, speaking on the resolution said that the Sind order against the Satyarth Prakash in the name of public safety was nothing but an attempt on the part of the Ministry to prolong its days. The Satyarth Prakash had in no way hampered the war effort of the Sind Muslim League Ministry in which that Ministry seemed to be actually engaged. The Swami added: "Let it be known that the Arya Samajists respect the Satyarth Prakash and hold it as high as the Christians hold the Bible and the Muslims hold the Quoran". He appealed to the Arya Samajists to lend their full support to Mr. Ghanshyam Singh Gupta in whatever lead he might give.

Swami Ramanand, General Secretary of the Niranjani Akhara, declared full support to the Sadhu Mahdal.

RAJPUT'S RESOLVE

Pandit Murari Lal brought a message from the Rajputs of Harians Prant (Rohtak, Hissar Districts etc.) saying that those brave men, who had helped the Government in the two ways and were at present serving in the army, would join the Satyagraha movement to protect the Satyarth Prakash.

L. Brij Lal, speaking on behalf of the Punjab Hindu Vigilance Board, said that the Arya Samaj had lived a life of struggle and he had no doubt that the Arya Samaj would stand any trial. The present struggle, he said, was neither against the British Government nor against the Muslims as a whole but against the Muslim League Ministry of Sind.

Principal Dewan Chand, speaking, said that they could not play with history. An attempt was being made today to base politics on the religion. In Europe religion had been banished from politics and the last country to do so was Turkey. Nation and nationality were two different things, for, as in Russia, there are a large number of nationalities but there is one nation. He wanted, as preached by Swami Dayanand, to keep religion and politics separate. If that was done it would end so many ills and evils.

HARIJAN'S SUPPORT

Mahoshe Satyapal Bhikkhu supported the resolution on behalf of the Harijans when, he said, Satyarth Prakash gave a status to the Harijans.

Pt. Narendra of Hyderabad, Deccan, supporting the resolution said that the Muslim League in Sind has, by placing the ban, signed its own death-warrant.

Pandit Budh Dev, speaking on the resolution, said that the present fight would be between the truth on which Arya Samaj was standing and the cowardice represented by the Muslim League.

The resolution was passed unanimously amidst shouts of "Satyarth Prakash Amar Rabe".

Mr. Ghanshyam Singh Gupta, in his concluding remarks, said that Mr. Jinnah and the League seemed to think the Arya Samajists as staunch Hindus and the

Sikhs were regarded by Mr. Jinnah as the only stumbling block in their way. Mr. Gupta read out a news item from Delhi in which Mr. Jinnah had expressed such views. Mr. Gupta wanted to add that the Arya Samajists were also an equally strong stumbling block in the way of Pakistan. Mr. Ghanashyam Singh said that by temperament he was peace-loving and was not excitable. He would do his best to let this spark not grow into a big fire. He wanted them to have stout and enthusiastic hearts but cool heads. In case, however, if he would not succeed in doing so, the responsibility of any conflagration and the misfortune would not be his or that of his Committee of Action or of the Arya Samaj but that of the Sind Government and even of the British Government if it would not intervene. Mr. Gupta said that he was not appealing for funds or men because he wanted to settle the dispute by negotiations, if possible. The present struggle was not only between the Arya Samaj but between the League and all those who stand for religious freedom for all. He appealed to the brave Sikhs to realise the significance of this move. For if today the Muslim League succeeded in their crusade against the Arya Samajists their next attack would be against the brave Sikhs. Mr. Ghanashyam Singh expressed the confidence that the Arya Samaj would not be found wanting when the time for trial came. The Congress concluded in the midst of great enthusiasm and slogans of "Satyarth Prakash Amar Rahe".

The Punjab Students' Conference

Open Session—Ludhiana—11th November 1944

The Welcome Address

The open session of the Punjab Students' Conference commenced at Ludhiana on the 11th November 1944 in the well decorated Pandal of the Punjab Provincial Hindu Conference. About 5,000 people, including a large number of students from various districts of the province, participated in the conference.

Master Lachman Das, President of the Reception Committee of the Conference, in the course of his address, said:—

"The Anglo-Muslim Alliance, to crush and cribble the Hindus, and the Muslim appeasement policy of the Congress are directly responsible for the existence of the Hindu Mahasabha. How the economic, social and national life of the Hindus is being constantly deteriorated by pseudo-nationals and anti-nationals, is no longer a secret to the Hindu. Their very existence is becoming unsafe in the country in general and in the Muslim majority provinces in particular. Murders, dacoities and abductions of Hindus are common occurrences in Sind and the Frontier Provinces. It has become a sin to be Hindu in these Muslim majority provinces. Merit has so much been replaced by communalism that an accident of birth is considered to be a merit or demerit to attain education and service. Many first division Hindu students are refused admission, while even third division Muslim students are accepted in the sciences, medical, engineering and training colleges of the Punjab, for the simple reason that the former have unfortunately been Hindus and latter have the advantage of having their birth to Muslim families."

Presidential Address

Mr. V. G. Deshpande, in the course of his Presidential address to the Conference, said:—

"For the last four months C. R. Formula and Gandhiji's talk with Jinnah have held the entire field of Indian Politics. The students have to study the communal problem and exactly understand its implications. The communal problem does exist in India. Its roots lie in the teachings of Islam which calls upon its followers to regard themselves as aliens in their own country as soon as they embrace Islam. Past history of India has also its share in the shaping of communal problem. I do not believe as the Congress does that Muslims and Hindus have completely blended themselves into one nation or that they are in the process of doing so. Though blood of our own blood and flesh of our own flesh, Indian Muslims have repudiated Hindu Nationhood. We have to bear in mind that the Muslim minority is not a national minority but a religious minority.

"At every stage we have found that the British Government has tried to convert the fight between the British and the Indians into a fight between Hindus and Mussalmans. Mussalmans have been an unflinching ally in this game and the Hindus have also unconsciously been caught into the trap. Many honest Hindus have believed along with Prof. Compland that "the path to freedom no longer lies through a struggle with the British Government but through a settlement among themselves". The real obstacle to Indian freedom is not so much the genuine communal problem, nor the Muslim alliance with the British for checking the Indian progress under the pretext of Muslim Rights but the belief of the Hindus that the problem of India's freedom would be solved as soon as the artificial communal problem created by the Britishers is solved.

"When Mr. Jinnah declared that Mussalmans are a nation by themselves and the national pride of Muslims cannot be satisfied unless Muslim Sovereign States are carved out of India which would be the homelands of Indian Muslims, a large number of Indian Nationalists, who upto this time believed in the dictum of "No Swarajya without Hindu-Muslim Unity" saw that there is no common ground on which the edifice of Hindu-Muslim Unity can be built. They realized that there cannot be Hindu-Muslim unity as long as the third power is there. "Hindu-Muslim unity will follow Independence and not precede it" were the words. But my Communist friends and our worthy leader Mr. O. Rajagopalachariar who have infinite faith in the good intentions of the British believed and still believe that as soon as Hindus and Muslims unite the paradise of Swaraj would be regained. And now we find that even Gandhiji who was the greatest critic of Pakistan scheme has come forward to bless it. The Britishers have been successful in their strategy. The world would now believe that the problem in India is not a struggle between the Indian and the British but it is a problem of settlement between Hindus and Mussalmans.

MUSLIM MINISTERS' MISDEEDS

"Rejection of the Federal part of the Government of India Act 1935 was the greatest blunder we ever made. Revival of that part of the Act is the first act of the solution of the communal problem. We have seen what havoc was wrought by the Communal Award in Bengal, the Punjab, Sind and N. W. F. The Dacca and Sukkur Riots and Famine in Bengal have already demonstrated what can be the effects on the province of a communally-ridden Ministry. The recent ban on Satyarth Prakash is also an instance of the Muslim Rule. If the Ministers are allowed to sit in judgment upon the Scriptures of other communities, what would be result? The Quoran, which has been responsible for the bloodiest of wars and the cruellest of atrocities will not come out very well in this game. After experience of Provincial Autonomy and Communal Award for seven years, our conclusion ought to be that the Centre must have the power to control the provinces. Our model ought to be Canada which after the experience of Civil War in U. S. A. curtailed the powers of the federal units to a large extent. U. S. S. R. is also another instance where extensive powers are vested in Federal Government. The separate electorates have strengthened the hands of the fanatic communalists among Mussalmans and made the existence of the Nationalist Muslims impossible. The Communal Award has given the Muslims in the Punjab and Bengal statutory majorities. And we have seen what harm the Muslim Ministries are capable of doing.

The Federation should come into existence immediately, the Federal Government's powers so far as the protection of minorities is concerned should be increased, the separate electorates ought to be abolished and the Communal Award must be immediately withdrawn and in its place a scheme by which all the communities will get representations both in the Federal Government and the Provincial Government strictly on population basis ought to be substituted.

GANDHI AND "C. R." Formula

"It is argued that even if the "C.R." Formula does not solve the Communal Problem and even though it militates against our ideal of Akhand Hindustan that is the only way of achieving Indian Freedom. At Sevagram I questioned Rajaji whether he seriously believed that the Britishers would at once grant us freedom as soon as Gandhiji and Jinnah agreed. Mr. C.R. grew serious and said, "My friend, do not be uncharitable to me. I never said that India would be at once free." I further asked: "In how many years we would be free? Within one year, two years hundred years? You are asking me to sacrifice the integrity of my country. I have every right to ask you when would we get independence for which we are paying such a high price." Mr. Rajagopalachariar had no answer to give. Mahatma Gandhi

also was asked "Whether he really believed that G. R. Formula would bring about communal settlement". His answer was in the negative. He was further asked "whether the formula would take us nearer our goal of independence" and his answer was not in the affirmative. He was then finally questioned: "Why is he sponsoring a scheme which would bring ruin to our country" and in his usual way he answered: "Believing as I do in non-violence, I do not see any other way and I have faith that this would ultimately do good to both Musalmans and Hindus".

The All India Students' Federation

8th Session—Calcutta—28th December 1944

Mrs. Naidu's Call to Students

"I would say to members of the Federation, to non-members of the Federation and also to the younger generation to whom my voice may reach: why quarrel over words? Those are mere slogans. Why not take the reality of the situation of your own country and the world situation, and create conditions of freedom for your own country in the right perspective, so that your country will fulfil your dream of taking its own noble place in the international federation of the world." In these words Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, addressing the 8th Annual Session of the All India Students' Federation at the Mahomedali Park, Calcutta on the 28th December 1944 made a passionate call to the youths of the country to close up their ranks and differences for winning the freedom of their motherland.

The Conference was presided over by Prof. Dhurjati Prasad Mukherji and was opened by Dr. B. C. Roy. More than one thousand delegates from all parts of India attended the session. The pandal which was decorated with portraits of Mahatma Gandhi, Maulana Azad, Mr. M. A. Jinnah, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Acharya J. C. Bose and Acharya P. C. Ray was packed to capacity with thousands of delegates and visitors.

Mrs. Naidu said that one thing that she would say to the vast audience and she hoped and believed and she was right in believing that many of their comrades who were not members of the Federation were present at the meeting—that there was no gulf in her heart between members of one youth association and another. One of the minor tragedies of her life had been the consciousness that the younger generation was putting itself even with the follies of the older generation. To her it seemed incredible that when the youth, which with all its splendid dreams, all its unlimited powers and opportunities should be marching forward looking ahead towards the destined goal, they should be wasting their time in putting their dreams by not looking forward but by looking sideways to each other. She had been, said she, addressed as the eternal mother of the Indian youth. She claimed to be the eternal mother of all the youths of the world because she loved the youth of the world whom she could scold, she could beat and put a ring round its neck and sometimes could say that rude phrase—Jahannamey Jao. (Go to hell). But she could also claim that she loved the younger generation of the world because the younger generation of the world—no matter what its colour, creed or political pattern might be—represented the hope of the world.

QUARREL OVER WORDS

Therefore, feeling for the younger generation, Mrs. Naidu also felt an agony towards her responsibility. "I feel," said she, "has my generation set so bad an example, so suicidal an example to younger generation, that they are steeped in quarrels, in internecine warfare and communal quarrels, that they quarrel over mere words? One group says: "I will call this a people's war". The other group says: "We say it is not a people's war." Then you say: who are you? But you do not know who are you, and they do not know who are they. "I want to tell you this: Why this quarrel over nobody else's war, somebody else's slogans—no matter how noble and inspiring they may be. By quarrelling you are delaying the day of freedom and redemption of our own country. I would say to members of the Federation, to non-members of the Federation, and also to the younger generation to whom my voice reach: Why quarrel over words? Those are mere slogans. Why not take the

reality of the situation of your own country and the world situation, and so create conditions of freedom for your own country in the right perspective, so that your country will fulfil your dream of taking its own noble place in the international federation of the world."

Do you think that one section of the students merely by putting up paper barriers is going to do this? Do you think the other section standing on the other side of the paper barrier and crying "no, no, and no" are fulfilling their duties? I say 'No'. "You are wasting energy that is given to you for the dedication of service to your country and to the freedom of your country, to the world. Remember that neither one side nor another—one which is so international that it cannot remember a place called India except when it looks at the map of India, and the other which is so national that it does not know any other country beyond the Himalayas—can do it. Both are exceedingly wrong, both are exceedingly ignorant, both are exceedingly foolish. Because India—the great India—is in herself a miniature of the entire problem of the human race. Your perspective must be right. You must remember that it is not by copying another that you will win your place in the world. You marvel at Russian heroism. Is there anybody who does not marvel at their heroism? But you must emulate the example of the solidarity and unity with which they stood in the face of danger. By emulating them, by emulating the solidarity of that country you can bring freedom. "On the other hand, those who believe that India is for Indians and nothing but Indians they are betraying the genius of India which has always been universal. The right perspective is this: "Our India is down-trodden; our India is in the grip of poverty and pestilence, our India is torn asunder by feuds and factions: our India is dehumanised by generations of enslavement; the freedom of our India is a living entity but not isolated entity in the world. We have to create conditions of our freedom.

HOW TO FORGE UNITY

"You shout: Congress-League unity. Do not use words cheaply. Unity—how? You cannot bring unity from the top of mountain. It is you and I in our daily knowledge of one another, in our appreciation of one another's culture, which expresses the soul of the community, only by building up that content can you expect any unity between Hindus and Muslims. Do not say: Oh, well, look at the map of India—here is Hindu India and here is Muslim India. It is not the leaders who can create unity. It is not the generals who win the battle. Hundreds of Napoleons cannot achieve a victory, unless his army is brave and loyal. Create the substance of unity. See that your unity does not mean paper unity. Unity comes on a recognition of individual and community rights of every section. If the majority recognises the right of the minority, the minority must also recognise its duties and responsibilities. Unity cannot be one-sided. It must be all-round and comprehensive, and can only come whether, politically, socially or otherwise, by the most scrupulous standards of justice and equity to which afterwards you may add large measure of generosity that lies in your power. That is the fundamental meaning of political unity. Why then, to-day, asked Mrs. Naidu, when they were almost on the threshold of realisation of something that they wanted, did they stand divided and disloyal to themselves? That was her point. "Close up your ranks—that was her call." If they had difference in personal convictions who were there to change those convictions? But in a battle, in a war of liberation all personal convictions and prejudices did not matter. They could fight out those things in days of victory. They must fight shoulder to shoulder irrespective of whether they liked or not their neighbours. They must be impersonal in battle.

Dr. B. C. Roy's Address

Inaugurating the conference Dr. B. C. Roy, on behalf of the students of his generation who were passing out, extended welcome to the youths of the new generation, a welcome of the past to the future. He welcomed them not because they belonged to one party or other, they believed in one dogma or one programme or the other but because they were students from all parts of the country meeting for the purpose of discussing the best method of some of the fundamental problems of human existence. Enumerating the problems now facing the world everywhere, Dr. Roy said that they were five in number. Want was the first, disease was the second, equalor was the third, ignorance was the fourth and idleness was the fifth. While discussing these problems they must not loose sight of the fact that the youth's fundamental duty was the service to mankind. In removing all these disadvantages there need be no distinction between persons belonging to one

province and another, one race as against the other. The problem was common to humanity.

President's Address

Prof. Dhurjati Prasad Mukerji, who presided, referred to the intellectual, moral and cultural disintegration that had been eating into the vitals of the student body of the present generation. There were fratricidal war between multifarious groups of students. Slogan shouting, heresy hunting, traitor baiting, according to him, had been the chief pre-occupation of the Indian youth of the day. The students had bidden adieu to the older generation. He warned them that if the young take this state of things as given, they were nothing better than primitives. Continuing, Mr. Mukerji said that the students' movement in India suffered from the defect that it had inherited from the political problem. Politics formed a large segment of life, but they were not the whole of life. The youth had problems peculiar to themselves, and national problems for them must be related to such problems from the apex to the base. The first problem, according to the President, was that the Indian youth, i.e., between 15 and 40 constituting as they did a bare 30% or less of the entire Indian population formed the "sociological minority", as compared with Soviet Russia and other countries. In his opinion, the vitality of a society, its capacity for progressive action, its proneness to new ideas and its fervour for progressive action depended upon the ratio of its youth to the sum of the children and aged. The factors that were mainly responsible for this state of affairs were maternal mortality, disease and epidemics, each one of which should be effectively controlled. Once they were rightly tackled, the sociological minority would be converted into a majority with all that it meant in the way of better and adventurous life. The process involved a whole-hearted co-operation with the aims and objects of Kasturba Memorial Fund and similar societies. In the second place, Prof. Mukerji felt that the youth as such were not citizens but marginal beings. On the one side of them there was the family control and on the other the uncertainties of the world, anarchic and uncontrolled. The Indian youth hovers between a world that was dead and another that was afraid to be born. The problem of the youth therefore was to cure the unrealities of being on the margin for which they were to look ahead and transform the anarchic future into concrete possibilities. Thirdly, there was the problem for declaring the student community on a platform in which there would be no difference of opinion.

The President concluded with a fervent appeal for the unification of the youth of India on the basis of these lowest common multiples of their problems which formed the authentic term for the redefinition of democracy suitable to the Indian youth to-day.

Resolutions—2nd Day—Calcutta—29th December 1944

The Federation having a membership of 78 000 met for its second day's sitting to-day and passed a resolution demanding that "the death sentence passed on 15 Chimur and Asthi political convicts be commuted immediately."

Another resolution which was carried amidst shouts of "Release our leader", read as follows: "The All India Students' Conference reiterates the universal demand for the immediate and unconditional release of the members of the Congress Working Committee. It condemns the continued detention of other political prisoners without any trial and demands their release.

"This Conference further demands the release of all student detenus, hundreds of whom are still in jail and also demand the withdrawal of restrictions imposed on the students in the form of externment and internment orders.

"The Conference appeals to all those students outside AISC for joint action for the release of Congress leaders and others political detenus."

At the outset a resolution condoling the deaths of India's prominent leaders during the last one year war passed.

FAILURE OF UNITY TALKS

On political situation the conference passed the following resolution which was moved by a Bengal delegate: The Conference regrets that the Gandhi-Jinnah talks did not result in a united front to win power for the Indian people.

"It deprecates the growing spirit of partisanship and intolerance which is driving many followers of the Congress and the Muslim League to question the good faith of either organisation, and to deny the very need for Congress-League agreement. Such mutual recriminations tantamount only to play into the hands of the British

Government which denies demands of both organisations and refuses to part with power.

"It appeals to all sections of students to discuss dispassionately the viewpoint of the two organisations as revealed in the talks and strive to evolve a common outlook as the basis of another meeting of Gandhiji and Mr. Jinnah to reach final agreement. In this way we alone compel the British Government to release the Congress leaders and make way for a provisional National Government which will check famine and epidemics, draw India wholeheartedly into the war of final destruction of fascism in Asia and take us forward to India's freedom."

A delegate from U. P. moved an amendment to the clause dealing with "peoples war". He said they had been talking of unity among students. He had some consultation with leaders of a rival organisation and his impression was that if his amendment was carried all the differences would vanish and a united front of the students of India would be released.

The Bengal delegate who proposed the original resolution opposed the amendment. It was said on his behalf that if this amendment was carried the whole resolution would become meaningless.

When put to vote, there were four delegates who supported the amendment, the rest opposing it. The original resolution was carried.

Dr. *Nalinaksha Sanyal*, Chief Whip of the Congress Parliamentary Party, Bengal, addressed the students asking them to sink their differences and present a united front. He said there was a feeling among certain sections of students in Bengal that members of a particular political organisation had adopted certain slogans that looked like helping the imperialist war. The result had been that there was a definite attempt made by some to have certain groups organised to crush the other group. Whenever he could Dr. Sanyal had resisted the formation of any such rival organisation. Congress should be a platform, Dr. Sanyal said, and not a party. Under the big canopy of the Congress there could and should develop organisations and parties with different ideologies having the common background of India's independence. It was a mistake to try to reduce Congress into an organisation dominated by a coterie.

Addressing the members of the A.I.S.F. Dr. Sanyal said: "My appeal to you would be: Examine new ideas and organisations in the light for uniting all section for the common good. Mere resolutions on unity would not be of much avail unless you understand the issues which are barriers to unity. The greatest barrier to unity is that we have ingredients in us which make us feel that our path is right and everyone else's is wrong. 'If Swaraj comes through me let it come. Otherwise I do not care.' If that psychology prevails mere lip sympathy to the cause of unity will hardly be of any avail. I appeal to you to see that everyone has an opportunity of expressing fully and fairly his views however wild, however unpalatable such views may appear to you for the time being.

Dr. Sanyal concluded: "I hope intolerance of to-day will give place to brotherhood and understanding to-morrow. I believe in the essential determination of the younger generation to create something new, something glorious, something in which not merely the present generation will be proud but the future generations would be glorious. And I expect you will conduct yourself in a manner so that glory, that pride may be ours."

The Associated Chambers of Commerce

Annual Session—Calcutta—14th. December 1944

Presidential Address

Mr. *K. W. Mealing*, in his Presidential Address to the annual general meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce of India held in Calcutta on the 14th. December 1944, said that the British commercial community in India had all along supported His Majesty's Government in its policy of sound and progressive constitutional advance with the determination of leading the country to the proper fulfilment of its aspirations to Self-Government.

"Had this disastrous war not taken place, and had Indian political parties so desired", he said, "the further four years' experience of provincial autonomy and

the great endeavours made by Lord Linlithgow might by now have resulted in the implementation of the second part of the Government of India Act, and a Federation might have come into being, a Federation of all India, including the Indian States, so balanced as to prevent the exercise of dictatorship by any one party and to ensure a chance for the working of democracy."

"It may be," Mr. Mealing continued, "that the present political cleavage between the two major communities may induce them to study again the provisions of the 1935 Act which was after all, the carefully considered outcome of a progressive policy embracing the Simon Report, three Round Table Conferences and a joint Committee, including representatives of both Houses of Parliament. On the other hand, the plan put forward by Sir Stafford Cripps on behalf of the British Government still stands. The time for putting it into effect draws every day nearer and seems likely to be upon us before the major Indian political parties have even found any common ground for discussion."

Mr. Mealing emphasised that political issues were of great moment, firstly, because great programmes of post-war development should have the support of all parties and the assistance of the best brains, and, secondly, because, looking to the future the part that India would play in the post-war world must depend largely upon her own internal unity and understanding.

INDIA—A MAJOR WORLD FACTOR

"India," Mr. Mealing said, by geographical situation and by population forms a major factor of world, and the attitude of the rest of the world towards India will be of equal importance. The political health of India is of vital importance to us all, for an India which endeavours to pursue a policy of isolation, or which fails to receive its share of co-operation from the rest of the world, cannot fail to be the subject, and possibly the cause, of disaster."

Alluding to post-war reconstruction, Mr. Mealing said that the British commercial community would be happy to offer such co-operation as it might be possible in post-war planning. "It must, I fear, be anticipated," he said, "that some interests will desire to shape industrial planning with greater regard for their own benefit than that of the country, and that political and racial slogans will be used to that end. I trust such a policy will not prevail as it can only stultify efficiency and progress towards sound industrial development."

Mr. Mealing said that one of the principal factors to be considered in connection with the future of the country, as related to economic peace and prosperity, was the question of population reaching 500 million. Within the next two or three decades, according to an estimate, should not be regarded with equanimity from any point of view at all.

Mr. Mealing paid a tribute to the Government of India for their successful endeavour in checking the inflationary tendency, which was rapidly becoming a grave menace last year. Observing that one of the principal factors in the inflationary trend was the food situation in 1942, Mr. Mealing referred to how the food crisis had been dealt with and said though there was cause for congratulation in what had been achieved, the difficult problems of price fixation, fair both to the grower and the consumer, and of quality had yet to be faced.

Stressing the need for improvement in rail transport, Mr. Mealing said that the conditions for all classes of passenger traffic, including United Nations personnel on duty or on leave presented the greatest difficulty and discomfort.

Turning to the coal shortage and the measures taken by Government to meet it, he remarked that progress had been hampered by unnecessary delay in setting up an organisation to procure essential mining equipment from overseas, these delays being to some extent due to lack of appreciation of the importance of the Indian coal industry at home.

LIQUIDATION OF STERLING BALANCES

Alluding to the question of sterling balances, Mr. Mealing expressed the hope that when the time came to negotiate the basis of a settlement, India's representatives would be guided by the real long-term interest of the country apart from all political considerations so that the very manner of liquidation would be beneficial to India itself.

Reviewing the war situation, Mr. Mealing said: "In our gratitude for the victories of to-day we must remember that the foundations of these victories were laid in the dark days—the shield which guarded us on the seas and the air when the British Empire stood alone in 1940, the thin shield which guarded India in the Middle East under your Excellency's Command and ultimately achieved resounding

victory in that theatre and the tired troops who guarded India under the incredible difficulties of 1942 and 1943."

H. E. Viceroy's Address

H. E. Lord Wavell delivering his address said:—

I thank you and the Associated Chambers of Commerce for your cordial welcome. I congratulate you, Mr. President, on the clear and thoughtful way in which you have dealt with India's current problems. I appreciate that you have handed to myself and to some of my colleagues in the Government, I will not say bouquets, but at least one or two pleasant little button holes, which we shall be glad to accept and to wear.

My first year as Viceroy has been a strenuous one and I am afraid, I see little sign of the second being less so. My staff inform me that, since taking over on the 20th October, 1943, I have spent the equivalent of nearly 20 weeks away from Delhi on tour, and have travelled well over 30,000 miles. I have visited all the provinces at least once and some of them two or three times.

I regret that, in the present conditions it is still impossible for me to take the Viceroy's usual Winter stay of some weeks in Calcutta. My house is, as you know, occupied for war purposes: and the demands of war-time administration are so intense, that it is not possible to be away long from the Centre at one time. I hope, however, that frequent short visits have enabled me to keep in touch with Calcutta and Bengal.

I join with the President in welcoming His Excellency Mr. Casey, to his first meeting of the Associated Chambers. Mr. Casey has had a brilliant record in Australia, the United States and the Middle East and the wide knowledge and experience he has gathered made him a most happy choice for the Governorship of Bengal during these difficult times. I am sure, you have all realised the value of his energy and imagination in all branches of the administration.

TRIBUTE TO BRITISH FORCES

I do not propose to say a great deal regarding the war. You can all see for yourselves how well that is going, and your President has given us a summary of its victorious course during the last year. I must say, however that I notice, with a little regret, that he began with what he called "the almost incredible feats of the Russian armies." I yield to no one in my admiration of the Russian Army, which I have known well for many years, and of its achievements; but in this gathering, let us not be too modest about our own performances. I should like to put these in the foreground, and in the present tense rather than in the past. Surely, if there ever was a feat of arms which might be called incredible, it was the landing on the Normandy coast, the great victory over the flower of the German Army, and the liberation of the whole of France and Belgium in such a surprisingly short time. I have read much of war, and have seen a little, and I am certain that this will go down to history as one of the very greatest military achievements of all time. And in that achievement the British Fleet, the British Air Force, and the British and Canadian land forces played an outstanding part. We do not know the respective share in planning this great battle, nor is there any need that we should: It was a combined British, Dominion and American plan; and surely, must have been the finest piece of detailed planning in military history. It was staged from British soil and British ports; and in the subsequent fighting, the British forces took their full share. That they should have been able to do so and to overcome such grim defences and such grim foes, and to attack with such vigour after five years' hard fighting is a tribute to the endurance of the British race, and its steadfast power to overcome danger or disaster.

INDIAN TROOPS PRAISED

In Italy too, British and Indian arms have put up and are putting up a fine performance. Progress may seem slow: but it must be realised that, just at the moment when another assault on a grand scale would probably have broken the German line altogether, General (now Field Marshal) Alexander, whose well deserved promotion we all welcome, had to send a number of divisions for the landing in the south France. In spite of this, a steady advance has gone on in most difficult country. In this Mediterranean theatre, Indian troops have played a great part. I will read you an extract from a letter of General McCreery, who has succeeded General Leeser, in the Command of the Eighth Army. I know General McCreery well, and he is certainly not one who distributes praise lightly. The extract from his letter reads as follows:

"The Indian divisions are fighting magnificently, and the latest division to greatly distinguish itself is the Tenth Indian Division. Unfortunately, I have never served in India: so, it is rather curious that, when I was commanding a corps, I had at one time all three Indian divisions under my command, and I am now filled with an admiration for the Indian soldier. Their fighting spirit, skill and endurance are outstanding. Fortunately, although we had a very wet October, the health of the troops is still excellent, and everything will be done to look after them as well as possible during this second trying Indian winter."

VICTORY OVER JAPS ON INDIA'S EASTERN FRONTIER

To continue the tale of our own exploits, British and Indian, on the eastern frontier of India, we have won the greatest land victory as yet achieved over the Japanese forces, and have established complete supremacy over them. This also was an Allied success in which British Indians, Americans, Africans and Chinese took part: but the great bulk of the Victorious army was Indian. I am glad to remember that during the sombre events of 1942 in Malaya and Burma, I strenuously maintained that the supremacy of the British and Indian soldier over the Japanese would soon be vindicated, given adequate training in jungle fighting. I am sorry to see that in some parts of the American press, there is still a tendency to decry the fighting qualities of the Indian troops. I am quite sure it does not represent general American opinion, certainly not that of those who have fought alongside them.

In this victory over the Japanese on our eastern frontier, not only the fighting services in India, but the Railways and Industry, and Labour in the mines and in the factories, have all had a share. Praise is due to the people of Assam, and particularly to the Naga tribesmen, for their loyalty and steadiness in a time of hardship and adversity.

On other aspects of the war in 1944, our success over the U-boat menace, the great victories of the Americans and Australians in the South-west Pacific, the Russian advances, and the elimination of the Germans from the Balkans, I do not propose to speak. When the end of the war will come, no one can yet say with certainty. It depends on the factor of national morale. That of the Germans, at least, must be near the breaking point, and that of the Japanese considerably shaken.

LORD MUNSTER'S VISIT

You will have noticed the visit of Lord Munster to ascertain the needs of the troops in India in the matter of amenities. It will be most valuable. I am sure, you will realise that there is no suggestion that India has not done her best to look after the troops who have been defending her frontiers. It is simply that there has not been enough of everything to go round, and for many years, India has had a low priority. On a world view, it was right that the Indian front should wait while the maximum effort was made on the Western front. It is not that we did not represent our needs and ask for improvement; it was just that the personnel and the things we wanted were not available. Now that the position has improved, and victory is close in the Western Theatre, Lord Munster's visit has been made to ascertain, as first hand, what can be done to improve the amenities for troops and the medical and nursing services. Both the Commander-in-Chief and myself are deeply interested in these improvements, and have continuously endeavoured to make the most of India's resources. Lord Munster coming from England, has naturally concerned himself, mainly, with the needs of the British troops fighting so far from their homes; but he is also representing to His Majesty's Government the requirements of Indian troops both here and in the Middle East.

WAR-TIME ECONOMIC MEASURES

In his speech, your President put post-war problems first and dealt with our war-time economy later. I propose to reverse this order; since, however important our post-war problems may be, the year of our greatest economic strain and effort may still lie ahead. The end of the war in the West will be, indeed, a mighty triumph over the powers of evil, but it will not be the end. Not until the Japanese are finally and utterly defeated, can there be any peace for India or for the world. And to defeat Japan as rapidly and thoroughly as possible, India must be the base for more warships, more divisions, more air squadrons. The great war crisis for India came when Japan attacked Pearl Harbour and Malaya and she had to execute a sudden "about turn" from west to east. That brought the dislocating strain of a violent unexpected jerk, as damaging to a nation's economy as it is to the human

frame. Now that we are already taking the strain, with all our muscles of production, supply, finance and transport braced, it is easier to support some additional burden, heavy though the total load will be, than it was to withstand the original abrupt shock.

Our war-time economic measures have been criticised as "too little and too late": and it is easy to say that we should have foreseen all our troubles earlier. Accurate foresight is rare in human affairs; and, even where it exists, cannot always be translated into action. That was a shrewd fable of the Greeks that Oesandra who had the gift of the true prophecy had also the curse of never being believed. We have now, however, a fair warning of our additional burden, can measure the stress it will cause, and make ready to take it. It will, of course, fall on those of our economic sinews which are already subject to strain—the sinews of finance, food, coal and transport. We may examine briefly how far we are prepared to withstand any additional burden on these.

FIGHT AGAINST INFLATION

I was glad to hear your President say that we had met with a great measure of success during 1944 in our efforts to hold the inflationary threat. It is men of commerce who should be able to judge this shrewdly; and a tribute from them is satisfactory. But the strictest watch is necessary to hold off the danger; and the continued co-operation of the commercial community is essential. I have never found the word "inflation" very satisfactory; and would prefer to compare our financial danger with another national danger which we have to face in this country. You have probably heard something of a calamity which is threatening the fields in parts of Northern India, that of water-logging, due to excessive seepage of water out of the irrigation canals. It has become a very serious danger indeed in parts of the Punjab, and measures, on a large scale, have become necessary to combat it. The process of monetary inflation is similar. To support the war and all the war projects more and more money has had to be poured into the financial channels. If all the residue of that money, after it had done its war work, could be brought back into its parent stream by its investment in Government loans, no harm would be done. Unfortunately, a considerable proportion of it seeps away out of the proper channels and, just as this overflow in the Punjab raises the whole water level with disastrous results, so, in the financial parallel, the overflow of money raises the price-level, often with disastrous results. Various measures are being taken in the Punjab to combat the danger. (One that would obviously be effective would be to line all the canals with cement or some imporous material to prevent the leakage of any water not absolutely necessary to irrigate the fields; this, however, is a very lengthy and expensive process, and can only be done to a limited extent. An alternative solution under trial, is to pump back the water out of the soil by a very large number of small tube-wells. Our financial remedies are similar. We try to line our channels with various forms of controls, but these can never be entirely effective; and we have also a most valuable remedy in a large number of small savings with which to pump the excess of currency back into Government loans. I ask the heads of our great business houses to do everything possible to encourage lending to Government and especially to the Small Savings Campaign.

COMMODITY CONTROL

We realise that the commodity controls which we have gradually introduced have caused extra work and inconvenience to honest traders. The Member for Industries and Civil Supplies and his staff will always be glad to receive suggestions from the public and from trade and industrial organisation. But until "we are built like angels, not men" as Kipling says in one of his verses, we must have controls. We shall continue to strengthen and improve them, but we have to feel our way step by step; since, if there is one certain lesson I have learned from experience of the direction of both military and civil affairs, it is that it is courting grave risks to go beyond one's administrative capacity.

We never cease trying by all means in our power to increase the supply of consumer goods available to the trade and to the public. In our water-logging parallel, this is roughly the equivalent of finding more thirsty unirrigated land to soak up the excess of war

Generally, the situation report on our financial front during 1944 is that we have not only held our own, but have gained some ground in the matter of price controls. But the increasing needs of the war against Japan, which is likely to reach its peak in 1945, mean that there will be an increased flow of financial irrigation and that our defences against water-logging must be strengthened.

FOOD PROBLEM

The great Latin satirist Juvenal wrote of the miseries of having served up *one crambis repetita* (twice-cooked cabbage). The food problem has been debated in such detail in so many places that I will try not to weary you here with much repetition of the stale cabbage of stock arguments, though I am afraid, I have no caviare, asparagus or other delicacy to serve in its place.

I was glad to hear your appreciation of the work done by the Food Department, and I take this opportunity of saying that I think that the Food Member and his staff have a very fine job of work during 1944. As is inevitable in such a difficult task, they get more hard words than kind ones, and they will be grateful for your recognition. I think they deserve a bouquet, not a mere button-hole. I may add that I have been told by them of the help they have received from large employers of labour and from the members of these Chambers of Commerce.

I agree with you that the complaints about the quality of the grains supplied to deficit provinces have often been well-founded, and require the attention of both the Central and Provincial Governments. These defects of quality have sometimes been aggravated by inadequate storage arrangements. I am trying to have both these defects remedied. Some progress has been made, but there is much more still to be done.

During the critical period of 1943, Provincial Governments had to concentrate mainly on foodgrains. Man may be able to live by bread alone, but he will surely not be healthy on it; and I am glad to see that they are now trying to improve the supply and distribution of milk, fish, meat, eggs, poultry and other perishable goods. I know that it is the fashion to attribute the shortage of these articles mainly to the army, who are sometimes pilloried almost as if they were cattle-lifters, nest-egg robbers, chicken thieves, and fish poachers. I would say, on the contrary, as an almost entirely unprejudiced observer, that the army is doing much to show us, civilians, how to increase our supply of these articles of diet. The army's dairy farms have long been a model, and they are now setting up poultry and vegetable farms and refrigerating plant on a large-scale.

The food problem is by no means solved, and will be with us for some years after war. But there are grounds for far greater confidence than a year ago; and with the co-operation of the public, I hope that all will be well.

"RICE SHORTAGE OUR MAIN TROUBLE"

Bengal is in a much happier position, convalescent at least, if not wholly recovered; and, at present, our anxieties are more in the south of India. Now that imports of wheat are arriving at a steady rate and in satisfactory quantity, it is rice shortage that is our main trouble; and you are well aware of the difficulty in including rice-eating populations to consume wheat or other grains. I hope, therefore that, Provincial Governments will do their best to persuade all their people who are, so to speak, bilingual in wheat and rice to eat wheat only; and that those who use rice only as a luxury—and there are many such, British and Indians—will forego rice so as to make more available for those who cannot do without it.

As has already been announced, it should not be necessary, in view of the position in Bengal, for the Central Government to accept any longer the entire liability for the feeding of Calcutta. This does not mean, of course, that they will not be concerned to assure full supplies for Calcutta; but it will probably be necessary to draw all these supplies from outside Bengal. It would obviously be wrong and wasteful to transport much needed rice from outside Bengal to Calcutta, while the Bengal Government held large stocks.

THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

It was on our transportation system more severely than on anything else that the sudden jerk of our "about turn" at the end of 1941 fell. We had been facing west, quite fairly comfortably; and had been exporting locomotives, rolling stock and track to Iraq and elsewhere, while our railway workshops were urged to make munitions and undertake other munitions work. I can remember that, not long after I became Commander-in-Chief in India in July 1941, I explained to the conference of the Railway Chiefs, the need for this and the great help it had been to the Middle East. So that it was through their virtues not through their fault, that the railways were caught not fully prepared. The difficulties of the sudden reversal caused by the Japanese attack were accentuated by the poorness of the communications in the threatened part of India.

I can assure you that a comprehensive programme to improve the capacity of

the railways is in hand. Large numbers of broad and metre gauge locomotives have been ordered, and many have been received. Very large orders have been placed both in India and abroad for wagons. The entire capacity of India for fabricating railway material is fully employed, and the fabricators—who are, I understand, mostly constituents of the chambers represented at the meeting—can help by expediting the work as much as possible. Nearly 20,000 miles of new telephone and telegraph line have been added to the railway network, and radio-communication between headquarters and divisions has been introduced. Additional running staffs have been trained; and in the railway workshops, maintenance has been given the highest priority, to the exclusion, where necessary, of war work. This programme should produce substantial results next year. In the meantime, we are doing our best under the priority system to see that essential goods are moved without undue delay.

I am aware of the difficult conditions of passenger travel. The fact, however, that the number of passengers travelling has increased by about twenty million a month, or 36 per cent, since the early part of 1942—and this in spite of a "Travel Only When You Must" campaign—shows that the conditions do not deter passengers. It is a little difficult to believe that all these journeys are absolutely essential.

In view of the shortage of coal and the requirements of the army for coaching stock—not that the army travels in any greater comfort than the general public, judging from what I sometimes hear in leave camps that I visit—any rapid improvement is impossible. But the railways are doing their best. I will take this opportunity to thank all railwaymen for their fine service in the war. I was glad recently at Lahore to see some of them at work and shall hope to visit other railway centres.

COAL POSITION

The coal position has, as Mr. Mealing indicated, been a considerable headache to the Government of India throughout the past year. I need not enter into the causes, nor detail the steps which are being taken to remedy them as I think they are well-known to you. It is an inappropriate phrase, but I think it is true that the outlook is less black than it was. Production throughout 1944, though below our target, has been greater, month by month, than the corresponding figures for 1943. We have succeeded in obtaining a considerable amount of machinery for open-cut working; and I trust that there will be a real improvement during the early months of 1945. In fact, to use two more clichés wholly inappropriate to coal-mining, though we are not yet out of the wood, we are beginning to see day light.

I have paid two short visits to the coal-fields, and have seen something of the conditions. It is doubtful if the mining industry will ever be stable or contented until a real effort is made to establish a permanent labour force in good conditions. The suspension of the ban on women working under-ground—which the Government of India sanctioned temporarily and with extreme reluctance—was necessitated mainly by the tendency of the labour to migrate. The miner has a hard and sometimes a dangerous life, and the counter-attractions of surface work in which his wife could take part and earn a wage were too much for him. If we are to produce all the coal we need for industrial development after the war it must be worth a man's while to become a whole-time miner; even after the ban on women working below ground has been re-imposed.

"INDIA HAS GAINED DURING WAR YEARS RATHER THAN LOST"

So much for India's current economic problems. From the brief review you have had of them by your President from his commercial angle and by myself from my official point of view, I trust you will have gathered confidence in our ability to keep the economic front stable, and in fact to strengthen it, until Japan is beaten. If so, India will be in a very favourable position to face the problems of the post-war world. Her land has not been devastated. Her losses in personnel have been comparatively light even if we reckon the deaths in the Bengal famine as war casualties. These war losses have been more than balanced, taking a purely, utilitarian point of view, by the numbers of her people who have received technical training as a result of the war. Financially she has become a creditor instead of a debtor country. In terms of property, of manpower, and of money, India has gained during the war years rather than lost.

Look for a moment at our great eastern neighbour, China. With half her country occupied by a ruthless invader, her ports seized, her railways torn up, her population reduced by war and famine, her prices at a fantastic level of inflation. Consider Great Britain, with one out of every three houses destroyed or damaged, more than 1½ million tons of shipping sunk (the very life-blood of an island State);

more than one quarter of a million lives already lost out of a population of 45 millions; her great accumulated wealth gone with the wind and enormous debts piled up, her people paying willingly—almost cheerfully—a scale of taxation unparalleled in history. If you look on these two nations, you will realise what sacrifices they have made to free the world from the Valley of the Shadow of Evil, from the greatest menace that civilization has faced since the days of Chenghis Khan and Tamurlane. Look at Russia, with the enemy at one time almost within sight of the Capital, with her most fertile fields and most valuable sources of Industry at one time in enemy occupation, with a large proportion of her population at the mercy of the enemy—a merciless enemy. These countries, even when they seemed beaten to their knees, faced the perils of war undaunted, and will face the perils of peace with the same courage. India should both give thanks that the efforts of these nations have saved her from experiencing the devastation of war, which she almost alone of great peoples has not felt for so many years; and should determine to use wisely the marvellous opportunity thus given her for development to a higher standard of living and progress.

POST-WAR PLANNING

I do not propose to enter into details of our Post-War planning. As men of business, you will realise the possibilities and the difficulties. I will deal only with two broad aspects—the relations between Agriculture and Industry and the financial problems. Before doing so, I should like to supplement what your President has said to welcome the appointment of Sir Ardesbir Dalal. The Government of India has been fortunate, indeed, to secure the services of one who is not only a most distinguished industrialist, but has experience as an administrator both of rural and of urban India. I am sure that we all appreciate the sacrifice he has made in taking on this very arduous work, and wish him all success in his efforts for the progress of India.

Though it does not arise directly out of Mr. Mealing's address, I should like to make a few remarks on the relative importance of Agriculture and Industry in the post-war development of India. I feel that there may be a tendency in our plans to stress Industrial advance at the expense of Agriculture. There is some reason for this. Industrialisation shows quicker and more obvious results, enriches a country and enables it to spend more, both on luxuries and on social services, such as health, education and communications. Also, I am afraid, men of business have more influence than farmers in the direction of State affairs. But Industrial expansion should not, and must not in India, be accomplished at the expense of Agriculture, which is still the employment of about three quarters of the ever rising population. It is essential that in your post-war organisation, the Indian farmer should be assured of prices for his produce that will both improve his own standard of living and will encourage him to produce the additional food needed for the proper nutrition of the existing population, and of its normal growth.

DANGERS OF TOO RAPID INDUSTRIALISATION

If you read Economic History, you should also take warning of the miseries caused to many, for the profit of a few by too rapid and uncontrolled industrialisation. In great Britain, one hundred years ago, the conditions produced by the Industrial Revolution were deplorable. I read some time ago a description of the manufacturing slums of the Victorian era, which painted the evils of the period with a ghastly pen; we are still recovering from the damage caused to the health and well-being of our working population by the neglect of sanitary, nutritive and housing conditions during that era.

Russia is another example of rapid industrialisation, where although the mistakes and cruelties of the Victorian Period in England were avoided, and the workers were given reasonably good conditions, there was a very great loss of human life, to be counted in millions, partly through loss of balance between agriculture and industry.

India cannot go back to the spinning wheel, and must develop her industry, but she should consider well these and other examples of the price, that may be paid in human health and life for too hasty or too speedy industrialization.

FINANCING OF PLANNING

The financing of progress such as India must make is a very complex problem. One fact is inescapable. If you want progress—and India not only wants it, but must have it—you have got to pay for it. No financial jugglery can produce for a nation, in the long run, greater wealth than that with which it has been endowed

by Nature in resources of minerals and such like, or which the skill, enterprise and hard work of its population have earned. It is the business of a nation's financial advisers to see that its wealth is fully mobilised, wisely used and so distributed as to benefit the greatest possible number of the population. They cannot create additional permanent wealth; though they can, by a bold financial policy, make for a limited period overdrafts on the annual income of the Government to finance projects which will eventually increase the national wealth and enable the overdrafts to be repaid. By their policy of taxation, the heads of the Government can prevent the profits of Industry becoming concentrated in the hands of the few and from being for the luxury rather than to finance further progress. But they have no magician's wands, no sleek rabbits of sudden additional wealth in the hat. The prosaic tools of their trade are income-tax tables, side-rules and books of financial regulations. Hard work, hard sober thinking and sound judgment are the qualities by which they obtain results, not conjuring tricks.

In the old canons of so-called orthodox finance, the budget had to be balanced from year to year. This is the view of the monetary stability that Dickens put into the mouth of his famous character, Mr. Micawber: "Annual income twenty pounds annual expenditure nineteen pounds, nineteen shillings and six pence,—result, happiness. Annual income twenty pounds, annual expenditure twenty pounds, and six pence,—result, misery." But I understand that Mr. Micawber's views are no longer wholly accepted by financial experts. They now admit the soundness of planning for five, ten or even fifteen years ahead. But remember this, if you are going to plan ahead, you must have confidence in the stability of your Government for at least that number of years; and you must realise that the bill has got to be paid some time.

Our immediate difficulty in Planning is to estimate what sums are likely to be available in the period after the war. There is a natural tendency on the part of of the provinces to seek information from the Centre on the amount they may expect to be allotted to them from the Central revenues; and an equally natural reluctance on the part of the Centre to commit itself to definite figures when there are so many uncertain and incalculable factors. We will do what we can to give guidance to the provinces; but, but for the immediate future, our system of Planning must be to see what we require for each of our many needs; for improvements in Agriculture, for developments in Industry—for the betterment of Health, for the advance of Education, for the increase of Communications, and so on. This is the method on which we are working. We have already a plan for Education, a plan for Public Health, when the Bhoru Committee reports. We have many hydro-electric and irrigation projects in hand. Once we have seen the total bill, we can—when we have recovered from the shock—begin to allot priorities, and make a long-term blue-print for Indian progress.

TRAINING OF TECHNICIANS

One direction, however, in which it seems to me that we can make progress at once, without waiting for peace or for a blue-print, is in training the many technicians and experts India will require—in Farming, in Engineering, in Electricity, in Chemistry, in Fisheries, in Building, and so forth. It has been very patently brought home to me even in a year's experience as Viceroy how wonderfully short India is not only in persons trained in the Applied Sciences, but in institutions and facilities for them. I hope that Young India will apply its abilities and energies towards these practical branches which will be of such value to India, and possibly a little less to the professions of law in which I understand India is quite reasonably well staffed.

POST-WAR TAXATION

One uncertain factor in the finance of Post-War Planning is, as you will realise, the scale of post-war taxation. India may be a poor country, but I do not believe she is unbearably bowed down at the present by war taxation. I hope that when the war against Japan is over, India will decide to declare war, relentless, unremitting war, with the whole nation united against the savage enemies of peace—poverty, disease, dirt and ignorance. If so, she will have to maintain a war scale of taxation.

STERLING BALANCES

Before I leave this subject of Post-War Development, I will mention very briefly two points. The first, which was mentioned by your President, is the matter of Sterling Balances. I share his entire confidence that these debts will be honoured,

But that does not of course mean to say that India will at once, after the war, receive a payment of so many hundred millions in cash. She could not spend such a sum in the international market if she did. The manner of payment of international debts incurred during the war will require much discussion and negotiation, I am quite confident that, in these negotiations the value and magnitude of India's contribution to the Allied war effort will be recognised; that her needs will be considered; and that the manner of liquidation will be arranged to meet her planned development. I do not see that political considerations need affect the settlement.

The other matter on which I should like to say a very few words is the relations between British and Indians in business. As I said here last year, I believe, there is a cordial spirit of co-operation towards Indian business at present in great Britain; and the sooner that representatives get together the better. I am, therefore, sorry that it has not yet been possible for the projected visit of Indian Industrialists to the United Kingdom to be carried out. I hope that it will not be delayed much longer.

From the foregoing very brief summary of India's position and problems at the end of 1944, I will try to draw one or two conclusions. Firstly, we are still in the turmoil of a world at war, an angry world in which there is no place for unrealities. We are winning the war, but we have not yet won it, and there can be no relaxation of the war effort. In fact, India may have to play an even more onerous role in 1945. The more closely we concentrate on this, our primary task, the more quickly shall we come to peace. Everything else must still be subordinate to our war effort. But peace will not and certainly should not bring for India any relaxation of effort. We shall have beaten off the external powers of evil, we have still many internal evils to lessen or remove and very much constructive work to do, in order to bring the people of India to a proper standard of living and India herself to her proper position in the world, as keeper of the peace and as a leader of the prosperity, thought and learning in the East.

INDIA MUST PRESENT A UNITED FRONT

I have given you some reasons to conclude that the war has strengthened rather than weakened India and has given her the greatest opportunity she has ever had, if—and this is of course a crucial 'if'—India can solve her political problems and present a united front to what will be, for at least some years to come, a stern, difficult, troubled world. If she is still tossing with the fever of political faction, or if her political doctors decide that she must undergo a major surgical operation, such as, Pakistan, she may miss the opportunity that is hers to take but can be taken only by a nation at health within itself and fit for a struggle that will test every nerve and sinew—the struggle for greater well-being and greater happiness in this great land.

Whatever the future constitution may be, the events of the past thirty years have shown us that it must provide adequately for the defence of the country; and Indian leaders will do well to consider this closely.

"QUIT INDIA" AND SATYAGRAHA CRITICISED

If I may be permitted to assume for the moment the role of the medical advisers to Political India, my advice would be something like this. "I do not believe that your condition call for a serious operation, I should certainly try all other possible remedies first. I do not think that the 'Quit India' mixture or those Satyagraha pills have done you much good. I should suggest your leaving off medicines altogether and you may find that you are not as ill as you think. Perhaps, some fresh air and work in the fields would do you good." In other words, I do not believe there are now real differences in principle between India and Britain, or that the communal problem, difficult though it is, is insoluble. But also, I do not believe that we can solve our problems by mutual recriminations and by harping on past grievances and mistakes. Our best hope lies in working together, without trying to lay down detailed conditions or to decide everything before we begin work.

To return to the medical metaphor for a moment, I think the first requirement for a return to health is a faith cure, a brief in the good intentions of the British people and in their genuine desire for a settlement and for the welfare and Self-Government of the Indian people. I can certainly assure you that I should not be here, if I did not believe in those.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL—A "NATIONAL GOVERNMENT"

It is commonly said that our current and post-war problems can only be solved

by a National Government, but the precise meaning of the term is seldom or never defined. I am afraid that to some a National Government is one in which their own particular party is in power. I think of a National Government as one formed to meet a national crisis, in which "none are for a party, but all are for the State", to quote Macaulay's "Lays of Ancient Rome." I contend that we have such a Government now, a preponderantly Indian Government, which, in spite of all the criticism and abuse heaped on it, is doing an essential job of work for India, and is doing it on the whole extremely well. It is making the mistakes, it is showing the shortcomings, inevitable in carrying out a very complex task of administration in difficult times. But it is accomplishing the main task: it is supporting our war effort to the entire satisfaction of the military commanders; and it is making a genuine and no unfruitful attempt to look ahead and prepare for post-war conditions. I think, India should be grateful to her countrymen in the Government for the courage and skill they are showing. I here express to them my thanks for their work.

This does not mean to say that some other National Government—national by my definition, but based on the support of the main political parties—might not be more serviceable to India's needs. Not because such a Government would necessarily be more efficient than the present Government, but because the efforts we have to make, now and in future, demand considerable sacrifices. The average man is not willing to surrender comfort and income for the benefit of those poorer than himself or future generations, unless he is coerced by a dictatorship or led by those in whom he has great confidence. If it were possible to form such a National Government during the war, it would quite clearly and quite definitely have to function under the existing constitution, no material change of which is possible during the war. And its primary task would have to be support of the war effort, not by mere lip-service which is useless, but sincerely and wholeheartedly.

It is now once more fashionable to demand a move by His Majesty's Government "to solve the deadlock." But remember that His Majesty's Government has made two attempts in the last decade. The first was the Constitution Act of 1935 a complete constitution based on years of discussion and research. I agree with Mr. Mealing that, had that Act been worked in the right spirit, it would have carried us far, in fact, I think, we should now be near the goal. The second attempt was the draft declaration propounded by Sir Stafford Cripps. Both attempts failed. After the second failure, His Majesty's Government said that they could do not more, and that India herself must make a constructive suggestion. No such suggestion has yet emerged; and the recent discussion between Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah shows how intractable the Communal problem still is. I am glad to see that prominent Indians are undertaking further discussion of the problem. The previous rejections of their offers must, naturally, make His Majesty's Government wary of a further advance until they feel that the spirit of compromise and co-operation is real. But their desire for a solution remains perfectly genuine; and I have tried to indicate lines on which progress might be attempted, if the Indian leaders desire it.

Gentlemen, I am afraid I have detained you unduly. I hope, I have been able to give you, on the whole, a favourable impression in all but the political field of the progress of our affairs during 1944 and of our prospects for 1945. I will conclude in the words of one of the greatest war leaders and statesmen of all time, Abraham Lincoln: "The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion."

Proceedings & Resolutions

INCOME-TAX TRIBUNAL

After H. E. the Viceroy's address, Mr. *H. Rowan Hodge*, M.L.A., (Bengal Chamber) moving a resolution on the Income-tax Appellate tribunal said, that the reply given by the Government of India to the resolution which they passed last year was entirely inadequate, and he requested the Government of India to give their earnest reconsideration to the points raised at an early date.

The resolution, as amended, and passed unanimously by the House reads: "This Association reiterates the request unanimously made by a resolution a year ago that the early attention of the Government of India be given to the following matters connected with the practice and procedure before the Income-Tax Appellate Tribunal: (1) that the demand for the establishment of Local Registrars for filing of applications and for facilitating communications with the

local Benches be reconsidered: (2) that the decisions of all Benches of the Tribunal be made available to the public.

Sir Robert Menzies (Upper India Chamber), while seconding the resolution, characterised the Government attitude as incomprehensible and felt that the Central Government took the opportunity of sheltering behind an obsolete provision of the Income-Tax Act even though it obviously involved a double levy.

WAR RISKS INSURANCE

Mr. J. C. F. Davidson (Northern India) moved the resolution on war risks insurance which as passed read: "Having regard to the continued improvement in the war situation and in view of the substantial amounts standing to the credit of the funds under the scheme, this Association recommends that, for the present, no further premia be collected in respect of the War Risks (Goods) Insurance scheme and that the payment of premia towards the War Risks (Factories) Insurance scheme cease after 31st March, 1945, but that Government continue to provide cover against war risks under the schemes and that the position of the two funds be reviewed before the end of the year 1945".

COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGE BY MILITARY VEHICLES

Mr. C. P. Bramble (Bombay) moved a resolution on injury or damage caused by army drivers when on duty. He said that a similar resolution was moved on behalf of his Chamber in 1941, which stressed the necessity of introducing adequate measures to enable the public to recover compensation when damage had been caused by military drivers in the course of their duties. The object of the resolution was to show that the measures which had in fact been introduced since and perhaps as a result of that resolution, were inadequate.

Seconding the resolution, *Mr. H. F. Stuckard* (Bengal Chamber) pointed out the difference between the procedure in this country and that in Great Britain. He said that if the latter could provide funds to meet claims of compensation, there was no reason why the same procedure should not be followed in India, instead of treating injured persons as 'beggars' entitled only to *ex-gratia* compensation.

Sir Robert Menzies (Upper India) suggested an amendment to the second part of the resolution, which the House accepted unanimously. The resolution as amended and passed now reads:

"In view of the fact that accidents are still being caused by negligent and improper driving by service drivers in the course of their duty and the failure of the military authorities to ensure that adequate compensation is granted, this association again urges upon the Government of India the necessity for the immediate introduction of measures which will enable the public to obtain adequate compensation for injuries or damage suffered.

"This Association is of the opinion that the Government should forthwith declare that they will provide the funds required to satisfy any judgment of a civil court obtained against the driver of a Government vehicle, if on duty at the time of the accident. This association is further of opinion that courts of enquiry, set up to investigate accidents in which service and civilian vehicles and or persons are concerned, should invariably include one civilian, preferably non-official, either as a member thereof or if this is not possible under military law then, as an observer, and further that an injured person should in any case be entitled to be represented at such courts of enquiry."

POST-WAR TRADE POLICY

Moving a resolution on the post-war trade policy of Government, *Lala Shankar Lal* (Punjab Chamber) asked for a revision of the present day tax system in a manner that would materially help the Government to put its reconstruction plans into effect without harming the industrial structure that had been built up over a period of several decades.

The resolution, adopted unanimously, reads: That whilst appreciating the necessity for exercising controls in time of war over various commodities in order to ensure their most equitable distribution having regard to the amount of these at the nation's disposal, this Association places on record its opinion that where there is frequent overlapping and duplication by different ordinances and or any other war-time emergency legislation, steps should be taken by Government to ensure that these do not react to the detriment of the normal long-standing legitimate channels of trade. This Association also urges on Government the necessity for an assurance that, if circumstances permit, prompt action will be taken to free trade from unnecessarily irksome control, thus avoiding the danger of unduly prejudicing a return to, and the future of, normal trade in this country.

The Chamber of Princes

New Delhi—4th December 1944

Resignation of Standing Committee

A crisis of first-rate importance was created on the 4th December 1944 by the resignation of the Standing Committee of the Princes, including the Chancellor, the *Nawab of Bhopal*. For the first time in its history, the session of the Chamber of Princes which was scheduled to meet on the 3rd December was obliged to be postponed indefinitely.

According to the "*Hindu*" of Madras, the causes that led to this sudden step on the part of the Princes are not yet known but from the secret and prolonged discussions which the Standing Committee of the Princes was having during the last two days, it was fairly clear to informed observers that the Princes were contemplating a joint and unanimous protest against the attitude adopted in respect of certain matters by the Political Department of the Government of India and that the discussions were calculated to help those who were undecided to make up their minds.

It seems that the Political Department sent out two circular letters to all the States, in one of which the question of the revision of treaty rights was raised. The Department seems to have urged that while the Crown stood by all the undertakings given in the past to the Princes in regard to the protection of their rights, the interpretation to be put on those treaties must be according to usage and in accordance with the changed circumstances of the present day.

The Princes seem to have construed this observation of the Political Department as an attempt on the part of the Crown to revise treaties in a unilateral fashion. Their contention seems to be that while they are agreeable to any revision of the treaties, it must not be done unilaterally by the Crown but only after consultation with the Princes. The Princes assert that they have always stood for the progress and wellbeing of their people and that they would not oppose the revision of a treaty just for the sake of opposition, but that they desired to be consulted when a revision was proposed.

Another point on which there seems to have been some differences of opinion between the Political Department and the Princes is in regard to the attachment of smaller States, which was carried out sometime ago. The contention of the Princes seems to be that the Crown Representative must at least have consulted the Rulers concerned before deciding on any action. It appears that the Princes desired to move a resolution on the above subject in the session which was to have met tomorrow but the Political Department objected on the ground that it would create a very embarrassing situation.

One other point which the Princes seem to have urged is that in regard to post-war development, the States should be allowed to import plant and machinery customs free and that licences for such import should automatically be granted to the States. The proposal does not seem to have found favour with the Government. On all these points the Princes desired to move formal resolutions in the open session of the Chamber.

Differences with Political Dept.

The main causes that have led to the present crisis in the relations between the Crown Representative and the Princely Order do not appear to be of any recent origin but may be traced to the steps taken by the Political Department some time ago to group together States for purposes of securing efficient administration and attachment of smaller States to neighbouring States, which were considered in some way to have affected their treaty rights.

A deputation of the Princes waited on the Crown Representative in the middle of September last, and at the interview important questions were raised, such as joint services for the States, protection of the Princely Order against attacks from British Indian leaders and Press, the scheme of attachment of smaller States, industrial policy and post-war reconstruction, courts of arbitration and treaty rights. A reply to the above seven points raised by the deputation seems to have been covered by a letter addressed by the Political Department to the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes dated December 2.

JOINT SERVICES

In regard to joint services, the Princes agreed that smaller States, which could not by themselves maintain an efficient standard of administration, should co-operate with some other States to achieve this end. The Princes urged that if smaller States are grouped for administrative reasons, there should be no suggestion that the States are being misgoverned, as States falling under this category are always dealt with separately. The deputation pointed out that a Committee with H. H. the Maharaja of Bikaner as Chairman has been appointed to define minimum standards of efficient administration which the smaller States must maintain. It was urged that on boards of control appointed for working joint services there should be only representatives of full powered States, and minority administrations and States governed by the Political Department should have no representation on those boards.

The deputation also desired that joint advisers appointed in this behalf should not deal with the Political Department direct over the heads of the Rulers or the representatives of the Rulers concerned.

The Princes also suggested that the working of the joint scheme must be reviewed periodically by a committee consisting of the Chancellor and a few other Rulers and that the Standing Committee of the Chamber should be permitted to prepare a scheme for the efficient administration of smaller States.

It is learnt that the Political Department took the view that States under minority rule would not always remain in that condition and that it would be unfair to deny States which contributed towards the cost of joint services a voice in the Board of Control. It was also explained that officers were fully aware of the necessity of keeping their interference with co-operative grouping arrangements restricted to the absolute minimum, though until the experiment had established itself finally occasional interference on the part of the officers for the purpose of coordinating and stimulating co-operative grouping schemes would be unavoidable. Periodical review of the working of joint schemes was welcomed by the Crown Representative as it would help to rectify any defects that might be noticed.

The point of view was put forward that the establishment of joint High Courts was an invasion of the sovereignty of the States. This view-point did not seem to have been accepted by the Political Department which felt that the moment the jurisdiction of a court entered a State it became the High Court of that State.

MINIMUM STANDARDS OF ADMINISTRATION

Regarding the suggestion that the Standing Committee of the Chamber should be permitted to draw up a scheme defining minimum standards of efficient administration, the Political Department's reply stated that while the Crown was always willing to receive alternative schemes, there was no reason why the existing experiment, initiated after much thought and labour, should be suspended while the States worked out another scheme.

It may be mentioned that this subject has been under discussion for some years and the present scheme was evolved after considerable negotiation and the Political Department feels that the Princes cannot produce any better scheme.

The Princes seem to be particularly annoyed at criticisms by the Press and leaders in British India of the administration of the States. The Princely Order would very much wish that the present British Indian Law and regulations protecting Indian States against attacks from British India were further tightened and for this purpose the Princes suggested that representatives of the Government of India should meet representatives of the Princes and discuss the question.

Lord Wavell is understood to have explained the difficulties in the way of stiffening the present legislation and expressed his confidence that with rising standard of administration in the States occasions for such attacks in British India against the Princes and their Governments would diminish. His Excellency appears to have urged that the Princes too must contribute to a solution of this difficult problem through wise government.

ATTACHMENT OF SMALLER STATES

On the question of attachment of smaller States, the Princes seem to have felt that the instrument of Attachment should be revised in consultation with representatives of the attaching and attached States and that no further extension of the scheme of attachment be permitted. The Princes urged that no attachment should take place without the consent of the State concerned as was done in the past and they actually drafted a resolution on the subject to be moved at the session of the Princes Chamber.

The Political Department, without whose consent and approval no resolution could be moved in the Chamber, objected to the resolution and the resignation of the Standing Committee was the result.

It was urged on behalf of the Princes that the powers of the Crown and the exercise of the same in respect of the States could not and should not be transferred to any third party, or other authority without the free consent of the parties concerned.

Urging revision of the Instrument of Attachment, the Princes said that the possibility of a settlement founded on consent should be explored. It was even urged that various measures of war control and war-time ordinances should not be used to put political pressure on attached States.

The view of the Political Department on this point seems to be that certain proposals affecting the text of the Instrument of Attachment are under consideration and as soon as a definite conclusion is reached, their purport will be communicated to the States concerned. It appears that no extension of the attachment scheme is under contemplation now.

The Princes seem to have protested vigorously against an order passed by the Government of India stating that payments will be made in British India for goods supplied to the Supply Department by factories and industries situated in the States and urged its immediate withdrawal. It is pointed out that the order adversely affects the revenues of the States and that it represents an indirect attempt by the Government of India to subject the profits of industrial undertakings in the States to British Indian taxation.

The argument on the other side is that uniformity in regard to taxes on income has not been established as between the States and British India even after considerable negotiation.

POST-WAR PLANNING IN STATES

Another point brought out by the deputation was that in case of rejection of applications for capital issues by the Government of India, an opportunity should be given to representatives of States to examine the reasons for such rejection and some suitable machinery should be evolved for this purpose.

With reference to post-war planning, the Princes urged that the Crown Representative should take the States into his confidence in regard to any scheme for the industrial and economic development of India as a whole. These two points, it appears, would be carefully examined by the Government of India.

TREATY RIGHTS

Two points on which the deputation seems to have laid particular emphasis are the appointment of a Court of Arbitration for the settlement of differences and treaty rights. In regard to the former, the Princes seem to hold the view that there should be a systematic recourse to the procedure embodied in the resolution of 1920 when dealing with dynastic rights and with questions of gross misrule. The Princes also emphasised that where issues are justiciable or relate to fiscal, economic or financial matters, including interpretations of treaties and agreements, recourse should be had as of right to the Court of Arbitration. It is believed that the Political Department declined to accept these two contentions on the ground that it was not desirable to limit the discretion vested in the Crown Representative.

It is the question of treaty rights that has directly led the legislation of the Standing Committee.

The Princes desired that there should be some effective machinery to ensure that treaty rights were not over-ridden.

The Princes requested the Crown Representative to set up some machinery whereby their views, through a few representatives selected by His Excellency, including the Chancellor, are placed before him before His Excellency decided to take formal action in exercise of the powers of the Crown vis-a-vis the States particularly in such matters as directly affected the Princes or where policies affecting the States in general were proposed. Emphasis was laid on the fact that the Crown Representative must hear the States before taking any decision unilaterally. On this point, the Crown Representative, it is learnt, is reported to have reiterated that fulfilment of all obligations arising out of treaties still remained the fundamental policy of His Majesty's Government, though he also urged at the same time that the interpretation of the text of the relevant treaties has long been affected by usage and suzerainty and has in the nature of things to be related to the necessities of changing times.

Exception seems to have been taken by the Princely Order to this proviso and there is apprehension that this is a direct attempt by the Crown to subdue the Princes.

Princes set up Council of Action

Well informed observers do not disguise the fact that it is needed a desperate step that has been taken by the Princes now in withdrawing *en bloc* from the Standing Committee and forwarding their resignations to the Crown Representative. The Princes have, however, made it clear that the step they have taken would not in any way affect the war effort, nor was it directed in any way against the person of the Crown Representative.

The Princes have appointed a Council of Action of five to take any step that may be necessary. There is no doubt that the political Department too was not prepared for its development and some time must elapse before any settlement is reached.

NO RESOLUTION OF CRISIS

No material change occurred to-day in the situation arising from the resignation of the Standing Committee of the Chamber of Princes and the postponement of the Chamber's annual session. The crisis seemed to be moving towards stabilisation rather than solution. Nevertheless, contact between the principal Rulers and the Viceroy continued to be maintained. Conversation were understood to be in progress between the Viceroy and the Chancellor, H. H. the Nawab of Bhopal, who and a number of other Princes are staying at the Viceroy's House. Cordiality on the social plane was exemplified in the 'at home' given this evening by Their Excellencies to meet the Princes and Chiefs.

It was learned in the morning that the Conference of States and Rulers and representatives on education, health and post-war reconstruction will be held as originally planned on December 7 and 8. The Chancellor will open the Conference and it is possible that his address will make some reference to the crisis.

Some prominent Rulers, however, have left Delhi already. Their Highnesses of Patiala and Jaipur are among them. Their departure emphasises the air of finality which pervades the Princes' camp. The unanimity with which the Princes acted under the Nawab of Bhopal's lead remains undented. But, not all Rulers, and in any case, not all their principal advisers, are convinced that the issue justified the extreme step taken.

Further details of the main points in dispute are cited in support of the contention that the crisis was not unavoidable. Some eight points, it is learned, were raised by the Princes' deputation which waited on the Crown Representative on September 15 and 16.

Firstly, the boards set up to control the working of the joint services of States should consist of full-powered States and should not include minority representative of States.

Secondly, joint advisers appointed for groups of States which find it financially and otherwise desirable to have them should not deal with political officers over the head of the State administrations.

Thirdly, the working of various schemes relating to States should be reviewed periodically.

Fourthly, the Standing Committee should be given the opportunity to prepare schemes to secure minimum standards of administration in the States.

Fifthly, Princes should be allowed to draw up an alternative plan for co-operative grouping.

Sixthly, joint High Court should not be set up. The Raja of Bilaspur, in particular, is reported to have opposed these courts as an invasion of the rights of States.

Seventhly, the Instrument of Attachment should be revised in consultation with representatives of the attaching and attached States and no further attachments should be made.

Eighthly, arbitration machinery should be set up to ensure that treaty rights are not overridden.

It is reported that the Viceroy's reply expressed disagreement with points one, two, five, six and eight and the first part of seven and promised consideration of three and four. As regards the second part of seven the reply, it is believed, pointed out that scheme of attachment was limited to Western India and Gujerat States and the Government had no intention of extending it to other States.

The reply, however, appears to have promised protection against undue newspaper attacks from British India against States and to have drawn attention to the fact that as States' administrations improved occasions for harsh and unjust criticisms would become less and less.

On the question of post-war reconstruction and industrial planning, the Crown Representative's stand is stated to be against allowing any unit or units to follow any policy of development that was likely to upset the All-India scheme.

With greater perseverance, it is urged friendly adjustment of these issues was not impossible.

Crisis in 1936 Recalled

Although the resignation of the Standing Committee as a whole is unique, students of the Chamber's history since its creation by the Duke of Connaught 23 years ago point out that an earlier crisis disturbed this body. That was in 1936 when differences between the greater and lesser States on the question of Federation resulted in the resignation of the Chancellor, the late Maharaja of Patiala. Thereafter H. H. the Maharaja of Bikaner resigned from the Standing Committee. No meeting of the Chamber was held that year and the Viceroy in consultation with the Princes convened a meeting in February 1937. Besides the larger number of Rulers involved in the present resignation, a vital difference, it is pointed out, is that the resignation of 1936 was a result of disunity, while the present resignation is an expression of unity among the Princes.

The resignation has been handed in to the Crown Representative as President of the Chamber of Princes. It is not known whether he has accepted it.

Princes' Draft Resolution

The text of the draft resolution which was framed for discussion, by the Chamber of Princes on the Crown's relationship with the States is published in *The Hindustan Times* on the 9th December. The resolution runs:

"The Chamber of Princes considers it necessary to reiterate in the most unequivocal and emphatic terms that the Crown's relationship with the States and the Crown's powers in respect of the States cannot, and should not, be transferred to any third party or other authority without the consent of the States concerned.

"The Chamber requests His Excellency the Crown Representative to be pleased to convey to His Majesty's Government the grave misgivings and apprehensions aroused in the States, by the recent tendency to alter the States' relationship with the Crown and to qualify the observance of the Crown's obligations, by unilateral action without the consent of the States, notwithstanding the Solemn Royal pronouncements that these treaty rights shall be maintained unimpaired, and the recent assurance conveyed to the Indian Princes by His Majesty's Government that the fulfilment of the fundamental obligations arising out of the treaties and sanads remains an integral part of His Majesty's Government's policy.

"The Chamber further requests His Excellency the Crown Representative to convey this expression of their devotion to His Imperial Majesty the King-Emperor, with the respectful submission that in this matter of fundamental importance to the continuance of their relationship with the Crown, the Indian Princes solicit His Majesty's personal good offices to ensure an early and satisfactory announcement".

As the session of the Chamber of Princes was cancelled, the resolution was not moved.

Chancellor on Amery's Reference

The Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes, the *Nawab of Bhopal*, in a statement on Mr. Amery's reference in Parliament to the resignations from the Standing Committee said on the 17th December 1944:—

"I have seen press reports of the statement made by the Secretary of State for India in Parliament on December 13. This makes it necessary to explain that the Princes refrained, as agreed, from making a public statement indicating reasons for their resignations because they felt that it may cause unnecessary embarrassment.

"The Princes will be happy to note that the communication of the 2nd December, 1944, to which a reference was made by the Secretary of State, was not intended to contain anything new in principle or policy. They feel that a public statement at this stage is not suitable for stating the issues involved. They will, at the appropriate occasion when discussions are held, be able to indicate where, in their opinion, changes have occurred, and what led to the resignations.

"At this stage it would be sufficient to recall what the Princes have said before, that the events of the past three or four years have caused grave anxiety and appre-

hensions to the Princes, big and small. They have, without a single exception, solidly stood by the Empire, and their people have unconditionally and to the utmost of their capacity given of their very best in men, money, material and personal services towards the successful prosecution of the war. They have, therefore, not been able to understand why at this stage of their long and honourable relationship with the Crown they should receive this treatment. I repeat again the assurance already given that the States will not relax their efforts until final victory has been won over all the enemies of the King-Emperor.

"I should also, in the course of this statement, like to make it clear that the Princes have no intention or desire, as is alleged in a section of the Press, to stand in the way of the growth of India to its full stature, or to hinder the political, economic or social progress and advancement of their peoples. I am confident that when the time comes and it is necessary that the Princes should make sacrifices in the true interests of their country, they shall not be found wanting.

"The Princes only ask for justice and fairplay. They have faith in Lord Wavell and rely on the goodwill of His Majesty's Government."

The All India States' Conference

New Delhi—7th December 1944

Chancellor's Address

The All-India States' Conference on Education, Medical Relief and Post-War Reconstruction opened to-day with an address by the Chancellor, the *Nawab of Bhopal*, who avoided all direct reference to the crisis in the relations between the Chamber and the Crown Representative, but made two general declarations on the States' attitude to British Indian plans for post-war development and on the internal administration of the States.

His Highness alluded to the contributions of Indian States to charitable, cultural and other institutions outside their territories and stated that figures collected, which were not complete, showed that about Rs. 11½ crores had been contributed in this way by Indian States. The Conference, said His Highness at the outset, was the first of the series which the Standing Committee in July 1944 agreed might be held every year on beneficent departments of activity. About 80 States were represented at the Conference.

His Highness proceeded: "Events in India and abroad are moving incredibly fast and even the most progressive governments have constantly to adapt their institutions to meet the requirements of the changing times. I am not aware of any amongst the Indian States that have refused to be influenced by the progressive march of time. Almost every State in India is steadfastly working for the development of its resources, the improvement of its administration and the betterment of the standard of living of its people. In certain fields at least, the Indian States are proud to have led the way for the rest of India. The States recognise, however, that there is and always will be room for progress and for advancement. They are determined to pursue it to the fullest extent possible.

"The Conference, which I have the honour to inaugurate to day, is intended to assist the States in their desire to make further progress in social services. It is intended to pool the experience of British India and the Indian States, as also of the leading countries outside India, in the important sphere of the beneficent activities and to make it available to the States. It should also help to co-ordinate and where needed, to stimulate action in this direction."

His Highness commended to the Conference's consideration the memoranda placed before them giving a resume of the available information, on education, medical relief and post-war reconstruction, explaining the progress made in the States, the plans in view of the Government of India, and proposals of post-war planning in great Britain and U. S. A. He added:

"There are two questions of policy, however, in regard to which you are entitled to an indication from me, of the attitude of the Princes in general. Those questions relate to the internal reforms in the States and the Central plans for post-war planing and industrial development.

"On the first question of internal reforms, I need only refer you to the resolution (of which copies are laid on the table) which has been approved unanimously at the meeting of Princes held this week in Delhi. This resolution is a declaration of our policy on this important question. The administration reports of the States, which are published now by every State, and the information digested in the memoranda placed before you, shows that the Indian Princes almost without exception, are applying themselves earnestly to the progress of internal reforms within their territories. They lend further support to the statement of His Excellency the Crown Representative, made at a recent session of the Chamber of Princes, that earnest endeavours were being made in the States to improve the administrative standards and that various admirable reforms had been introduced. In accordance with the highest traditions of the Indian States, their contributions towards the charitable, cultural and other institutions, have recognised no limitations of frontiers or creeds. The figures already collected, which are not yet complete, show that since 1877, about 1½ crores non-recurring, and Rs. 40 lakhs (annual) and Rs. 1½ lakhs (monthly) recurring have been contributed by the Indian States towards such beneficent activities outside their own territories."

POST-WAR DEVELOPMENT

His Highness proceeding said: "I shall now refer briefly to the attitude of the Indian States towards the Central plans for post-war development. We are grateful to the hon. Sir Ardesbir Dalal, for taking us in confidence, as far as possible, at this stage, in regard to those plans. We have considered them, within the time so far available with the earnestness which they demanded. Our general conclusion is that it is in the interests of the States, as also of the country as a whole, that the States should co-operate to the fullest extent possible with these plans.

"Our attitude towards the industrial development of British India and the States is equally reasonable. The economic interests of India and the need for raising the standard of living of its people demand all round development of its natural resources. The States, like British India, must look primarily to industrial development to provide necessary revenues to meet the growing requirements of progressive administration and social services in the post-war period. We believe that there is ample scope in India for the industrial development of British India as well as of the States. The consumers' goods required for the Indian population could not be supplied, for many years to come, even by the joint out-put of British India and the States. Any rise in the standard of living of the people of the States, through the development of States' resources, would increase their purchasing power which would react favourably on the All-India position. It is therefore in the interests of British India, as well as the States, and in the best interests of the country as a whole, that there should be the fullest possible industrial development of British India and the States.

"The States must make up the great lee-way in respect of their industrial development if they are not to retard the progress of the country as a whole. I hope that we shall receive the fullest co-operation of British India in this matter; and it should be possible, with goodwill on both sides, to overcome any difficulties in the way. I am confident that such a development would be for the benefit of both. We must not, however, forget that all this can be achieved only if we first win the war. And in this connection I need hardly repeat what is already known to all of you that the Princes are determined to render every possible assistance towards the successful prosecution of the war."

Princes' Declaration on Internal Reforms

It is understood that the resolution on administrative reforms mentioned by the Chancellor was intended to be placed before the Chamber of Princes. The resolution says that the Chamber, while emphasising the importance of internal reforms in the States emanating where necessary from the Rulers themselves and their Governments, strongly recommends that, unless already done, the Governments of the States may carefully review their systems of administrations with a view to implementing, to the fullest extent possible and with due regard to the local circumstances the important recommendations made by the Special Drafting Committee of Ministers of 1942, which have been fully endorsed by the Standing Committee and the Committee of Ministers.

These recommendations, which are already in force in many States and are receiving active consideration of many others include:

- (a) Statutory provision guaranteeing the Rule of Law and security and proteo-

tion of person and property, with powers to the States' court to see that these fundamental rights are scrupulously enforced;

(b) The administration of justice through an impartial and competent Judiciary, independent of the executive, with suitable provision for the adjudication of disputes between the States and their subjects;

(c) The establishment of a Council form of Government providing for the advice and assistance of Ministers to the Rulers in ordinary sphere of administration, and the association of the peoples with the governance of the States through suitable representative institutions, their pace and form being inevitably conditioned by local circumstances and with due regard to the traditions and the structural balance of society in the individual States;

(d) Suitable arrangements to ensure continuity of policy and the security and integrity of public service.

(e) A clear demarcation between State expenditure and the civil lists of Rulers which may be fixed at reasonable percentages of the ordinary revenues of the States;

(f) A fair and equitable incidence of taxation allocating a definite and substantial portion of the revenues for the benefit of the peoples particularly in the beneficent departments.

This Chamber, the resolution proceeds, while recording the fact that the States, individually as well as collectively, are giving active consideration to, and are working out plans for post-war development, desires to emphasise in particular, their suitable extension unless already done, in the following directions with due regard to local conditions :

(a) The fullest possible collaboration with the Central Government in regard to such plans and policies for post-war development which affect the States and in the formulation and implementing of which, they have been adequately associated. It is understood that in view of the diversity of conditions between British India and the States collaboration with these plans does not imply complete uniformity of all details of the administration of these plans in the States territories without their agreement by any outside agencies;

(b) The adoption of effective measures for raising the standards of living of their people with particular attention to the improvement of the conditions of ex-soldiers and their families; the labouring population; the agricultural classes and the backward classes.

The Chamber recommends to His Excellency the Crown Representative that in order to enable the States to raise necessary funds for the aforesaid objects, they may be given all possible facilities for the development of their own industries and resources as requested by His Highness the Chaucellor and the representative of the States.

Mr. Phillips' Mission in India

American Columnist's Allegations

The well-known American Columnist, *Drew Pearson* writing in the *New York Daily Mirror* on the 6th. July 1944 from Washington made some sensational allegations. He said that about 18 months ago *President Roosevelt* sent a friendly letter to *Mahatma Gandhi* "urging nationalist co-operation with the Allies". But the British authority refused to deliver that communication to the Mahatma. Later, when Mr. Phillips, *President Roosevelt's* Special Envoy in India, sought an interview with *Mahatma Gandhi* he got a curt refusal from the Government. *President Roosevelt* himself, according to *Drew Pearson*, tried to urge on Mr. Churchill at the Washington Conference to follow a more liberal policy in India, but "Mr. Churchill was almost insulting" and virtually told the President "to mind his own business". Though the White House Secretary, Mr. Stephen Early, denied knowledge of "anything of this sort", the story of *Drew Pearson* does not appear to be wholly improbable. It is now common knowledge that Mr. Phillips, who occupied the unique position of being *President Roosevelt's* Special Envoy, did ask for an interview with *Mahatma Gandhi* before leaving India, but his request was flatly refused.

Colonel Johnson—the first occupant

The post of President Roosevelt's Personal Envoy at New Delhi seems to be a remarkably ill-fated one, according to the correspondent of the *Hindu* of Madras.

Colonel Johnson, its first occupant, had not been in office for more than six weeks. He came right into the middle of the Cripps negotiations and, being a politician, was willing to take risks and intervened openly just when Sir Stafford Cripps seemed stuck over a suitable defence formula. Colonel Johnson developed a tremendous regard and affection for Pandit Nehru whom he considered one of the world's greatest personalities. He made no secret of America's attitude towards India; America, he declared, being the main fighter in the Far Eastern theatre of operations, was determined to see through a settlement of the Indian problem. She was concerned with only two things: would India after a satisfactory settlement throw herself wholeheartedly into the war effort; secondly, would the Congress Party be content with the transfer of the substance of power during the war and concede all reasonable safeguards to the Minorities?

Col. Johnson tried to persuade Pandit Nehru to accompany him to Washington but failed. Before leaving New Delhi, he made a significant remark that some day there will be a Johnson version of the Cripps Mission—but he disappeared quietly from the political scene on his return to the United States.

ADVENT OF MR. PHILLIPS IN NEW DELHI

After an interval of six months came his successor, Mr. Phillips,—the very antithesis of Col. Johnson in many respects. He spoke English without a trace of Americanism, was correct in everything he said and did and shunned the limelight. But he kept himself busy throughout the five months he spent in India. He had seen Mr. Churchill before leaving London for India and had obtained an assurance that he would have full facilities to study the Indian situation, see any body he liked and make any suggestions he thought practicable. Armed with such an authority, he went round the country, interviewed politicians, officials, soldiers, businessmen and princes. Among the politicians two impressed him most—Mr. C. Rajagopalachari and Sir T. B. Sapru.

In the first week of February, (1943) Mr. Phillips approached Lord Linlithgow with a request to let him see Gandhiji. The Viceroy pointed out that Gandhiji was about to commence his fast. Therefore, the suggestion could not be entertained at that stage.

Mr. Phillips, meanwhile, clarified his own ideas and gradually evolved some general propositions which, he felt sure, could be made the basis for an all-round settlement. Self-determination for Muslim areas, he thought, was a legitimate concession though he found little real enthusiasm for Pakistan in the Punjab; within the existing constitution, he was satisfied a great advance could be achieved along the lines Sir Stafford Cripps had indicated; in the sphere of Defence, he seemed to think that the creation of an Allied War Council with an Indian representative in it with headquarters at New Delhi would overcome the objection of Congress leaders to the proposals contained in the Cripps formula. Generally speaking, Mr. Phillips aimed at specific improvements to that offer to meet the criticisms of the Congress and the Muslim League.

Before leaving India at the end of April 1943, he assured his friends (as did Colonel Johnson) that his absence from Delhi would be of extremely short duration and repeated his request to the Viceroy to let him see Gandhiji. The Viceroy invited him to Dehra Dun and discussed the situation with him and politely turned down his request a second time, when he realised that Mr. Phillips' proposals for a settlement had general approval in the country.

MEETING WITH MR. CHURCHILL

By coincidence or deliberately perhaps, Mr. Phillips arrived in Washington on the eve of the Churchill-Roosevelt meeting in May 1943. Remembering the Prime Minister's remark to him in London in the previous December, Mr. Phillips forced himself upon Mr. Churchill and placed his outlines of a solution for the Indian problem before him. Mr. Churchill was indignant. "You don't know India," he burst out, in effect "and your solution will mean widespread disorder and handing over India to the Japanese." Mr. Phillips, persistent and undeterred by Mr. Churchill's rebuke, fought for the President's intervention. More politely perhaps but with equal firmness, Mr. Churchill made it clear to Mr. Roosevelt that India could not be made a subject of discussion.

Was Mr. Phillips' return to India thwarted and beaten at every stage? He

retained his post as President's Personal Envoy at New Delhi but preferred an assignment in a temporary and special job in London while, it was freely asserted in New Delhi, warm weather lasted. Curiously winter came but warm weather seemed to continue at Delhi for Mr. Phillips kept himself busy at London—with consequences which have just come to light. Who will succeed Mr. Phillips or will anybody succeed him at all in New Delhi?"

Mr. Eden's Reported Cable to Washington

The following Reuter message from New York appeared in the Colombo papers:

Commentator Drew Pearson's syndicate column "Washington Merry Go Round" in Monday's New York *Daily Mirror* declares: "Diplomats are indignant over the ousting of Ambassador William Phillips from London as political adviser to General Eisenhower. Mr. Phillips came home for 'personal reasons'. But the fact is that he was asked to leave London because he wrote a letter to President Roosevelt criticising British policy in India and recommending Indian independence.

"The letter published in this column on July 25, caused a furore. The British demanded official explanations. Later the Foreign Minister, Mr. Anthony Eden also demanded the recall from New Delhi of General Merrell, acting as chief of the United States mission in India during Mr. Phillips' absence. He resigned and returns shortly. The British objected because Mr. Phillips reported to his chief on India. London is sore over his point that India is of great concern to us on account of the Japanese war."

After quoting Mr. Phillips as stating, "The Indian army is mercenary. It is time for the British to act. They can declare that India will achieve her independence at a specified date after the war", Mr. Pearson declared: "Mr. Eden cabled Sir Ronald Campbell, British Charge d'Affaires in Washington, stating that he and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, were perturbed and ordered the Embassy to approach the State Department with a formal demand for investigation. Mr. Cordell Hull informed the Embassy that Mr. Phillips' letter had leaked out through the Under-Secretary, Mr. Sumner Welles. Mr. Eden again cabled expressing surprise that a paper of the calibre of the *Washington Post* published Mr. Phillips' letter and suggesting that the *Post* should publish an editorial contradicting and criticising the story. When Sir Ronald cabled this to London, Mr. Eden replied asking the *Post* to correct Mr. Phillips' statement about a mercenary army.

"In London Mr. Churchill and Mr. Eden put the heat on on the United States Ambassador, Mr. John Winant, and had that official ask Mr. Phillips if he still held the same views. Mr. Phillips said he did more than ever but was sorry his letter was published, adding 'I hope my other reports, even stronger, will not leak. Mr. Eden cabled his Embassy to inform the State Department that Mr. Phillips was *persona non grata* in London, observing: 'India is more important than a thousand Phillips's.'"

Johnson's Resolution in House of Representatives

The spokesman for the House Committee on Foreign Affairs said at Washington on the 31st August 1944 that the resolution introduced in the House of Representatives by the Republican Representative Mr. Calvin D. Johnson asking that Sir Ronald Campbell, the British Minister in Washington, and Sir Girya Shankar Bajpai, Agent-General to the Government of India in the United States should be declared *persona non grata* because of their efforts to "mould" American public opinion, would be considered by the Committee "as soon as conveniently possible." The text of the resolution in the House of Representatives by Mr. Calvin D. Johnson, reads:

"Whereas the President's Special Ambassador to India, Mr. William Phillips submitted a report to the President of the United States stating that the Indian Army and the people will not participate with any force in the war unless they are given a promise of independence, and whereas Ambassador Phillips also reported that India is the most important base for American operations against Japan and since Britain will only play a 'token' part in the war against Japan, it is vital for the United States to have more active support of the Indian army and the Indian people, and whereas it is now more than a year since Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt meeting in Quebec in the summer of 1943 promised an offensive through Burma to aid our gallant ally China and whereas Mr. Phillips pointed to the inertia of the Indian Army and of the criticism of it given by General Stilwell unquestionably contributes to our delay in that theatre of war and whereas the

British Government taking exception to the report which Mr. Phillips submitted to his chief, the President of the United States, has made Mr. Phillips' position in London as Political Adviser to Gen. Eisenhower untenable and declared him *persona non grata* and whereas Mr. Phillips was not accredited to the British Government but is part of the armed force of the United States; that it is the sentiment of this body that Mr. Phillips be not recalled to the United States and his services lost to Gen. Eisenhower but that the transfer of his headquarters to a place on the European continent suitable for the continuation of his political advice to the American High Command, be it further resolved that it is the sentiment of this body that the British Minister for India in Washington, Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai and Sir Ronald Campbell who have endeavoured to influence the views of the American press regarding India shall be declared *persona non grata* to the Government of the United States, should they continue in their efforts to mould public opinion in Mr. Phillips' case."

Senator Chandler's Demand

Senator Chandler of Kentucky in the Senate in Washington on the 28th August 1944 demanded that President Roosevelt should make a full report on conditions in India. "I believe in co-operating with our Allies, but only by knowing the truth of the situation in other countries can we hope for a genuine co-operative peace".

He said the American Political Adviser, Mr. William Phillips, had been attacked by the British for his report on the Indian situation and declared that British representatives in the United States had even approached certain American publishers with a view to preventing publication of Mr. Phillips' view.

Senator Chandler, who, with five other Senators, visited India some time ago, said high British officials in the United States had told him that what is happening in India is none of his or the Senate's business.

"I repudiate that statement", he added. "Conditions there had a bearing on the war with Japan. If the British are going to be able to force a recall of our diplomats merely because they submit truthful reports, I think we ought to know about it."

"Our British Allies have taken an incredibly harmful step which can only injure the friendly relations between ourselves and them in declaring President Roosevelt's personal Ambassador, Mr. Phillips, *persona non grata*". Mr. Chandler continued: "The British Foreign Office took this action because Mr. Phillips made a report on the conditions in India which the British don't like. Is the Government of the United States so weak and our people so incompetent, has our sovereignty been so impaired that even the President is no longer permitted to know the truth about conditions in friendly countries? Only by knowing the truth of the conditions in countries not as we wish them to be but as they exist, can the American people in future organise and promote a policy of friendship with other nations that will lead to lasting peace."

BRITISH SPOKESMAN'S DENIAL

In answer to the inquiry made in the Senate, a spokesman of the British Embassy said that it was not true that the British Government had described Mr. Phillips as *persona non grata*. It was also untrue that the British Government asked for his recall.

The United States State Department spokesman said that the British Government at no time asked for Mr. Phillips' recall and that the arrangements for his return were made sometime ago. The British Embassy spokesman denied Senator Chandler's assertion that Mr. Phillips was recalled at the request of the British.

LORD HALIFAX'S DENIAL

The British Ambassador Lord Halifax, emphatically denied the charges that Mr. William Phillips was recalled at London's request. He said, "the State Department had denied the truth of this allegation before this Embassy denied it and I hope it will not be repeated."

MR. SOL BLOOM ON MR. PHILLIPS' RESIGNATION

The Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. Sol Bloom, siding with Lord Halifax and the State Department, made the statement that "neither the British nor the Indian Governments ever requested or even suggested Mr. Phillips' recall."

Mr. Sol Bloom declared that there was no connection whatever between Mr. Phillips' resignation and the "unauthorised publication of the views he had commu-

nicated to the President concerning India." Mr. Bloom continued: "When Mr. Phillips was first assigned to London, the Secretary of State advised the Press on September 8, 1943, that his assignment was for a temporary period. The British Government was at that time confidentially advised that Mr. Phillips would be doing special work in connection with the planning of the invasion of the continent and that it was contemplated that he would remain in London only during planning period. In April 1944, Mr. Phillips indicated that his work was approaching completion and before long he would wish to resign for personal reasons and return to the United States. On July 19, 1944, Mr. Phillips wrote specifically that he wished to return in September 1944. The Secretary of State reluctantly agreed to his request. It was only on July 25, 1944, that the unauthorised publication of certain of his views on India occurred."

MR. PHILLIPS DECLINES TO COMMENT

Mr. Phillips declined to comment on Senator Chandler's charge that he was recalled because of British objections. "I think Secretary Hull's statement disposes of the matter", Mr. Phillips said. He added that he has planned to return to the United States before long.

MR. KRISHNA MENON MEETS MR. PHILLIPS

Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon, Secretary of the India League, had a long discussion with Mr. William Phillips, on the 29th. August 1944. Both declined to comment, but the impression gained was that the conversation was satisfactory.

BRITISH COMMENTATOR'S RETORT

The well-known Commentator "Candidus" writing in the *Daily Sketch*, discussed the "world problem of colour which must be faced." "Candidus" says, "In the interests of Anglo-American unity it will be better if some prominent Americans would deny themselves the luxury of criticising our administration in India—undeterred by the fact that they are completely ignorant of what they talk about."

Quoting Senator Chandler's recent statements as an example of a "tissue of inaccuracies" "Candidus" characterises Senator Chandler's demand that President Roosevelt should make a full report on the conditions in India as "independent suggestion" designed merely to whip up Anti-British feeling in America. Incredible as it may be to the Senator Chandlers of the United States, Indians would rather have us there than any other foreigners." "Candidus" remarks that Indians are not likely to be weakened in this attitude by incidents in the United States such as the recent riots in Philadelphia arising from the promotion of Negro transport workers against which white Trade Unionists revolted.

Emphasising the extent of colour prejudice in the United States, "Candidus" declares that the position of coloured peoples *vis-a-vis* the white is a problem which will figure conspicuously on the agenda of post-war world reconstruction. Nations of every complexion are fighting with the Allies to kill the blasphemous doctrine of the "mester race" and, adds "Candidus": "What do you propose to say to them when the war is won and won with their assistance? Are we, whites, going to say to them, 'You have given us wonderful help in winning the war but you can not share in the fruits of victory? Do we mean to tell them that equality of status and opportunity is to be denied them on account of their colour? If we do, then though we have won the war they will very thoroughly have lost it. On the long view we shall have lost it, too, for the coloured peoples will refuse tamely to accept the implication of inferiority which has no biological justification. And thus will the ground be prepared for the most terrible of all wars, let alone of all racial wars—war of non-whites against whites, wherever they may meet."

Senator Chandler Offers Proof

Senator Chandler, referring to the British denial that Mr. Phillips' recall was requested by the British Government, made public a telegram on the 3rd. September 1944 which, he said, had been sent to London by Sir Olaf Caroe, Secretary to the External Affairs Department of the Government of India, in which he said that India could not again receive Mr. Phillips.

The telegram said in part: "We feel strongly that the British Embassy should be supported in carrying this matter further with the State Department. We are doing our best to prevent the entry of newspapers or letters carrying the text of Mr. Pearson's article. We understand that the designation of Mr. Phillips is still the President's personal representative to India. Whether or not he was connected

in any way with the leakage of the views he has stated, it would make it impossible for us to do other than regard him as *persona non grata* and we could not receive him. His views are not what we are entitled to expect from a professedly friendly envoy. The Viceroy has seen this telegram."

Senator Chandler also claimed that British censorship prevented republication of Drew Pearson's article which first reported the alleged British steps concerning Mr. Phillips. He said that Sir Olaf Caroe's cable, for which Senator Chandler gave no date, referred to Drew Pearson and said, "We stopped this particular message from coming into the country, doing our best to prevent the entry of newspapers or letters carrying the text of Pearson's article. It is regrettable we have to use censorship in the defence of such attacks by our great ally."

Senator Chandler said, in an interview, that he was in possession of a confidential letter written by Mr. Phillips to President Roosevelt under date May 14, 1943, which could not be made public this time, but if occasion developed, he would read it in the open Senate.

A British Embassy spokesman, asked to comment, reiterated Lord Halifax's statement that Mr. Phillips was *persona non grata*.

BRITISH EMBASSY'S WORRY

After Senator Chandler had made public the alleged texts of Mr. Phillips' memorandum to President Roosevelt and Sir Olaf Caroe's cable to the India Office, London, the U. S. State Department reiterated its denial that the British had requested for Mr. Phillips' recall from London and added that the British Government never raised with officials in Washington the question of Mr. Phillips' being *persona non grata* in India.

A spokesman for Lord Halifax said that the Ambassador would not comment on the Chandler documents. The spokesman said that if Senator Chandler's statement about Sir Olaf Caroe's cable was accurate, it would not be considered as refuting Lord Halifax's statement but merely as a report of one official in India to another in London. The spokesman indicated that the British Embassy was concerned to find out how the American Senator had obtained a copy of what was presumably a coded cable between two British points.

Mr. Phillips' Report to President Roosevelt

The report by Mr. William Phillips to President Roosevelt on the situation in India—referred to in the resolution to the Committee of the House of Representatives moved by Representative Calvin D. Johnson and in Senator Chandler's demand for a report from the President on India as published in the *New York Journal American* says:

"Assuming that India is known to be an important base of our future operations against Burma and Japan, it would seem to be of the highest importance that we should have around us a sympathetic India rather than one indifferent and hostile. It would appear we will have the prime responsibility in the conduct of the war against Japan. There is no evidence that the British intend to do more than give token assistance.

"At present, the Indian people are at war only in the legal sense as for various reasons the British Government declared India to be in conflict without the formality of consulting Indian leaders or the Indian Legislature. Indians feel they have no voice in the Government and therefore no responsibility in the conduct of the war. They feel they have nothing to fight for as they are convinced that the professed war aims of the United Nations do not apply to them. The British Prime Minister in fact has stated that the provisions of the Atlantic Charter are not applicable to India and it is not unnatural therefore that Indian leaders are beginning to wonder whether the Charter is only for the benefit of the white races.

"The present Indian Army is purely mercenary and only that part of it which is drawn from the martial races has been tried in actual warfare and these martial soldiers represent only 33 per cent in the Army. General Stilwell has expressed concern on the situation and in particular in regard to the poor morale of Indian officers.

"The attitude of the general public towards the war is even worse. Lassitude and indifference and bitterness have increased as a result of famine conditions, the growing high cost of living and continued political deadlock. While India is broken politically into various parties and groups, all have one object in common—eventual freedom and independence from British domination.

DATE FOR INDEPENDENCE MUST BE FIXED

"There would seem to be only one remedy to this highly unsatisfactory situation in which we are unfortunately but nevertheless seriously involved and that is a change of attitude of the people of India towards the war—to make them feel that we want to assume responsibilities to the United Nations and are prepared to give them facilities for doing so and that the voice of India will play a part in the reconstruction of the world.

"The present political conditions do not permit of any improvement in this respect. Even though the British should fail again, it is high time they should make an effort to improve the conditions and re-establish confidence among the Indian people that their future independence is to be granted. Words are of no avail—they only aggravate the present situation. It is time for the British to act. This they can do by a solemn declaration from the King-Emperor that India will achieve her independence at a specified date after the war and as a guarantee of good faith in this respect a provisional representative coalition Government will be re-established at the Centre and limited powers transferred to it.

AMERICAN RIGHT TO INTERVENE

"I feel strongly, Mr. President, that in view of our military position in India we should have a voice in these matters. It is not right for the British to say 'this is none of your business' when we alone presumably will have to play a major part in the struggle against Japan. If we do nothing and merely accept the British point of view that conditions in India are none of our business, then we must be prepared for various serious consequences in the internal situation in India which may develop as a result of despair and misery and anti-white sentiments of hundreds of millions of subject people.

"The people of Asia—I am supported in this opinion by other diplomatic and military observers—cynically regard this war as one between the Fascist and the Imperialist Powers. A generous gesture from Britain to India would change this undesirable political atmosphere. India itself might then be expected more positively to support our war effort against Japan. China which regards the Anglo-American bloc with misgivings and mistrust might then be assured that we are in truth fighting for a better world. And the Colonial people conquered by the Japanese might hopefully feel they have something better to look forward to than a return to their old masters.

"Such gestures, Mr. President, will produce not only a tremendous psychological stimulus to the flagging morale throughout Asia and facilitate our military operations in that theatre but it will also be proof positive to all peoples—our own and the British included—that this is not a war of power politics but a war for all we say it is for."

Text of Phillips' Letter to Roosevelt

According to *Drew Pearson*, the full text of the letter *Ambassador Phillips* wrote to *President Roosevelt* from India in the Spring of 1943 (14th May?), is as follows:

Dear Mr. President,—Mr. Gandhi has successfully completed his fast and the only result of it has been increasing bitterness against the British among large sections of the people. The Government have handled the case from the legalist point of view. Mr. Gandhi is the "enemy" and must not be allowed to escape from his just punishment, and at all costs British prestige must be maintained. The Indians look at it from different angle. Mr. Gandhi's followers regard him as semi-divine and worship him. Millions who are not his followers, look upon him as the foremost Indian of the day and consider that since he never had the opportunity to defend himself, it is a case of the persecution of an old man who has suffered much for the cause which every Indian has at heart—freedom for India. So it is presumable that Mr. Gandhi comes out from this struggle with an enhanced reputation as a moral force.

The general situation, as I see it to-day, is as follows: From the British point of view, their position is not unreasonable. They have been in India for 150 years and except for the Mutiny in 1857, generally speaking, internal peace has been maintained. They have acquired vast vested interests in the country and fear that their withdrawal from India would jeopardize those interests. Great cities like Bombay, Calcutta and Madras have been built up largely through their initiative. They have guaranteed the regime of the Princes who control territorially about one-third of the country and one-fourth of the population. They realize that

new forces are gathering through the world which affect their hold over India and they have therefore, gone out of their way, so they believe, to offer freedom to India as soon as there are signs that the Indians themselves can form a secure Government. This the Indian leaders have been unable to do and the British feel that they have done all they can in the circumstances. Behind the door is Mr. Churchill who gives the impression that personally he would prefer not to transfer any power to an Indian Government either before or after the war, and the *status quo* should be maintained.

Indians, on the other hand, are caught up in the new idea which is sweeping the world, of freedom for oppressed peoples. The Atlantic Charter has given the movement great impetus. Your speeches have given encouragement. British Declarations that freedom would be granted to India after the war, have brought the picture of Indian Independence as never before into the thoughts of the entire Indian intelligentsia. Unfortunately, as the time approaches for ending the war, the struggle for political prestige and power between parties has increased, and this has made it more difficult than ever for the leaders willing to reach a compromise agreement. Furthermore, Mr. Gandhi and all the Congress leaders, not to mention fifty or sixty thousand Congress supporters, are in jail, and as the Congress is the strongest political party, there is no one available to speak for it. There thus is a complete deadlock; I should imagine that the Viceroy and Mr. Churchill are well satisfied to let the deadlock remain as long as possible. That at least is the general impression in most Indian circles.

DEADLOCK MUST BE BROKEN

The problem therefore is, can anything be done to break this deadlock through our help? It seems to me, all we can do is to try and include Indian political leaders to meet together and discuss the form of government which they regard as applicable to India, and thus show the world they have sufficient intelligence to tackle the problem. We must not assume that they will adopt American or British systems. In view of the importance of guaranteeing protection of minorities, our majority form of movement may not be applicable and a coalition may prove to be the one and only practical way of guaranteeing internal harmony. We cannot suppose that the British Government can or will transfer power to India by a scratch of the pen at the conclusion of the Peace Conference, unless there is an Indian Government fit to receive it. The question remains, therefore, how to induce leaders to begin now to prepare for their future responsibilities. There is, perhaps, a way out of the deadlock, which I suggest to you, not because I am sure of its success but because I think it worthy of your consideration. With the approval and blessing of the British Government, an invitation could be addressed to the leaders of all Indian political groups on behalf of the President of the United States to meet together to discuss plans for the future. The Assembly could be presided over by an American who could exercise influence in harmonizing the endless divisions of caste, religion, race and political views. The conference might well be held under the patronage of the King Emperor, the President of the United States, the President of the Soviet Union and Marshal Chiang Kai-shek, in order to bring pressure to bear on the Indian politicians. Upon the issue of invitations, the King-Emperor could give a fresh assurance of the intention of the British Government to transfer power to India on a certain date, as well as his desire to grant a provisional set-up for the duration. The conference could be held in any city in India except Delhi.

INDIANS' LACK OF CONFIDENCE IN BRITISH PROMISES

American Chairmanship would have the advantage not only of expressing the interest of America in the future Independence of India but would also be a guarantee to Indians of the British offer of Independence. This is an important point because, as I have already said in the previous letters, British promises in this regard are no longer believed. If either of the principal parties refused to attend the conference, it would be a notice to the world that India is not ready for self-Government and I doubt whether a political leader would put himself in such a position. Mr. Churchill and Mr. Amery may be obstacles, for notwithstanding statement to contrary, India is governed from London down to the smallest details. Should you approve of the general idea and care to consult Mr. Churchill, he might reply that since the Congress leaders are in jail, a meeting such as is contemplated is impossible. The answer could be that certain of the leaders, notably Mr. Gandhi, might be free unconditionally in order to attend the conference. The British may even be searching for a good excuse to release Mr. Gandhi, for the struggle between him and the Viceroy is over with honour for both—the Viceroy has maintained his prestige and

Mr. Gandhi has carried out his protest against the Government through his successful fast and has come back into the limelight.

There is nothing new in my suggestion, except the method of approach to the problem. The British have already announced their willingness to grant freedom to India after the war if Indians have agreed among themselves as to its form. The Indians say they cannot agree because they have no confidence in British promises. The proposed plan, perhaps, provides the guarantee required by the Indians, and in line with Britain's declared intentions. Possibly, this is a way out of the impasse which, if allowed to continue, may affect our conduct of the war in this part of the world and our future relations with the coloured races. It may not be successful, but at least America will have taken a step in furthering the ideals of the Atlantic Charter.

I offer the suggestion now in order that it may have your consideration before I return to Washington at the end of April or early in May when I shall be able to give you at first-hand, further information on the subject.

Sincerely Yours, (S.I.) William Phillips.

Reactions in Delhi

Official circles in New Delhi maintained complete silence on the 4th. September 1944 over Mr. Phillips' report and the disclosure in Washington of a cable alleged to have been sent to London by Sir Olaf Caroe.

Their attitude is believed to be that the matter is now one for London and Washington to clear up and that any statement must be made there. If a statement is issued here, it will presumably be in accord with London.

The general public here consider that these opportune disclosures are more closely linked with the American presidential election and the desire of President Roosevelt's opponents to prove his subservience to Britain than with any desire to help India at this juncture. The tone of some of the press here to-day is a partial reflection of this view.

Mr. Phillips' reference to the Indian army as purely mercenary, his statement that General Stilwell has expressed concern over the poor morale of the Indian officers and his declaration that Britain would only give token aid in the war against Japan have aroused great indignation in both British and Indian army circles in New Delhi. Similar sentiments are likely to be felt in Kandy which is concerned with actual operations.

Mr. Phillips' remarks on low morale and on token aid were much criticised to-day in Indian army circles. "Of course, we grumble about our pay being lower than the British", said another officer, "but it is the soldier's privilege to grumble and the citations of awards will prove that our morale is not low."

"As to fighting", he continued, "there are three Indian divisions now fighting in Italy. Indian troops formed the bulk of the British and Indian division which repulsed the Japanese advance into India and recaptured one-tenth of Burma. General Stilwell and his Chinese troops were only opposed by one Japanese division which was being constantly harassed by Chindits. But five Japanese divisions fought the British and Indian troops in Arakan and Manipur and three of them at least were totally destroyed. It was an Indian division too which came to General Stilwell's assistance by taking Mogaung. It is not the Indians or the British who are the token force in India."

J. J. Singh's Revelations

Further revelations concerning Mr. William Phillips' position in India and the demand that Colonel Louis Johnson's report on India should also be made public, was made on the 4th September 1944 in New York by Mr. J. J. Singh, President of the India League of America. Mr. Singh also urged the lifting of British censorship to and from India. He said that Representative Chandler's publication of Mr. Phillips' report would be welcomed by Americans, Englishmen and Indians interested in a just solution of the deadlock. Mr. Singh said that reports received by the India League showed that he had made a sincere effort to gather all relevant data and be helpful. He asserted that despite the fact that he was hampered in obtaining the Indian side of the picture, it would be remembered that the British authorities in India prevented him from seeing Mr. Gandhi and Pandit Nehru, "his report supports the view that British policy in India is hampering the war by preventing a political settlement."

Mr. Singh said that the League understands that upon his return from India Mr. Phillips had a conversation with Mr. Churchill in which he stated his views.

"We understand on unimpeachable authority that Mr. Churchill was adamant, refusing to face the facts laid before him."

He added that it was also understood that Mr. Phillips verbally made it clear that the British alone were unwilling to make a move towards a solution. "This opinion is amply confirmed by the recent rebuffs to Mr. Gandhi's offer for a settlement".

Mr. Singh said that it would also be helpful to know what Colonel Johnson reported to the President after his return from India. He said Colonel Johnson who was the President's First Representative in India and was present during the Cripps Mission was at that time quoted as saying that there should some day be a "Johnson version" of the Cripps Mission. Mr. Singh said that it was most disturbing to learn that Sir Olaf Caroe prevented news of Mr. Phillips' reports reaching India and other American expressions on this affair "were being withheld from the Indian press". The deadlock in India will not be difficult enough to settle when everyone is in full possession of all facts. But it will be made hopeless when Indians are prevented from knowing how Americans feel and Americans can get only fragmentary reports of the real situation in India. British censorship must be lifted".

Mr. Singh concluded that a solution of the Indian problem would mobilise India, give a new impetus to China and peoples under Japanese domination. "It is important that the United Nations should realise that India is not merely a concern of the British."

Seal Supports Johnson's Move

Mr. P. B. Seal, Chairman of the Committee of Indian Congressmen in Britain, sent a message to Republican Representative, Calvin D. Johnson who introduced the resolution in the House of Representatives, now under consideration of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, to declare Sir Girja Sanker Bajpai to be "persona non-grata" to the Government of the United States.

The message, it is understood, says that Representative Johnson has "truly voiced the opinion of the people of India. Only the people's organisation, namely, the Indian National Congress, can appoint a popular representative to voice the opinion of the people."

In his message to Mr. Johnson, Mr. Seal further stated that Mr. William Phillips should be sent back to India as President Roosevelt's Special Ambassador at New Delhi.

London Journal Attacks Senator Chandler

The official code cabled by Sir Olaf Caroe, Secretary to the Department of External Affairs in India, to the British Foreign Office was obtained in some mysterious way by Senator Chandler of Kentucky—one of the leading anti-British members of Congress, says the Washington correspondent of the "Daily Telegraph." The correspondent says, "Its authenticity has not been denied by British officials who are naturally concerned at the way in which it came into the Senator's possession. The cable dealt with the publication in the United States of the report of Mr. William Phillips, President Roosevelt's Special Representative in India, which mysteriously fell into the hands of the anti-British columnist Drew Pearson. These two leaks have occurred at a time when the only hope of the Nazis is to bring about a division among the leading Allies. Mr. Phillips' subsequent recall by the State Department from the position of Chief Political Adviser to General Eisenhower, to which he was later appointed, was at once attributed to British pressure. But the British Ambassador Earl Halifax has finally issued a formal denial that the British Government had ever represented to the United States Government that Mr. Phillips was *persona non grata* or made any request to them for his withdrawal. Senator Chandler denied the truth of this statement and to support his position made public the text of Sir Olaf Caroe's cable which stated in part "whether or not Mr. Phillips was connected in any way with the leakage, the views he has stated would make it impossible for us to do other than regard him as *persona non grata* and we could not again receive him. His views are not what we are entitled to expect from a professedly friendly envoy."

The "Daily Telegraph" correspondent adds, "This incident would be less important if it were not the symptom of a widespread tendency on the part Americans to pounce on any incident which could be turned against the British just as though England, and not Germany, were the chief enemy."

New York Journal's Comments

The New York Journal "American" gives prominence to a dispatch from its Washington correspondent on the 5th September 1944 stating that Congressional speeches on alleged British interference with American diplomacy "threatened to bring a Congressional investigation of British interference in American internal affairs." The newspaper is owned by Hearst Chain. The dispatch cited recent speeches by Senator Chandler and Representative Calvin Johnson in Congress and articles by columnist Drew Pearson on the subject of Mr. Phillips' return to Washington.

The journal "The American" said on the 5th September in a Washington despatch that Senator Chandler, entering the controversy surrounding Mr. Phillips' return to Washington anew, has called on President Roosevelt to reveal the contents of the second confidential report on India submitted to him by Mr. Phillips.

Mr. Chandler is quoted as saying that Mr. Phillips' second letter is "much stronger" than the original report. Mr. Chandler added: "Contrary to the British view-point that conditions in India are none of our business, they are of paramount importance, inasmuch as the United States is carrying on the brunt of the fighting in the Pacific. India is not only of great value as a base for our future operations against Burma and Japan, but can shorten the victory road to Tokyo and save thousands of American lives. I fully agree with Ambassador Phillips in his statement that India has only lukewarm interest in the war against Japan because of British treatment. Aside from indications of British interference with our diplomatic appointments the Phillips incident reveals the necessity of knowing just where we stand in the fight against Japan after the European war is finished."

DEBATE CONTINUES UNABATED

The debate on Ambassador William Phillips' return to Washington continued unabated in the American Press.

The "Chicago Sun" published an editorial on the matter and the British Conservative member of Parliament, Mr. *Reginald Purbrick* wrote a critical letter to the "New York Times". Mr. Purbrick who represents Walton Division, Liverpool, referred to Republican Congressman Calvin Johnson's resolution of 30th August which he said included "fantastically inaccurate statements."

To Mr. Johnson's statement that Britain will play a "token" part in the war against Japan, Mr. Purbrick declared: "Everyone but Mr. Johnson knows that Great Britain is coming into the fight against Japan immediately the European situation permits the release of any of its forces and fleet at present engaged there."

Mr. Purbrick said that in regard to the "inertia of the Indian army" he could not do better than refer Mr. Johnson to "the great American in whom doubtless he had confidence, General Eisenhower, and ask the General how many divisions of this army are engaged actively in the war along with the British and Americans and whether they are not displaying a magnificent fighting effort."

The "Chicago Sun" editorial said: "Britain batters including Representative Calvin Johnson of Illinois have had a field day on the resignation of Ambassador William Phillips as Political Adviser to General Eisenhower. Allegations that the British have forced Mr. Phillips out because "the publication of the report he had made to President Roosevelt, criticising Britain's Indian policies, have set isolationists and Jingoes to hysterical demands for investigations and reprisals.

"Actually it appears that Mr. Phillips had long intended to resign and wrote his resignation to Washington before his confidential report of India leaked out. Competent British authorities have denied that they in any way asked for his return. Yet, there is Mr. Phillips' case that is valid. Frederick Kuh reports convincingly from the Sun's London Bureau that Mr. Phillips had been cold shouldered in official British circles because of his critical views on the Churchill Government's stand vis-a-vis India. For our part we believe that the Ambassador, who was President Roosevelt's Emissary in India some months ago, is on unassailable ground in holding that America has a right to differ with British Indian policy. We believe that the restoration in India of confidence in the official British intent to permit early Indian freedom would aid the war in the East and would increase confidence in American war aims. We by no means share Mr. Phillips' reported views which undervalue Britain's share of the war burden in Asia, but if the Indian political phase of the controversy drives home how deeply averse that country is to imperialism it can yet do more good than harm."

The journal "American" on the 6th September 1944 in an editorial declared that the Phillips' incident "is assuming serious proportions and indeed is a serious

matter". It added that while the State Department denied that Mr. Phillips is *persona non grata*, "there has been no repudiation of his purported report on India. The significance of such a report would be not in any objections the British have to it, but whether or not it is true".

For the past week the journal devoted much space to stories on the Phillips incident, most of them featuring alleged British interference in American affairs. *Karl von Wiegand*, the columnist of the journal, said that "Mr. Phillips is pro-British and while American Ambassador to Rome he did not welcome criticism of Britain."

Wiegand, who is described by the journal as "the dean of American war correspondents" continues, "The British attitude towards him, therefore, is somewhat astounding to us, who knew Mr. Phillips in Rome and I knew him when he was in the State Department at Washington. In Rome he did not like my contacts with Mussolini, not understanding that my business was to get big news and get it first. Americans usually are for freedom and independence because they enjoy it themselves. Few Americans know anything or very little about India. They know the name of one Indian—Gandhi—and some know a second—Nehru."

Bombay Docks Explosions Report

Inquiry Commission's Findings

Five causes for the Bombay docks explosions on April 14, 1944 are set out in the first report of the Commission of Inquiry which also lists fourteen points in which action taken before or during the disaster was defective.

In the two explosions aboard the S. S. "Fort Stikine", 231 were killed and 476 injured among the various services, fire brigade and dock employees and at least 500 civilians were killed while the injured treated in hospitals including the services above totalled 2,408.

Material damage done is estimated at several million pounds and is being checked up by a committee of insurance companies acting for Government which is bearing the burden of compensation, apart from the 15/20 per cent borne in certain cases by insurance companies.

The Commission considers that the possibility of deliberately planned sabotage could not be seriously entertained and the most probable cause of ignition of the cotton was careless discarding of a cigarette or match by some one smoking in the hold.

CAUSES OF THE DISASTER

The five causes given by the Commission are:

"The existence of a state of war, resulting in the practice of bringing into docks ships laden with explosives and ammunition; the stowage of S. S. "Fort Stikine" at Karachi in such a way that cotton was stowed above and below explosives and ammunition; accidental ignition of the cotton in No. 2 lower hold; failure at the outset of the fire by those present in authority to appreciate the gravity of the situation and during the course of the fire failure by those then present in authority to take energetic steps either to extinguish the fire or to take alternative action to avert the disaster and the absence at the fire of a centralised executive control with power to issue paramount orders and co-ordinate the various authorities and services concerned".

"Many errors and mistakes, both of omission and of commission," observes the report, "go to the building up of the final tragedy. But we are conscious and desire to record that, with our powers of summoning evidence before us and experts to advise us and with time to deliberate in the security of our Court Room, we are in a favourable position to judge what ought to have been done, whereas the actions it has been our duty to submit to searching scrutiny were taken either under the stresses of everyday affairs or in the heat and turmoil of a desperate situation."

GOVERNMENT ACCEPT FINDINGS

A statement published simultaneously by the Government of India accepts the

Commission's findings about the causes of the explosions and explains the various steps taken by reorganisation and revision of regulations to make a recurrence humanly impossible. The statement says the Commission is incorrect in suggesting that vested interests of peace-time have influenced and governed war-time control of the Ministry of War Transport ships in India. The suggestion is made in connection with stowage of commercial cargo at Karachi and the statement declares the Ministry's representatives were authorised to make the fullest use for local service of any available space in ships passing between Indian ports and the operators had no financial interests in the results of the voyage. The statement also dissents strongly from the allegation that two of the Master-Mariners' Rules and Regulations have been scrapped.

COMMISSION'S REPORT

The Commission was set up by the Government of India (War Transport Department) on May 2, 1944, by a Resolution which stated that "the Governor-General-in-Council has been pleased to appoint a Commission of Inquiry to inquire into and report on the causes of the fire and explosions in the Bombay Docks on April 14, 1944, and into the adequacy of the action taken before, during and after the disaster". It consisted of the Hon'ble Sir Leonard Stone, Chief Justice of the Bombay High Court, President; and Mr. S. B. Dhalve, formerly a Judge of the Patna High Court and Rear-Admiral C. S. Holland, R. N., on the staff of the Commander-in-Chief, Eastern Fleet, Members. This, the first report, has not been dealt with the adequacy of the action taken after the disaster, which will form the subject-matter of another report. Its narration stops with the first explosion which will be the starting point of the second report. The Commission examined 133 witnesses and a large number of documents. The enquiry was held *in camera* for security reasons.

The report states that, among the personnel of various Services and employments, 231 were killed and missing and 476 injured. Including these casualties, 2,408 cases were treated for injuries in hospitals of which 961 were detained. "However, the figure 2,408 is too high as indicating the number of injured, as it includes persons who were treated at more than one hospital." From a compilation of the various sources of information available to them, the Commissioners estimate that about 610 civilians were killed and missing, which they regard "is not an over-statement."

EVENTS LEADING TO THE TRAGEDY

Narrating the events leading to the tragedy, the report says that S. S. "Fort Stikine"—the ill-fated ship which caught fire and exploded in Bombay—was a single screw coal burning vessel of 7,142 gross and 4,216 net registered tons of the British Ministry of War Transport. She left Birkenhead on February 24, 1944, with a cargo consigned partly for Karachi and partly for Bombay. The cargo for the former port was composed of aeroplanes, R A F and general stores, explosives and ammunition; that for the latter consisted of about 1,365 tons explosives and ammunition and some service stores.

The ship arrived alongside at Karachi on 30th March. The unloading of the cargo consigned for that port was completed on the morning of 3rd April; this was done practically with no disturbance of the cargo consigned to Bombay. The shipping space released thereby amounted to about 286,000 cubic feet. This space was utilised by taking on new cargo, comprising upwards of 8,700 bales of cotton, a large amount of lubricating oil, some timber, scrap iron, sulphur, fish manure, rice, resin and a large number of other commodities. The loading of the new cargo was completed on 7th April and the ship sailed for Bombay on the 9th.

Bombay was reached in the early morning of the 12th. The red flag—the International Code Signal indicating that a ship coming into the harbour had a dangerous cargo on board—was not hoisted and never flown at Bombay. The ship came alongside No. 1 Berth, Victoria Dock at 11-30 A. M.; this was the berth which had been previously allotted to her. Under the Bye-laws of the Bombay Port Trust a ship carrying explosives is not allowed into the Docks; but under Rule 88 of the Defence of India Rules this Bye-law is suspended in cases in which the Military Officer authorised for that purpose has given a Certificate of grave urgency; such a Certificate was, in fact, given in respect of S.S. "Fort Stikine."

Unloading commenced in the afternoon of the 12th, general cargo being dealt with in the first instance. Because of the anxiety to get rid of the dry fish and the delay in the arrival of the lighters and the wagons—into which explosives and ammunition were to be offloaded—no explosives or ammunition were offloaded until the ship had been alongside for over 24 hours. "This seems remarkable," observes the report, "as a Certificate of 'grave urgency' had been issued enabling S. S. 'Fort Stikine' to

come into the docks." During the afternoon of the 13th and the 13-14th night, unloading of explosives and ammunition from No. 2 'tween decks and dynamos and scrap iron and wireless sets from No. 2 lower hold—where the fire broke out—continued at the same time. The scrap iron was finished on the morning of the 14th except for the large piece weighing over 8 tons which required a double lift. Some of the timber had also been taken out before the cessation of work for the refreshment hour from 12 30 to 1-30 P. M. on the 14th.

TIME OF OUTBREAK OF FIRE

The alarm of fire was raised aboard S.S. "Fort Stikine" at about 1-50 P. M. being the time when the stavedores saw smoke in No. 2 lower hold in which they had returned to work. "In spite of this", the report says, "there is no doubt that there existed in Bombay on the days subsequent to the disaster persistent rumours to the effect that the ship at No. 1 Berth was on fire in the forenoon of the 14th of April and even that she was on fire before she came into the dock." After noticing the evidence of six witnesses who averred that they saw smoke issuing from the ship between 12-30 and 1 P. M., the Commissioners observe: "We accept the evidence of these six witnesses, with the consequence that other persons in the dock probably saw what was, or what appeared to be, a column of wisps of smoke coming from No. 2 hold at some time or times between 12-30 P. M. and 1-30 P. M. This fact may well, after the disaster, have given rise to the rumours that the ship was on fire before 2 o'clock and although we understand that the rumours put the fire at even earlier in the morning than midday, we consider that this may be accounted for, either by exaggeration as no witness has come forward to give any evidence of seeing smoke before 12-30 P. M., or by the mistaking of the Bombay time for Standard time, both of which are kept in Bombay, the former being 1 hour 39 minutes behind the latter." They further observe: "In spite of the fact that no trace of any early manifestation of the fire was felt in the hold when the stavedores returned to work, the possibility that the lower hold was on fire at 12-40 P. M. remains; and although it is established to our satisfaction that the ship cannot have been on fire when she came into the docks, there remains sufficient ground for the starting of the rumours."

FIRE NOT CONSIDERED SERIOUS AT FIRST

The work of discharging cargo was resumed at 1-50 P. M. after the refreshment interval. About four slings of cargo had been worked from each hook when smoke was noticed coming from the cargo in No. 2 lower hold. The general alarm of fire was raised and within a few minutes water from three of the ship's hoses was being directed into the hold. "No one at this stage paused to consider the alternative plan of closing the partially open lower hatchway and turning on the steam injectors. Thus the first step along what proved to be a fatal road was taken, by applying the instinctive sense that water is in all circumstances the antidote to fire and applying it in this case without ascertaining the heart of the fire. The steam injectors would not have extinguished the fire, but by excluding the oxygen they would have held it in check, thus enabling the ship to be moved.

"The time when the fire alarm sounded at the Fire Station in Alexandra Dock was 2-16 P. M., it being then relayed to the Control Room, so that nearly half-an-hour from the discovery of the fire had elapsed before any message was sent through to the Fire Brigade Services, and, the message sent indicated an ordinary fire not one of a serious character." The Commissioners state that "at the outset nobody present regarded the fire as anything but a small affair. There is no doubt that the ship's company and the trailer pump party thought they would soon have the fire under control."

As no No. 2 message—signifying that a ship carrying explosives was on fire—was despatched to the Control Room in the first instance, only two fire engines belonging to the Bombay Fire Brigade Service arrived by 2-24 P. M.; the No. 2 message was received at 2-30 P. M.—i.e., approximately 40 minutes after the alarm of fire had been raised on board. On receipt of this message eight more pumps were ordered. "This delay", the report says, "set the principal officers of the Fire Brigade Services, when they did ultimately arrive, a far more difficult situation to cope with than ever ought to have been allowed to develop."

Captain Oberst of the Indian Army Ordnance Corps arrived on board the ship at about 2-25 p. m. He saw the Second Officer of the ship, pointed out the extreme danger and suggested that the ship should be scuttled. He would appear to have stated that the explosives on board were equivalent to 150 "Blockbusters" and that the docks would be blown up. Commander Longmire (Chief Salvage Officer R. I. N.) too urged the Master to scuttle the ship. The Master said he could not take any responsibility,

FAILURE TO GET AT HEART OF FIRE

"From the very outset," the report states, "there was a failure to get at the heart of the fire. No more efficacious steps were taken by Mr. Coombs (Officer Commanding the Bombay Fire Brigade Services) and his principal officers when they arrived to get firemen down on to the 'tween decks than had been previously taken."

Between 2-45 and 3 p.m. a heat patch was noticed on the port side of the ship at the aft end of No. 2 hold and at a level which placed it below the 'tween deck. This tell-tale indication of the approximate heart of the fire did not escape either observation or action being taken upon it. The emergency tender of the Fire Brigade Services contained a gas cutting appliance and Mr. Coombs gave order for a hole to be cut alongside the heat patch in order that water could thereby be directed on the heart of the fire. The attempt did not, however, succeed. Desperate attempts were now made to get further apparatus: but the appliances and the apparatus came too late.

At about 2-50 p.m., Col. Sadler, General Manager, Docks and Railways, Bombay Port Trust, arrived on the scene and suggested to the Master of the ship that an attempt should be made to take the ship out. The Master, however, was unable to make up his mind. "He was receiving conflicting advice from a number of different people, most of whom were experts in their respective spheres."

At about 3-15 p.m. the position was that, except for the unsuccessful attempt to cut a hole in the side of the ship with a view to getting at the heart of the fire, no plan of action had been devised other than the continuation of the course automatically pursued at the outset of projecting water into the lower hold from the main hatchway. As time advanced, the possibility of interfering with the course of action being pursued became increasingly impracticable. "There can be very little doubt that before 3-30 p.m. some of the tiers or layers of the cotton in the lower hold covered with timber had become buoyant, and, with water projected into the lower hold, without reaching the heart of the fire, floated gradually upwards thereby bringing the burning cotton towards the underside of the magazines 'tween decks and increasing the heat in the magazines until ignition finally took place".

At about 3-45 p.m., some of the explosives must have ignited, causing black smoke suddenly to billow up through the upper hatchway. Very shortly afterwards fierce flames appeared. The flames rose and fell, but each rise roared with increasing vigour, reaching to the height of the top of the masts and even higher. The heat became intense and the order for the firemen to withdraw was given at about 3-50 p.m.

In the words of the report: "So was the scene set for the sacrifice of the firemen and the destruction of their equipment, which factors were to be such a heavy handicap in fighting the flames so soon to be spread by the subsequent explosions about the docks, adjacent godowns and storehouses and into the residential area itself."

NO EFFECTIVE WARNING OF FIRE GIVEN

Right up to the first explosion, the police at the various gates were checking the passes of people leaving, which impeded the exit of persons. No effective warning of any kind was given to any other ship in the docks by any one. "So it came about that at 4-6 p.m. (when the first explosion occurred) all the firemen were still in the immediate vicinity of S.S. "Fort Stikine", most of the ship's company were somewhere near the Red Gate, Prince's Dock, life was proceeding almost normally on board the other ships, and there was a large number of Indian workmen working in these ships and generally in the docks."

"The explosion was a terrific detonation spreading destruction over a wide area. There was extensive fragmentation of red hot metal from the ship which destroyed all who stood in its path. Vast quantities of debris and blazing cotton were cast upwards to fall and spread a sea of fire over sheds and ships. S.S. "Fort Stikine" glowed red through a cloak of black fog, so that none of the few who miraculously escaped the blast have been able to give any description of the shattered ship."

"The repercussions of the explosion shook Bombay Government House, the Bombay Municipality, the Headquarters of the Commissioner of Police, the Chairman of the Port Trust, Naval Headquarters and many other centres of authority, received their first intimation that something unusual had occurred. Those who glanced from a window in the direction of the docks saw a darkening column of blackish smoke billowing from the scene of devastation."

At 4-33 p.m., the second explosion occurred, more powerful in its effect and devastation than the first.

PRIMARY CAUSES OF THE DISASTER : THE WAR FACTOR

Discussing the five primary causes of the disaster, to which a reference has already been made, the report says regarding the first cause, viz., "the existence of a state of war resulting in the practice of bringing into docks ships laden with explosives and ammunition", that "it is not our opinion that there is available any practical alternative. The real need is the setting up and enforcing of proper and adequate safety precautions. Explosives and ammunition in bulk are not actually dangerous in themselves, provided they are properly handled and not subject to fire or friction. . . . What is dangerous in the existing circumstances is not, in our opinion, so much the bringing of explosives and ammunition along-side, as the failure to treat them properly."

IMPROPER STOWAGE

The second cause was the stowage of S. S. "Fort Stikine" at Karachi in such a way that cotton was stowed above and below explosive and ammunition. The result of this stowage was, the report observes, "to produce a situation in which, if a fire should break out in the cotton stowed as it was in No. 2 and in No. 4. holds above and below explosives and ammunition, there would be imminent danger of a grave disaster." The manner in which cotton was stowed in the ship was therefore, in the opinion of the Commission, "wrong and dangerous and a primary cause of the disaster."

SABOTAGE OR ACCIDENTAL IGNITION ?

According to the report accidental ignition of the cotton in No. 2 lower hold—was the third major cause of the disaster. Deliberate sabotage is ruled out as being highly improbable. Elaborate inquiries were made both at Karachi and at Bombay. Previous reports on cotton fires in Karachi were carefully gone into. As a result of these and other investigations the Commissioners have come to the conclusion that the possibility of deliberately planned sabotags "could not be seriously entertained".

By far the most probable cause of the ignition in the cotton was, according to the report, "the careless discarding of a cigarette or other smoking material by some one smoking in No. 2 lower hold."

FAILURE TO APPRECIATE GRAVITY OF SITUATION

The fourth major cause was the failure at the outset of the fire by those present in authority to appreciate the gravity of the situation; and during the course of the fire failure by those then present in authority to take energetic steps either to extinguish the fire or to take alternative action to avert the disaster. Regarding this the report observes:

"No action was taken to discover the heart of the fire. Water from the ship's hoses and from the trailer pump was merely projected into the hold..... Thus the proper point of attack, namely the heart of the fire, remained undiscovered. The delay in summoning the Fire Brigade Services points to the optimistic view that fire would soon be got under control..... The fire was in fact in the upper layers of the cotton on the portside of No. 2 lower hold and inaccessible to a jet of water projected over the hatchway from the main deck. Even the approximate location of the heart of the fire was not discovered until much later when the heat patch gave some indication of it. The urgency of dealing with a cotton fire in a ship still partially laden with explosives did not find any place in the course of action pursued, resulting in the difficulty of its extinguishment increasing as the fire consolidated in the cotton."

Again:

"If fire-fighting as opposed to taking S. S. "Fort Stikine" out of the docks, was the course to be pursued, then in our opinion the only certain method of extinguishing the fire was to get directly at the heart of the fire with water at all costs; but if this failed, then, to flood the hold with maximum speed, using open-ended hoses and bringing into operation every available pump. That neither of these courses was pursued compels us to come to the conclusion that the most effective means were never employed and that by attempting to flood the hold without using open-ended hoses the firemen could not fill the hold quickly enough".

The fifth and the last major cause of the disaster mentioned by the report is "the absence at the fire of a centralised executive control with power to issue paramount orders and co-ordinate the various authorities and services concerned."

INADEQUACIES IN ACTION

The report then gives and discusses in detail a series of fourteen "inadequacies of action" which, in its opinion, contributed to the disaster. These were:

(1) At Karachi there was not exercised by the Ministry of War Transport's Representative any control or supervision from the point of view of safety when commercial cargo was to be stowed in S. S. "Fort Stikine" already partially laden with explosives."

(2) At Bombay there was a failure to inform, either by the regulation red flag or by any other means, the other ships in the Victoria Dock that S.S. "Fort Stikine" was laden with explosives.

(3) No adequate steps were taken in Bombay to ensure that matches, lighters or smoking materials were not taken on board ships carrying explosives as is done in magazine areas on shore.

(4) There was a lack of co-ordination in Bombay between the ship's anti-sabotage guard (Dams and Maritime Regiment) and the civilian watchmen in the ship, resulting in a haphazard and insufficient watch being kept when the hatches were open.

(5) By dismantling at Bombay the main engines for repairs, it was impossible for S. S. "Fort Stikine" to move under her own steam, although at all material times she had sufficient steam up to be able to move herself.

(6) There was lack of co-ordination at Bombay between the civil police and the military Field Security personnel:

(7) On the discovery of the outbreak of the fire at approximately 1-50 p.m., there was a failure to appreciate the gravity of the situation or even summon the Fire Brigade Services till 2-16 p.m.

(8) No No. 2 message, signifying a serious fire, was immediately despatched to the Central Room of the Fire Brigade Services.

(9) There was a failure to take energetic steps either to get water at the heart of the fire or to batten down No. 2 hold, turn on the steam injectors and take S.S. "Fort Stikine" out of the docks.

(10) The Bombay Fire Brigade Services' gas cutting apparatus or its manipulation was defective and failed to cut any hole in the side of the ship when the attempt was made.

(11) There was no method or alarm signal in Bombay by which a dock or docks could be cleared of non-essential personnel. It did not also occur to the civil police or to any body to give any general warning to other ships in the dock of the impending disaster.

(12) The failure to cover the hatchways of No. 4 and No. 5 holds after the outbreak of fire in No. 2 hold left a direct means access to the spread of the fire to the explosives in No. 4 hold.

(13) Neither Commodore, Royal Indian Navy, nor the Naval Officer-in-Charge, Bombay, to whom authority was given under the Defence of India Rules to order a ship on fire in the docks to be scuttled or beached, was even informed of the fire.

(14) The Law, Bye-laws, Regulations and Rules concerning docks, fires and explosives were uncoordinated, resulting in the failure in personnel concerned either to know or appreciate or to act upon them.

Govt. Resolution

The Government of India, in their resolution on the Commission's report state:

In resolution No. 8-P (29)/44, dated the 2nd May 1944, the Governor-General-in-Council appointed a Commission of Inquiry, with the Hon'ble the Chief Justice of the Bombay High Court as President, to inquire into and report on the cause of the fire and explosions in the Bombay Docks on the 14th April 1944, and into the adequacy of the action taken before, during and after the disaster. The proceedings took place *in camera* and in the interests of expedition and security the witnesses were sworn to secrecy and no legal representative of any interested parties was permitted. The Commission commenced taking evidence on the 8th May, 1944, and their first report which covers the events and action taken up to the first explosion at 4.6 p.m. on the day of the disaster, is now published. The Government of India have carefully considered the suggestions and criticisms contained in the report. In the observations that follow they have dealt with the precautions and remedial action considered by the Commission to be necessary and the measures to be taken to ensure that they are adequate and are strictly enforced.

2. The Commission have pointed out that war necessitates considerable movement of explosives and ammunition in bulk and that the discharge of such dangerous cargo in docks or alongside wharves is, in many cases, unavoidable, and is the practice in other countries of the British Empire. Although they consider that the bringing of explosive into docks in war-time is a primary cause of the disaster, it is not their opinion that there is any practical alternative to it. They observe that "real need is the setting up and enforcing of proper and adequate safety precautions". The Government of India agree. They also accept the other findings viz., that the method of stowage, at Karachi, of cotton above and below explosive and ammunition on s.s. "Fort Stikine" was one of the primary causes of the disaster; that the possibility of deliberately planned sabotage cannot be seriously entertained and by far the most probable cause of the ignition in the cotton was the careless discarding of a cigarette or other smoking material; and that there was failure to appreciate the gravity of the situation at the outset.

ORDERS PASSED TO COORDINATE ACTION

3. The Commission have also come to the conclusion that the absence of an officer with power to issue paramount orders and co-ordinate the various authorities and services concerned was one of the primary causes of the disaster. Under the orders issued by the Central Government the Naval Officer-in-charge and the Commodore R. I. N. had been given concurrent powers to give directions, when a ship was on fire, or had suffered damage and constituted a danger to other vessels in the port, to the owner or master requiring him to scuttle or beach the vessels. These orders were known to officers concerned and to the Deputy Conservator of the Port, but neither the Commodore nor the Naval Officer-in-charge received information of the fire, and the Deputy Conservator only came to know that the fire was a serious one at a very late stage, when he promptly hastened to the spot. He omitted, however, to inform the Naval Officer-in-charge with whom he normally maintains close liaison. It is open to doubt whether, having regard to the delays that occurred in giving information of the serious nature of the fire to the Deputy Conservator and the uncertainty as to the time it would take for the ammunition to explode, the notification of the danger to the Naval Officers and their presence could have entirely averted the tragedy which took place. They could not have been of much assistance in fire fighting which was the responsibility of the Chief Officer of the Fire Brigade, but it is reasonable to suppose that they might, by issue of warnings to other ships and to the personnel in the docks, have mitigated the effects of the explosions. The Government of India agree that there was a lacuna which have needed to be filled up by orders as to when, how and by whom the Naval Officer-in-charge and other authorities concerned should be informed of a fire; and necessary action in the matter has already been taken.

OMISSION TO GIVE WARNING TO OTHER SHIPS

4. In Chapter IV the Commission have drawn attention to a number of points on which action was inadequate, or in respect of which regulations ought to be laid down or revised. These include the need for warning other ships by the hoistings of a red flag by day and a red light by night on a ship carrying explosives when in harbour; the necessity for precautions to ensure that matches and other smoking materials are not allowed on or near a ship carrying a explosives or dangerous cargo; the importance of ensuring that there is adequate co-ordination between the ship's anti-sabotage guard and civilian watchmen when the hatches are open; the importance of ensuring that ships carrying dangerous cargo can be moved at any time during discharge without undue delay; and the importance of setting up a mechanical alarm system by which ships and dock personnel can be warned. Certain omissions on the part of the Master of the ship and the Fire Service have also been referred to, and the failure of the gas cutting appliances condemned. The cause of the failure of the appliance is still not known. As regards the acts of omission by the Fire Services, the Government of India are inclined to agree with the view taken in paragraph 115 of the report that the situation which had been allowed to develop was beyond their knowledge and training. It is gratifying to note that, whatever omissions may have occurred, the officers of all services concerned displayed most praiseworthy heroism in the discharge of their duties.

REGULATION FOR HANDLING OF DANGEROUS CARGO

5. As regards the other matters referred to in the preceding paragraph, very soon after the Bombay explosions, the Government of India in the War department

set up a technical committee known as the Dangerous Cargo (Ports) Committee, to examine the adequacy of the existing regulations on the subject of handling dangerous cargoes at major ports, and to enquire into local dispositions and the machinery for the enforcement of the regulations. This committee has completed its investigations at all the major ports and and after considering the points referred to in the report has drawn up regulations to be observed by all concerned while ships carrying petroleum or explosives are in port. These Regulations which have been issued, as well as the Port fire regulations, which have been revised at each port in consultation with the Naval and Military authorities, cover all the important matters referred to in the report, except method of stowage, which are dealt with in paragraph six below. All port authorities have been directed to maintain in working order a mechanical alarm system. Immediately after the explosions, the Naval Officer-in-charge issued a notice on Masters of ships directing them to communicate immediately with him in the event of any emergency likely to endanger a ship. A similar direction in case of fire has been included in the revised fire fighting regulations.

6. A standing sub-committee on Transport by Sea of the Explosives Storage and Transport Committee in the United Kingdom has since the beginning of the war regularly reviewed the general question of the loading of types of cargo which are normally regarded as safe but which when loaded with explosives might give rise to danger. A sub-committee of the Dangerous Cargoes Committee in India has this question under consideration as also the supervision over stowage of cargo at Indian ports on ships carrying explosives and ammunition. The Ministry of War Transport had, soon after the explosion and without waiting for the Commission's report, issued provisional instructions as to precautions to be taken when cotton is loaded in ships carrying explosives. The Commerce department has taken similar action in respect of Indian tonnage.

7. The Commission have commented on the mistakes made and on the inadequacy of the action taken by individual officers. In assessing blame, the Commission observe in paragraph 59 of their report: "We are in a favourable position to judge what ought to have been done, whereas the action which it has been our duty to submit to searching scrutiny, were taken either under the stresses of every day affairs or in the heat and turmoil of desperate situation." Some of the officers referred to have perished in the disaster, while those living have not had an opportunity of being informed of the comments that have been made by the Commission or of being heard in their defence. In the circumstances the Government of India refrain from making any observations and they are confident that any action which may on enquiry be found to be justified will be taken.

8. The Commission have made a number of statements regarding the British Ministry of War Transport and its representative in India. As regards these the Government of India have been in consultation with His Majesty's Government, who point out that, as a result of the procedure, which was adopted for reasons set out in the opening paragraph, there was no means of knowing what evidence was being given to the Commission or of testing its accuracy by cross examination. Since as a consequence the report contains misconceptions about the activities and responsibilities of the Ministry of War Transport, His Majesty's Government have asked that a clear statement of the facts so far as they relate to that Ministry should be made public. The "Fort Stikine" was a ship registered in the name of His Majesty represented by the Ministry of War Transport. In accordance with settled practice she was assigned for the voyage in question to the Bibby Line as operators under the Ministry's Liner requisition scheme notified to Parliament in 1940. One of the bases of the scheme is utilisation of the skilled experience and facilities of existing organisations of the Liner Companies. Accordingly booking of cargo at Karachi was arranged by the British India Steam Navigation Company since the Bibby Line had no berth on the Indian coast. In paragraph 97 of the report the Commission have stated that they have "shown how it comes about that the vested interests of peace time come to influence, even if they do not govern the war time control of Ministry ships in Indian waters carrying explosives on their way to a theatre of war". It is not correct that vested interests of peace time have influenced or governed war time control of Ministry ships in India. Throughout the war, the British Ministry of War Transport has been under constant pressure from the Government of India to supply shipping assistance towards maintenance of Indian economy and programmes of shipment of Indian coastal cargoes have been under constant review between the Indian Shipping Controller and the British Ministry of War Transport representative in India. The Ministry have authorised

their representative in India to make the fullest practicable use for local service of any available space in overseas ships which may pass between Indian ports, especially as the maintenance of the economic life of India is an essential part of the war effort. When, therefore, it was found that the "Fort Stikine" would have available space on the voyage from Karachi to Bombay, the Ministry representatives readily made this space available for shipment of coastal cargo. Though normal peacetime machinery was utilised for actual booking and loading of cargo and though these services were paid for by way of a commission on freights, the operators had no financial interest in the results of the voyage nor any financial incentive in the choice of individual parcels. Of the cargo shipped at Karachi, cotton had admittedly very high priority, the Textile Commissioner, Bombay, having recommended "that any available space in any ship should be utilised for movement of the priority commodity from Karachi to Bombay subject only to Naval and military operational considerations". Timber is also a high priority cargo and the particular parcel shipped was intended for specific purpose of high strategic importance. The lubricating oil was discharged at Karachi from an American Army Transport with Bombay as its final destination. The sulphur was shipped to the Shipping Officer, Bombay, on behalf of the Supply department of the Government of India. Fish manure was also an essential commodity for Indian agriculturists. Whatever answers may have been elicited from the witnesses, the position, in fact, is that the priorities of cotton and timber were so well established that no question arose as to whether they should be carried from that point of view.

9. In paragraph 75 of the report the Commission find the crux of the whole situation in the statements of two master mariners that rules and regulations "have been absolutely scrapped" or "gone by the board". These statements, however, are incorrect. Loading of explosives and other dangerous goods in the United Kingdom is done in accordance with the advice of a body of eminent experts. Their advice is incorporated in departmental documents which are issued by the British Ministry of War Transport and which are also used as guides by Indian authorities.

Though in the interests of the war effort, the rules have in certain respects—mainly in regard to quantity of explosives that may be carried in one ship—been modified where modification could with safety be permitted, in other respects rules have been tightened up as war experience has shown this to be necessary. Statutory responsibility for safe loading in Indian ports does not rest upon the Ministry of War Transport, and while it is no doubt true that the Ministry's representatives in overseas ports would not tolerate an admixture of cargoes which was obviously dangerous, reliance must in the main be placed upon local shipping authorities and upon Masters of ships upon whom, apart from statute, rests primary responsibility for seeing to safety of ships. In the particular case of the "Fort Stikine" no protest was made by the Master or the Chief Officer as to the cargo actually loaded though they did exercise their rights in rejecting a parcel of turpentine which was tendered for shipment but which they considered dangerous.

10. His Majesty's Government cannot accept the implications contained in the following passage: "Even so questions of policy are involved which would necessitate the consideration of whether the Ministry of War Transport and its representatives are entitled to exclude from consideration the fact that the loyalty, patriotism and courage of the Masters of merchant ships may overcome their discretion as experts, and induce them to take and to stow with explosives cargoes potentially dangerous, but which they believe to be necessary in furtherance of the war effort and which the Ministry of War Transport impliedly allow them so to believe. It may be a debatable point whether if, as Mr. Leman suggests, the Master is in effect the arbiter of safe stowage, he should be told when the cargo which he is expected to stow in a Ministry ship with explosives is not being shipped as a part of the war effort but in order to maintain the normal commercial life of the community, particularly in cases in which it is known in advance that the ship must ultimately discharge in Docks and not in midstream". It is wholly incorrect that Masters are deceived with the connivance of the Ministry into carrying unessential and potentially dangerous cargo by being led to believe that such cargo is being shipped as part of the war effort. Furthermore it is common ground with His Majesty's Government of India that the maintenance of the civil economy of India is an essential part of the war effort.

11. In conclusion, the Governor-General in Council desires to take this opportunity of expressing his appreciation of the services rendered by the President and Members of the Inquiry Comm. in conducting the inquiry. Their report has been of great assistance to him in assessing the position and deciding upon the action required,

India In Parliament & Abroad

House of Lords—London—25th July 1944

Gandhi's Scheme for Interim Govt. Criticised

Opening the debate on the political situation in India in the House of Lords on the 25th. July 1944, Lord Strabolgi said that Labour Party wanted facts on this subject. There had been fierce censorship in India, both military and political. There had been complaints that the military censorship had been aimed, primarily at preventing news reaching the British people which was already known to the enemy and not to prevent news reaching the enemy. The political censorship had been most rigid and it had been very difficult to obtain accurate information about what was going on in the political field.

After remarking that it had been reiterated that the Cripps Offer still stood, Lord Strabolgi continued: "We have no desire to dwell on the past, but desire to look forward to the future, and it is, surely, inconceivable that, now that the Japanese danger has passed and the war everywhere is going well, the policy of the Cripps Mission should be thrown overboard." Lord Strabolgi added, however, that he was not accusing the present Government of doing anything of the kind.

"REMARKABLE CHANGE OF FRONT"

One important piece of news received from India early this month, despite censorship, Lord Strabolgi said, was the remarkable interview given by Mr. Gandhi to Mr. Stuard Gelder of the *News Chronicle*. After quoting from the interview and also from a subsequent interview given to the same journalist, Lord Strabolgi said that those who knew Mr. Gandhi would recognise that these statements constituted a remarkable change of front.

Lord Strabolgi said that he wanted to ask three questions on behalf of the Labour Party Peers. What information had the Government about these matters? Could they see in these developments the long-awaited chance to break the present deadlock in India? What did the Government intend to advise the Viceroy to do? In particular, were opportunities going to be provided for the imprisoned Congress leaders to consult with Mr. Gandhi and each other? "We are dwelling on the past." I am not posing these questions in a hostile manner. We are looking to the future. We certainly see more than a ray of hope", Lord Strabolgi concluded.

Viscount Elibank said that no one could help being tremendously impressed by the military effort being made by India towards winning the war. At the same time, every sound-thinking person both in India and this country must feel that any withdrawal from India at the present time, during the war would be quite wrong and impracticable. The differences between Hindus and Muslims must be settled before our pledge for Indian Independence or Dominion Status could be fulfilled. If Independence or Dominion Status were given in the conditions of to-day, with the differences still persisting between castes and religions, it was quite certain, India would revert to a state of anarchy and the progress she had made during the past two centuries under British guidance and with British help would perhaps be lost altogether.

ATTACK ON GANDHI

"There is", Viscount Elibank continued, "one individual in India—I have not the same regard for him as Lord Strabolgi has—one individual who is the greatest obstacle to a settlement and the biggest bamboozler of the century and in Far Eastern history. He has bamboozled many of his own countrymen for years and I am sorry to say he has bamboozled a good many of our countrymen in this country. One of the greatest tricks of bamboozlement is when he inflicts on himself starvation just up to the point of dying and, in this way, plays on the sympathies of the Indian people and leads them into further difficulties."

"TRUST THE MAN ON THE SPOT"

Regarding the suggestion for a meeting between the Viceroy and Mr. Gandhi, Viscount Elibank suggested that that was a matter which should be left to Lord Wavell to decide. Viscount Elibank continued: "The Viceroy has all the strings

in his hands and knows what is going on. I suggest, you must trust the man on the spot, especially when he is a man of Lord Wavell's calibre and fine administrative and military qualities, with keen sympathy with the people of the country he is governing and the intense interest which he has in trying to lead India into that path which will enable her to achieve the Independence she is seeking. I would add a word of commendation of Mr. Amery. I know his keen sympathies with the Indian people. At a time when there was a good deal of controversy in this country, I was aware of the attitude which Mr. Amery adopted in those days towards giving India much greater control over her own affairs than many were prepared to do at the same time. My own view is that, with Mr. Amery here and Lord Wavell in India in these days, we should be prepared to leave these matters very largely in their hands to solve. We should trust the Secretary of State for India and the Viceroy on the spot to do the best for India in the present circumstances."

Lord Munster, Under-Secretary of State for India, replying said that he wanted to remind the House of the speech which the Viceroy made to the combined Legislature on February 17, this year. Paying a tribute to the qualities of statesmanship and the characteristics of a great soldier which Lord Wavell had displayed, Lord Munster said he thought Lord Wavell's personal and prompt intervention into the food problem, from the very earliest days of his arrival in India, had considerably enhanced the morale of the Indian people and had certainly encouraged Indians with a sense of civic responsibility to one another.

Lord Wavell's actions in the political sphere had been no less striking. Lord Munster proceeded to quote Lord Wavell's remarks in the speech referred to and his reiteration that the Cripps Offer was still opened and remained in all its essentials, his appeal to Indians to co-operate with Government and his advocacy of the setting up of a small authoritative body of Indians to make a preliminary examination of the constitutional problems.

VICEROY'S RESERVE POWER

Lord Munster reminded the House that the Cripps Offer implied two essential things—first, there must be agreement amongst Indians, amongst the main elements in India, regarding the terms of the constitution to be framed by Indians after the war; and, secondly, that any interim Provisional Government must be within the terms of the present constitution and on the basis of the Viceroy retaining his existing reserve powers.

Lord Munster said that the reasons for these stipulations were clearly inherent in the solution. We had to ensure that not only should nothing affect the continuance of the war, but everyone should assist in its successful prosecution, and also make quite sure that the activities of the interim Government would not prejudice the claims of minorities with respect to the ultimate constitution. "His Majesty's Government have not departed, in any way, from the intentions declared by the Cripps Mission, and which have been repeated again by the Governor-General in his speech to the combined Legislature", Lord Munster declared.

Lord Munster added that it was wrong for Lord Strabolgi to suggest that because we are at war in 1941, we had been prepared to come to an agreement at any price. "These plans were being worked out before Singapore and Rangoon fell, and that the arrival of Sir Stafford Cripps should have coincided with the fall of Rangoon, had nothing to do with the position we were then in."

Turning to the recent political moves initiated by Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Rajagopalachari, Lord Munster said that, at the beginning of the month, Mr. Rajagopalachari published details of the correspondence which had taken place between him and Mr. Jinnah earlier in the year on the basis for a Congress-Muslim settlement, which was proposed by the former. "Mr. Rajagopalachari states," continued Lord Munster, "that the draft scheme which he submitted was discussed with Mr. Gandhi at the time of his fast in 1943, and that he was authorised to say it had received his full approval. At no time, so far as his Majesty's Government are aware, did Mr. Gandhi append his signature to any document which was delivered to Mr. Jinnah through Mr. Rajagopalachari."

C. R.'s SCHEME

The document which is full of importance contained the term for a settlement and it laid down: first, the Muslim League should endorse the Indian demand for independence and would co-operate with the Congress Party in the formation of a provisional government for the transitional period. Secondly, after the termination of the war a commission was to be appointed for demarcating contiguous

districts in North-West and East India wherein the Muslim population was in absolute majority. In areas thus demarcated a plebiscite of all inhabitants was to be held and this would ultimately decide the issue of separation from Hindustan. Thirdly, It was open to all parties to advocate their points of view before the plebiscite closed. Fourthly, in the event of separation mutual agreements would be entered into for safeguarding defence, commerce and communications and for other essential purposes. Fifthly, any transfer of population was to be held entirely on a voluntary basis. Sixthly, these terms would be binding only in case of transfer by His Majesty's Government of both power and responsibility for the Government of India. This then was the scheme which Mr. Rajagopalachari urged Mr. Jinnah to accept and suggested thereafter that both he and Mr. Gandhi should advise the Working Committee of the Muslim League and the Working Committee of the Congress Party respectively to accept it. Now Mr. Jinnah was prepared to submit, though not previously, to endorse the scheme of the Working Committee if he received the scheme from Mr. Gandhi direct but declines to accept responsibility for agreeing to it or rejecting it before doing so.

"The exact position", Lord Munster stated, "is somewhat obscure, but the negotiations seem for the moment to have been suspended. The publication of this scheme had a very mixed reception in the Indian Press, and it is difficult, at the present moment, to understand or appreciate their reactions to them. It does appear, however, that Mr. Gandhi's association with these particular proposals marks a very significant change in his attitude towards the Muslim League's position. That, in itself, might improve the chances of an agreement between the two major parties. So far as this should prove to be the case, we can, of course, only welcome the fact that there has been such an advance on Mr. Gandhi's part. The House will appreciate that this scheme has not been put to it. I understand a meeting of the Working Committee of the Muslim League is to be held at the end of this month, when the position may be clarified. The House will have observed that neither during the communications between Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Rajagopalachari, nor during the flow of correspondence between Mr. Rajagopalachari and Mr. Jinnah has the Viceroy received any communication from anyone of these three participants."

GANDHI'S STATEMENTS

"What I already said", Lord Munster continued, "is by no means the end of the tale, for directly after the publication of the scheme, there appeared a series of statements in the Press which were attributed to Mr. Gandhi. The more important of these statements contained seven points, and was issued after the publication in the *News Chronicle* of an interview which Mr. Gandhi had given to one of its Press correspondents. Indeed, Mr. Gandhi stated, himself, that the premature publication of the interview with Mr. Gelder, the *News Chronicle* representative, had led to some confusion in the minds of the Congress and therefore Mr. Gandhi had advanced the following views: Firstly, Mr. Gandhi said, he would never use the weapon of Civil Disobedience during the war unless for a very grave reason, such as, the thwarting of India's right to freedom. Secondly, he would be satisfied with a National Government during the war, with full control of the civil administration, composed of persons chosen by the elected members of the Legislative Assembly. Thirdly, the Viceroy would be, like the King of England, guided by responsible Ministers. Fourthly, Popular Government would be automatically restored in all provinces, that is, provinces at the moment under Section 93. Fifthly, while under National Government, the Viceroy and the Commander-in-Chief would have complete control of military operations, there would be a portfolio of Defence in the hands of the National Government, which would be genuinely interested in the defence of the country and may render great assistance in the shaping of policies. Sixthly, the Allied forces would be allowed to carry on operations on Indian soil, but the expense of such operations would not be borne by Indians. Seventhly, Mr. Gandhi would advise Congress participation in the National Government if formed."

Lord Munster, proceeding, said: "The procedure followed is a little complicated and a little difficult to understand. A few days after Mr. Gandhi published these seven suggestions through the intermediary of the Press, he gave further explanations to Press correspondents, in which he emphasised that his statements constituted his personal effort to end the deadlock, but that if his suggestions are not acceptable to Mr. Jinnah or the powers that be, he would consider it a most unfortunate incident. In clarification—if indeed it be clarification—of his offer to Mr. Jinnah, he stated that his proposals were wholly different from the Cripps Offer which, he insisted, contemplated almost perpetual vivisection of India. Frankly, it is difficult to under-

stand if these statements by Mr. Gandhi have, in point of fact, definitely improved the chances of an inter-communal settlement."

PROTECTION OF MINORITIES

"The main point, so far as His Majesty's Government are concerned," Lord Munster declared, "is that he (Mr. Gandhi) is still clinging to precisely that claim which wrecked the Cripps Mission and put an end to negotiations in April 1942, for he is no more prepared to-day than he was then, to accept the formation of an interim Government with the Viceroy maintaining his existing reserve powers. He demands a so-called 'Interim' Government in full control of the civil administration, with the Viceroy occupying the position of a constitutional monarch as we understand it in this country. Let it not be forgotten that, if an agreement is set up under the present existing constitution, there are still a number of very important questions, not the least of which is the protection of the minorities, to be resolved. All these matters must be settled before the final constitution can be evolved. In this, it will seem that Government have not departed one iota from the pledge they gave some time ago and which I will repeat now, that the proposals which were taken to India by Sir Stafford Cripps still stand in their entirety."

Referring, in conclusion, to the question by Lord Strabolgi, who asked whether the Viceroy was prepared to allow Mr. Gandhi to see the members of the Working Committee, Lord Munster said: "I would refer Lord Strabolgi to the letter which the Viceroy sent to Mr. Gandhi on June 22nd last. He said that another meeting between himself and Mr. Gandhi could only raise false hopes. He said, that Mr. Gandhi had publicly stated that he adhered to the 'Quit India' Resolution which he (Mr. Gandhi) regarded as innocuous. The Viceroy did say that as soon as Mr. Gandhi had any definite or constructive policy to put up, he would be very glad to consider it at that time."

Withdrawing his motion, Lord Strabolgi said with regard to Lord Munster's speech, "It might have been worse. I thought I detected one or two gleams of understanding and hope," he added, "but I would like more of warmth and sympathy. I think there is a chance now of a wide settlement if we take it, but I suppose Lord Munster was bound to take the attitude he did. He became acclimatised to the India Office atmosphere all too soon."

Lord Strabolgi particularly welcomed the statement that the suggestions made towards Mr. Jinnah might improve the chances of an agreement between the major parties and that this would be welcomed by Government. It was also good to hear that the Cripps Offer still stood.

With reference to Gandhiji's proposal for a provisional government Lord Strabolgi continued: "This is a delicate matter. It seems to excite some apprehension in Lord Munster's mind. I should have thought if we could get this form of provisional government for All-India composed of all parties with, of course, necessary safeguards, we should welcome it and it would be a magnificent step forward. But it seems to have created some alarm that it should be suggested that the Viceroy should hold the position of a constitutional monarch with his reserved powers."

Lord Munster: "Constitutional monarch without his reserved powers."

Lord Strabolgi: "No, with his reserved powers. The constitutional powers behind the monarch in this country if set down on paper look immense. It could be argued that as confidence grows and as democracy has its chance and Indian statesmen become trained to responsibility these powers would recede more and more into the background. That is what has happened in this country. But the power is there all the same. I really think that the India Office and Lord Munster make too heavy weather of that particular point."

House of Lords—London—25th. July 1944

Debate on India's Food Position

The question of India's food situation was raised in the Lords on the 25th July 1944 by Lord Faringdon, who said that many people were becoming increasingly uneasy and he wanted to know what provision was being made to deal with it. According to an article in the *Times*, by September next, something like 800,000 tons would have been imported towards the million tons of grain recommended by the Gregory Commission, but nothing would have been imported towards forming the half a million tons reserve. In such circumstances, optimism if not ill-placed, was at least hardly justified. It meant that there was already 200,000 tons deficit for consumption purposes and no reserve. Moreover, it would be extremely difficult

to ration and control prices which would have been possible if the Government had got the half million tons reserve.

EPIDEMICS IN BENGAL AND BIHAR

Lord Faringdon also referred to the report by Dr. Roy, the head of the Bengal Medical Co-ordination Committee, that something like 20 million people in Bengal and Bihar were affected by epidemics, and said that it had also been reported that the cholera situation in Bihar was worse than that in the gravest recorded year of 1920. The health situation, he added, was adversely affected by the famine and reacted upon it, since one could not hope to obtain from a country, with a serious epidemic situation, that production of foodstuffs which might otherwise have been hoped for. He hoped, Government would be able, in some future debate, to give assurance about the steps they were taking to promote the manufacture of drugs in India and facilitate the import of drugs from this country.

Lord Faringdon added that if the anticipated food surpluses were obtained from the provinces and additional supplies could be found in Australia, the United States and Canada, then transport would be a critical problem.

Lord Munster, Under Secretary of State for India in reply, said that he thought, if a balanced view were taken between optimism, and pessimism, there was reasonable justification for thinking that they were on the road to better days. If the present monsoon proved favourable, as there was some justification for thinking it might, then it should be possible to resolve the difficulties and meet all the requirements in the current year. The wheat crop in North-west India had suffered this year from a spell of bad weather before the harvesting, and the portion of the surplus which would have been available for distribution to the deficit areas would have to be found from elsewhere. Although this event should not in itself cause food shortage, it must, nevertheless, be taken into account in examining the position as a whole. Last year's famine, which occurred mainly in the rice-growing areas, was caused by a variety of events of which, not the least, were the abnormal climatic conditions, but, in so far as it was a matter of human control, every measure had been taken to ensure that there should be recurrence. They could not, of course, deal with elements which were beyond their control.

Lord Munster proceeded to give an account of the ration system adopted in cities and towns throughout India, of the procurement plan, the price control system and the import programme for which shipping has been supplied by His Majesty's Government. Giving the most recent news of the food position in Bengal, he said, since last year's famine ended, conditions had immensely improved in rice crops. The Government of India had given the undertaking that they would make themselves responsible and supply from sources outside Bengal 640,000 tons of food grains to feed the city of Calcutta. That in itself would remove a burden off the Bengal market which, obviously, must be suffering to some extent from the inevitable aftermath of last year's disaster.

"BENGAL ALMOST OUT OF THE WOOD"

The difficulties which originally postponed the introduction of complete rationing in Calcutta had now been overcome, and he was told the system was working smoothly and well. The new Bengal Governor, Mr. Casey, had put in hand a number of measures all directed to reorganising the whole food position, and had stated that food grains which had been procured under the scheme operating in the province justified all his expectations and hopes that the total procurement would be adequate to meet all the essential needs of the deficit areas within his particular province during the present year. There might be certain relatively small areas in which difficulties would perhaps be experienced, but everything was being done to anticipate and meet these difficulties before they arose. In the beginning of July, Mr. Casey had stated, in a broadcast speech, that they were within reasonable sight of having procured the minimum of rice to see the province through until the next winter crop in November was harvested, and this meant that Bengal was almost out of the wood so far as this year was concerned. Lord Munster paid a warm tribute to Mr. Casey for the superhuman efforts by which he had steered his province towards brighter days.

"ASTRONOMICAL PROGRESS IN RATIONING"

Discussing the rationing system, Lord Munster gave facts and figures to show the progress made and described them as astronomical. In the whole of India, 210 cities and towns with a population exceeding 35 millions had now come on to rationing. However good the rationing system might be, he added, the whole

organisation might be seriously impaired if price control was not taken into consideration. The Government of India had, therefore, to make quite sure that the prices charged for vital foodstuffs were not only fair and equitable and gave a reasonable return to the producer, but that they were such that the community at large could afford to pay. It was vital to stimulate confidence amongst the people in the ability of the Government to maintain rigid control and if anything should occur either at Home or in India through hasty or ill-considered remarks which might shake or lessen the prevailing spirit of confidence, built up so successfully by the present Viceroy, difficulties might emerge which might well have the very gravest consequences.

If a spirit of confidence reigned and the price control was firm and fair, then the tendency of the producer to hoard his surplus crop would be considerably lessened and probably overcome. "The Government of India's price control policy has, therefore, been directed to this end". Lord Munster said that the procurement policy had been well thought out. It was an entirely new departure in India and the whole scheme was designed to supply the needs of cities and other deficit areas, as well as to give the Central Government stocks with which to control the market. As regards the Punjab, he gathered that the Government scheme of purchases through agents was not working altogether satisfactorily, and an amendment was now contemplated to ensure closer control by the provincial authorities.

GRAIN SHIPMENTS TO INDIA

After giving details of the procurement schemes in other provinces, Lord Munster said that in normal times, there should never be any great difficulty in importing into India sufficient quantities of wheat, which, together with the amount secured inside India by any procurement policy, would place a substantial reserve in the hands of the Government to enable them to control the market.

"It has been the object of His Majesty's Government to try and provide the maximum quantity of imports for current consumption as recommended in the Gregory Report, but the House knows well enough the ever-increasing calls made upon our shipping last year and again this year, in spite of these demands—and we obviously cannot allow our military operations to be imperilled—we have provided sufficient ships for carrying to India of 800,000 tons of wheat from outside sources in a period of twelve months ending October, 1944, and we have given an undertaking to the Government of India that we will consider in August and again in November the allotment of further shipping for this purpose."

IMPORTANCE OF LONG-TERM POLICY

Dealing with the action the Government of India proposed to take to ensure a steady and continued all-round increase in the internal production of foodstuffs, Lord Munster said that though a short-term policy might assist in increasing the immediate quantity of edible foodstuffs, a long-term policy was required which would come into operation and full effect year by year. "We cannot therefore rely on a short term policy during our existing troubles, but we can and must lend all our efforts to secure that a permanent policy is produced and should start operating at once continuing over future years, so as to meet the threat of famine or shortage of food due to the continual increase in population, but before it arises".

Owing to the war circumstance and the loss of Burma, the rice market imports had been very heavily cut, said Lord Munster, and it was not possible to guarantee the immediate restoration of them when the war ended. It was, therefore, all the more important that a scheme for the further expansion and development of agriculture should be worked out now. The Government of India had not been negligent in their duty in this respect. He went on to give details of the various measures being adopted to increase food production and referred to the mission now in India to advise the Government on the possibilities of increased manufacture of chemical fertilisers, the target figure for which had been set at 350,000 tons a year. Other measures included the promotion of better methods of husbandry including proper crop rotation.

PLAN TO DOUBLE CROP YIELD

"A plan has been envisaged to double India's agricultural yield with the immediate object of increasing production by 50 per cent over the next ten years and ultimately by 100 per cent in 15 years. The capital cost of this immense plan is estimated at 1,000 crores with a recurring annual expenditure of Rs. 20 crores. After stating that the plan had been drawn up by a special committee appointed by the Advisory Board of the Imperial Council for Agricultural Research, Lord Munster

said that the plan aims at securing enough food of the right kind for every individual and improving the standard of living of the people. The Provincial Governments had been asked for criticisms and suggestions within the next three months, but the order of priority for the more important items of improvement is stated to be (1) irrigation by construction of tanks, wells and canals. (2) manure and manufacture of ammonium sulphate. (3) land improvement. (4) tillage (5) the establishment of seed farms and (6) the grading of cattle. Some of these suggestions in this big plan have already been put in hand by the Government of India's 'Grow More Food Campaign'. The Government of India has not been behind the Bombay Industrialists in thinking ahead and planning an agricultural economic policy which year by year can bring into production more and more areas of cultivable waste. It is true perhaps that progress in the political field may tarry awhile but if the standard of living and the general welfare of the Indian masses can be raised to higher levels than we shall at any rate have met one of the essential needs to political as well as industrial progress."

Lord Faringdon warmly welcomed Lord Munster's reply though he said he was still slightly anxious about the immediate position. No one would underrate the difficulty of rationing a population so vast as that of India. So far as the Government were coping with this monumental situation they were to be congratulated. He particularly welcomed the assurance that His Majesty's Government hoped in August and November to be able to offer the Indian Government additional shipping and he congratulated the Government on their agricultural policy.

Lord Samuel (Liberal) joined in welcoming Lord Munster's statement, which he considered one of the most important statements on India they had had in the Lords for many a long day. It had fully recognised in many quarters that the Indian problem was not merely and perhaps not primarily a political problem. The rapid increase in the population of India in recent years, which was still continuing had added to the anxiety which had been widely felt on account of the low standard of living of so many millions of the Indian population. Now the Government have taken in hand this fundamental problem with great vigour, energy and foresight, and if the large programme which Lord Munster had in mind was fully carried into effect, it would have a vast and the most beneficent effect upon the welfare of the population of India."

House of Commons—London—28th. July 1944

Amery Rejects Gandhi's Proposals

Opening the debate on India in the Commons on the 28th July 1944 Mr. *Pethick Lawrence*, Chief Labour speaker, said that those associated with him had, hitherto, hesitated to ask for a full debate because of the extreme delicacy of the situation and the feeling that a debate might injure, instead of improve the prospects of a settlement. He added: "Though it is still true that it would be unwise for recriminatory words to be uttered that might do harm, we feel that helpful and constructive words may be fruitful of great good, and I hope, very much, that only wise and statesmanlike words will emanate from all parts of this House to-day."

DISTRUST MUST BE REMOVED

"We all realise that super-imposed on the very inherent difficulties of this problem, there has been a psychological personal distrust, which has greatly aggravated the difficulties. Is it too much to hope that this debate will help to remove one at least of these distrust, by showing to the peoples of India and the outside world that all sections of this House are willing, and indeed anxious, that there should be Self-Government in India after the war is over."

Mr. *Pethick Lawrence*, proceeding, said that, how far India would continue as single and undivided, was one of the issues in dispute. Nevertheless, he was quite certain that it was of supreme importance that there should be an Indian representing the great Indian peoples in the comity of nations—an Indian with whom power of decisions rested, and in whom the world would see a country destined to play a vital and important part in the whole history of mankind. "We, in the House, cannot solve that problem, it rests with the Indian people themselves. We can only note with satisfaction that, in the last few months, Mr. Gandhi has made a gesture of approach to the other sections in India. In these subtle matters, it is very difficult for most of us, not completely immersed in Indian politics, to judge how far he has gone, but that he has made some move will not be denied. When things have reached an impasse, even a small move may be of supreme importance."

Mr. Pethick Lawrence said that there had been events of immense importance in the political sphere in India. Terrible famine in more than one quarter of India had brought home the great danger which India, with its rapidly increasing population, faced. Famines were frequent in old days, and it was one of the merits of the British administration that until recently, it had succeeded in keeping famines down. If the population of India was to increase at the present rate, then, undoubtedly, the problem of famine might recur. He hoped that, behind all the political differences, the problem of feeding the mass of population might bring the people of India together.

INDUSTRIALISTS' PLAN

Another great event in the economic sphere had been the turning of India from a debtor to a creditor country. From being a great debtor country, India had become one of the world's creditor countries, and that had a bearing on the economic future.

"Then there has been," Mr. Pethick Lawrence continued, "the publication of the Tata Pamphlet, sometimes called the Millionaires' Pamphlet. I think, it is the greatest of all steel plants in the empire and anything emanating from that firm might not be lightly brushed aside. It is not for me to express an opinion on the details with figures on a scale which has hardly hitherto been mentioned, but, undoubtedly, having recently been published, it provides a basis for discussion, which cannot afterwards be entirely put aside.

"Can India—can the peoples of India, poor, malaria-ridden, with poor standards of life, with an immensely high rate of mortality be brought into line with the progressive countries in the world economically? Whatever may be thought of the details of the Tata Plan, the suggestion, that is possible, is one of the great and arresting importance".

Mr. Pethick Lawrence continuing said that, all these things, taken together, showed that economics were likely to play an exceedingly important part in the future problems of India.

INDIA'S FREEDOM ESSENTIAL FOR WORLD PEACE

Referring to the military aspect of the Indian problem, he said, many things had happened to cast some doubt on the power of Britain alone to keep the peace in the Seven Seas, and in no part of the world was that more the case than in the neighbourhood of the great sub-continent of India. "As I see it, India is a great strategic bastion. I do not believe the peace of the whole world can be firmly assured, unless part of the strong pillars supporting that peace consists of India itself. Therefore, the whole question of the future of India does not concern even only the principal parties to the present discussion—this country, other parts of the British Empire and the peoples and parties in India. It also very deeply concerns all the nations of the world and, particularly, the United Nations, who desire to place the military basis of the world upon a fundamental basis which will stand the tempests and shocks of national desires and will give to the hard-pressed peoples a promise of real prosperity."

GOVT. MUST TAKE STEP FORWARD

Reverting to the political and the racial aspects of the whole problem, Mr. Pethick Lawrence said, "I suggest to Government that the time is coming, if it has not already arrived, when they can contribute to the solution by a new step forward. I notice Mr. Gandhi has said in his speech or writings, that 1944 is not 1942, and that many changes have taken place in objective facts and in his views regarding them in those intervening years. Mr. Gandhi is careful of his words and we can put such interpretation as we like upon them, but I would put forward this for the consideration of Mr. Amery and the House. We cannot expect people who are put into prison or kept in detention on political grounds to recant their past views. I believe, Mr. Amery realises, quite well, and I am sure the Viceroy also realises, with him, that we cannot expect these people to stand in a white sheet and admit the errors of the past. But I do believe, most men of sense—and those who are detained at the present time are men of sense, whatever mistakes it may be that they have made—will recognise, with Mr. Gandhi, that 1944 is not 1942, and that a great many things have changed in the meanwhile. One of those changes, of course, is that at the time the Cripps Offer was originally made, it looked to the outside world as though we were losing the war. There were few parts of the world who considered we had a dog's chance and, no doubt, in India, that view was as largely prevalent. It appeared to a number of Indians that we were drowning men, clutch-

ing at a straw and promising things to India which we had no intention afterwards of carrying out. That of course, was not the case, and I think, it is apparent to the peoples of India, to-day, that it was not the case. I am quite sure they recognise, as is recognised in other parts of the world, that, far from losing the war, we are going to win both the war in the West and the war in the East and that before a very long time. Therefore, the promise we made two years ago and still make, of Self-Government, is a very much more real and substantial thing now, than it ever was before and that alone, if there were not a number of other factors, must have a great influence on the minds of the members of the Congress Party. Mr. Gandhi has made use of words which might fairly be interpreted as a measure of goodwill and as a desire to come to a satisfactory solution both inside and outside India with regard to this problem."

LEADERS MUST BE SET FREE AT EARLY OPPORTUNITY

Pointing out that when a man was detained preventively, no term was set upon the length of his imprisonment. Mr. Pethick Lawrence said that it rested with the Executive authority, in such cases, to release him when the appropriate time came. "In the last resort, it is with the Secretary of State and the very wise man he has appointed to be the Viceroy, to decide the time and place and the arrangements suitable for his release. There are risks to be faced in releasing people who have been in detention. The risks are very real and he and the Viceroy will have to weigh up those risks; but there are also risks involved in not releasing people, and those risks are very grave indeed—the risk of permanently alienating men who are not guilty of what are described as moral turpitude, but who have been detained for political reasons. I am quite sure he will not ignore the grave risk of continuing detention, however much he may see the risk of bringing it to an end."

Mr. Pethick Lawrence added that it would be quite impossible to make an important pronouncement on their release on this occasion, but he hoped Mr. Amery would not feel it necessary, as a result of what might be said during the debate, to make a positive adverse statement which might tend to make the situation worse. "We do ask them to bear in mind the great importance of choosing a suitable and early opportunity of bringing into a life of liberty, men who must, in the end, be parties to the agreement made between ourselves, them and other sections of opinion. We look forward to a wise decision being taken."

Concluding, Mr. Pethick Lawrence said, let us get rid of old distrust on all sides, let us think of the future—the future of this great country, containing in its population one-fifth of the whole human race, a great country which has been brought from its somewhat anarchic conditions to its present great position, largely through the medium of this country, and a country which we here have the power to help to speed forward on its path for the future. I believe we can do that. I believe we should do that, this country will show the great British spirit of Democracy, and that we shall set an example to the world which will long be remembered—the greatest tribute to the genius for statecraft of the British race.

"FORMER ROADS LEADING NOWHERE"

Mr. *Walter Elliott* (Conservative), said that the fact seemed to stand in the present situation, "was that they were going nowhere along the former roads. The urgency of the problem has been shown by the Bengal famine and still more by the situation underlying the Bengal famine. Another vital fact in the position to-day was that it had moved Mr. Gandhi to a momentous decision. He had decided to recognise the principle of partition. His views did not differ greatly from the Cripps Proposals. A great step forward has been made. But these proposals could not be left simply kicking about. What Commission was going to have greater knowledge or better leaders than Parliament? What greater jury was there than the Imperial Parliament to sit and consider a proposal brought before it by, say, the present Government? He said that the Pakistan solution suffered from over-simplicity and a dual solution was a solution to perpetuate antagonism.

Lord Winterton (Conservative) interjected: "It is not a question whether it is right or wrong. It is put forward by a vast number of the Indian people and has to be considered in conjunction with Mr. Gandhi's offer."

Mr. *Elliott* continuing said: "The essence of the Pakistan scheme is the perpetual subjection of the minority to the majority which it cannot change by any voting process. That is to produce an impossible situation and some means of escape must be found from it—whether a dualist solution or more than a dual solution—the setting up, it may be, of four or five units."

Mr. Elliot said that he was more attracted by a solution such as the River Basin scheme, which suggested four Great units, and there had been other suggestions including the Five-State scheme. "But", he added "on the principle of two or more than two, it seems to me that two is a more dangerous solution than many, because two seems to make for antagonism, which would be exacerbated more and more as years go on.

"As for the States, they want to be free to start Dominions in their own right—development and administration will be their main tasks—to put through enormous changes to handle the bringing of industrial revolution to millions of people. I believe the greater their powers, the quicker will be the solution. The essence of Dominion Status is Responsible Government.

"People talk, as if this were the partition and vivisection of the live body of India. But if you can get units of the human race to live comfortably with each other by the hundred million, that is sufficient for a miracle. We have seen Iceland declaring that there is no one in the world, not even Denmark, she could live with and setting up a pocket republic in the Arctic. This is the way things are developing in the world. Marshal Stalin is developing armies and Foreign Offices in different parts of the Soviet Union. This is the way in which the world will move. So, I would not put limits on the powers of the States. Regarding Finance and Customs, they must not be subject to one central bank and locked up inside one customs union. It was the lack of a Custom Union which enabled Britain to live in amity with Australia, South Africa, Canada and New Zealand. I suggest that His Majesty's Government should announce, in the next King's speech, an India Bill which this House can get to work on and which will enable advances to be made."

DEFENCE PROBLEM—NO BAR TO ENDING DEADLOCK

Dealing with the question of Defence, Mr. Elliot said: "All over the world, we have had to work out the relations between the bases of what we may call an Imperial or what may be a World Force of the future and the rights of local inhabitants. Defence is a big problem and cannot be treated simply on the basis of the Indian Army. I am quite sure much bigger factors will have to be brought into consideration. Again, I do not think difficulty about that should justify a deadlock in which nearly one-fifth of the world's population are locked on a dead centre, where half of them die of hunger before the age of 22."

Sir George Schuster (Liberal National) declared:

"I do hope that, although we recognise the communal difficulties in India and the need for devising new constitutional forms which may allow to each of the communities a measure of freedom in their own administration, on which I feel sure they will insist, yet I hope we shall say nothing which will give a push forward to a move for the complete breaking up of India. The unification of India is, perhaps, one of our greatest achievements. Let us not, at this stage, adopt the attitude that we must face a breaking up of that unity. It would be disastrous to have anything which prevented India operating as one unit in the security structure of the world. I know of the difficulties in achieving agreement among Indian parties, but I would not throw up the sponge yet."

Agreement between parties was what we had to try to achieve. To suggest, at this stage, that we should step in again with a new Government of India Bill before they got together to consider their own future, was dangerous and not a timely suggestion.

"NO BELIEVER IN A HALFWAY HOUSE"

Sir George Schuster added that he had never really believed in a halfway house being satisfactory or possible. A great deal had to be done to associate leading Indians with the Government of India. A constitutional change unwritten but none the less real had taken place. But all our attempts to bring the two main political parties into participation in the government had failed. All that we had been able to do was to ask them to come into a Coalition Government. To ask political parties whose main plank was opposition to British rule, to join a Coalition Government under a British Viceroy, was to ask a great deal.

The first of the tasks before us was to concentrate on carrying the war to a successful conclusion. The second was to do everything in our power to help the Indian parties to get together and join in realistic constitutional discussions round a table, so that they might get on with preparing for the final constitutional plan; and the third was the use of the remaining period of our own responsibility to prepare the way for the introduction of those economic programmes without which there was not the slightest chance of maintaining either the international stability or inter-

nal security of India or fulfilling the advancement of the genuine welfare of the Indian people. Sir George Schuster hoped that the United States and the British Governments would do all they could to give the necessary priority to further shipment of food grains to India.

Regarding Finance, he said: "I feel grave doubts whether our policy in this war by which, maintaining a fixed rate of exchange, we have expended vast sums of money in India and Egypt, has not contributed more than was really necessary to the inflationary price rise which has taken place".

CONSTITUTIONAL DISCUSSIONS MUST BE INITIATED

Sir George Schuster hoped that Parliament would indicate very strong support for the Viceroy in his efforts to help the Indian parties to get together and that it would welcome any constructive measures that may be taken. "I feel Mr. Gandhi's recent utterances have at least given a gleam of new hope. I regard the Viceroy as a man of courage and generous liberal spirit, and I hope, we shall say nothing to embarrass him or hamper his discretion in any way. If he, in his discretion, thinks the time has come to take a bold step and release political prisoners in order that there may be a start with a full political discussion, then, I would give him my support."

Sir George Schuster explained that he was referring to confidential talks designed to prepare the way for the more formal proceedings of a Constituent Assembly. Saying that the millions of Indians in the armed forces were entitled to be heard, and it was one of Britain's chief responsibilities to see that they got a hearing, Sir George Schuster added: "I would still press urgently that the time has come for starting a process of discussion, which we should do all in our power to promote."

Proceeding, Sir George Schuster asked: "Will Mr. Jinnah be prepared with plans to show how a Mussalman State will be set up? It will not be any good for him saying: 'I will fight rather than accept. India in the future cannot be governed by opposition nor can the welfare of the people of India be provided for merely by parties which say 'no'. I want them to realise that we, on our side, mean business and that the day is near when each must shoulder his part in the responsibility and all parties must fit in together."

ECONOMY POLICY

Sir George Schuster added that the third British task for the remaining period of their responsibility was to prepare the way for the economic policy. Economic problems should take the front place in the political discussions, and the political parties should concern themselves, more and more with these matters and less and less with barren communal controversies. That was why he himself welcomed the Bombay or Tata Plan. There was a special opportunity for the Government of India to collaborate with Indians and even with those who for political reasons had not been able to join with the Government. There should be as wide a collaboration as possible and minimum controversial rivalry. If a preliminary All-Party Conference on the constitutional issue could be started, there might be, as a part of it or parallel to it, an all-party conference on economic lines. In this co-operation in the economic field, it was not merely a question of what the Government of India could do. We in this country had also a part to play. He believed that there was really a bright prospect for true co-operation between this country and India in India's industrial development. There should be a complete frankness in our approach to these matters, and the unreserved recognition that Indians had the right to be masters of their own destiny; this destiny in turn depended upon industrial and economic development. We should beg of Mr. Gandhi, Mr. Jinnah or any other leader to turn from manoeuvring any clever formula to the consideration of the basis of an agreement so that we, with good conscience, could transfer constitutional responsibilities.

INDIA MUST RANK AMONG THE GREAT POWERS

Finally, Sir George Schuster said that the structure of world security could not be other than insecure, unless the Eastern half was strong, but the Eastern half could not be strong if India was divided and a centre of chaos. Sir George Schuster added that he desperately wanted to see India take her place as one of the great nations of the world. When people spoke of the Four Great Powers in the world including China, it hurt his feelings that India should not be mentioned. China could be a great power for the peace of the world, but India ought to stand forward equal with China.

Mr. Price (Labour) did not think that Government should take any very definite line until Mr. Gandhi's views had developed further. He thought that the Govern-

ment of India should rally opinion in India on the economic issue and the raising of the standard of living.

Mr. Price deprecated the breaking up of India into a number of Dominions—a kind of bastard Pakistan. India must be kept an economic unit. He advocated a big campaign for the education of the Indian peasants and hoped that India would obtain real independence within the British Commonwealth.

DIVISION OF INDIA OPPOSED

Prof. Hill (Conservative) stressing the urgency of the Indian problem said: "India is living on the edge of a precipice. The factor of safety is so low that any disturbance, even a comparatively minor one, may send her over the edge. I have grave doubts about the wisdom of urging that consideration should be given to partition. Devolution, yes; Self-Government as we have in this country within limited regions. But partition, having five separate regions in India, could only lead to a Balkanisation of that great peninsula. I would like to emphasise the frightful penalties which would result from the disaster if it occurred. The machinery in India is heavily over-loaded, and if we were to take liberties with it, by allowing disorder or a bloody revolution, as some people lightly speak of it, then, the disaster would not be a minor one, but a major catastrophe. This is no time to talk lightly of a disaster in India as a possible way of solving her difficulties."

INDIAN INDUSTRIALISTS' VISIT

Referring to the forthcoming visit of Indian Industrialists this Autumn, Prof. Hill hoped that a group of Indian scientific men would also visit Britain. "There is a chance", he said, "of co-operating with Indian industry if we show courage, generosity and vision, but the alternative to our not showing those qualities is not that Indian industry will not develop, but that Indians will turn to America and not to us for help. They would rather turn to us and if we can help them, they will co-operate with us, but only on some terms which seem to them reasonable."

Prof. Hill said that we had everything to gain in the end by the kind of co-operation that Indian industry would like and would be very willing to offer. He urged that every encouragement possible should be given to the development of Radio as a means of education in India.

ECONOMIC FLIGHT OF THE MASSES

Regarding population, food and health, he said that reference has been made to his recent comments on the subject. He admitted he had tried deliberately "to make people's flesh creep". The situation was not one which could be tolerated for a long time. The solution of the difficulties in India depend upon health, food, population, agriculture, and education. They would not yield simply to political dialectics or manufacture of political machinery. They required deliberate co-operation all-round, deliberate thinking and hard work.

Dealing with the Bengal famine, he said that the fundamental reason for it was that the factor for safety in India was almost zero and tended to be held there all the time by excessive reproduction. He deprecated endeavours to place the blame upon the Secretary of State for India or anybody else. The question was what our friends in India and ourselves were going to do about these problems. "If they do not do something and do it pretty quickly, I can see nothing but calamity, misery and poverty ahead."

MUST HAND OVER GOVT. TO INDIANS

Prof. Hill said that he was wholly in favour of repeating in India, when conditions allowed, the experiment which had always been amazingly successful hitherto except in Eire where people's eyes were always turned backwards. That was why he was in favour of the experiment of handing over to Indians, Government including the defence of the country. It was an act of faith, and we could not be sure of the result. If it failed, that would be too bad, but it would not be our fault. Mere continuation of the present system would certainly fail anyhow. If it succeeded, India might become, after a few years, a proud and contented member of the British Commonwealth.

Prof. Hill, continuing, said that if the House made it perfectly clear that Britain was determined to see that the best possible chance was given for the improvement of the life of Indian people, that would do more good than if one argued for ever about the political machinery. "India is ripe now for a great technological development. I can see little hope of India having greater prosperity apart from going with the stream of modern life and seeking the prosperity in that kind

of development. The essential condition for success is a reasonable degree of economic and political unity."

As regards Defence, there must be external security because if India achieved high industrial prosperity but had no adequate unified defence, she would be an easy prey for any aggressor. Thoughtful Indians knew this and realised that the Balkanisation of India would leave her defenceless against external aggression.

Mr. Clement Davies (Liberal) recalled that he had listened to every debate on India in the House for the last 15 years and said he did not remember during all those years such a note of unanimity as marked the speeches in to-day's debate — such single current of opinion all flowing one way. "It seems to be summed up like this: There is everywhere not only a genuine desire but a genuine anxiety to see these problems settled satisfactorily. There is also this: Let there be no recriminations of any sort. Let the dead past bury its dead and let us look forward to the future. With goodwill and co-operation, a settlement can be achieved." On the political side there was complete unanimity that India was entitled to and should have Self-Government at the earliest possible date. On the social and economic side, there were two problems—one an immediate problem with which the British Government had to deal because at the present time they were trustees for the Indian people and the other that could only be settled by a long-term policy. The long-term policy could only be satisfactorily settled by the Indians themselves under their own Government. Mr. Davies continued, "Britain has a record with regard to India of which she is entitled to be justly proud. I wonder if, some other nation, had fate so decided it, had to co-operate with India as Britain has had to do for 200 years or more, what would have been the position of India to-day. Britain has brought immense benefits to India, toleration and understanding and she is trying to inculcate law and order. It has always been our policy that every nation should look after its own affairs and stand upon its own feet and enjoy its own liberty and that moment is coming when we can say, not goodbye but 'good luck, the responsibility is yours'. Let us forget mistakes and try to see whether we cannot work together for the general benefit of Indians and the world."

"BRING INDIA AS INDIA INTO THE WAR"

Mr. Clement Davies said that everyone would like to see the end of the political deadlock and he proceeded to put forward his own personal suggestions in the hope that these might lead to new negotiations. The first thing was to bring India as India into the war. The South-east Asia Command should be extended to include India and the Indian seas. There should be an Allied Council for South-east Asia composed of representatives of the principal Governments concerned, namely, the British Government, China and the United States and India herself should provide a representative for the Council. Representatives of others interested like the Netherlands, Indo-China and naturally the Union of South Africa and Australia and New Zealand should be consulted. They would be appointed in name by the Governor General but after consultation with either parties or leaders or whoever it might be. He suggested the Governor-General might invite the leaders of principal representative parties to submit the names of the representatives whom they desire to sit on the Council. The Governor-General would function as the constitutional head of popular Government but holding in himself special responsibility in relation to the armed forces and in respect of Crown relations and by virtue of his office, he would be a member of the South-east Asia Allied Council and of the All-India Defence Committee.

With regard to the relationship between India and London, the Secretary of State for India would become more important in his duties than to-day. He would occupy a much more important position than that occupied by the Secretary of State for the Dominions as between the Dominions and the Home Government. The Government of India would be no longer represented on the War Cabinet because it would be represented in the South-East Asia Command. There should be provision made for the protection of minorities, for determining what was reserved legislation, for guarantees for the minorities and for the setting up of a rational tribunal to settle any differences. After stating that his plan was merely a suggestion, Mr. Clement Davies added, "The idea I would have in mind would be something like the United States with individual provinces which would be sovereign ones, reserving to themselves full right but by transferring to the central federal authority such rights as they agree should be exercised by the federal authority. There should then be drawn up a constitution which is to bind

each one of them with complete right in any state to contract itself out. What we are anxious about is that this deadlock should end as quickly as possible. We are anxious to seize this opportunity now presented to us after this tremendous world fight of extending to India a chance for her to settle her own affairs for the benefit of their own people.

Mr. Sorensen (Labour) said that they were confronted in India with something much more than could be settled by offering them more food. In the debate members of all parties seemed to stress the economic side. He would issue this warning, "We must be very careful not to leave the impression that we are now to be concerned very much with India's economic problems in order to sidetrack India from her demand for political liberty". Mr. Sorensen emphasised that it was impossible to separate economic plans from political development and political freedom and proceeded, "For good or ill, Mr. Gandhi whom many have criticised in this House and who certainly is not an infallible person, nevertheless, is recognised as being in India not a man above the average, but one of the great souls of the Indian race. Even those frankly hostile to Mr. Gandhi, nevertheless respect him as one of the few great men the world has thrown up in recent years. Even Mr. Rajagopalachari recognises the outstanding significance of Mr. Gandhi. I am glad Lord Wavell, with such advice as he had had, has released Mr. Gandhi not only on the ground of ill-health, but I hope for other reasons as well. I hope that that release will be followed before long with the release of other Congress leaders. Mr. Gandhi's views on non-violence did not commend themselves either to members of this House or members of the Congress whereas Pandit Nehru has always made it perfectly clear that whilst he will accept non-violence as an expedient for internal political education, as far as external affairs are concerned, he is prepared to use arms in the defence of his country against the Japanese.

"Therefore, from the standpoint of the great majority of this House, Mr. Gandhi is much more dangerous of the two, but he is released while Pandit Nehru is still detained. I cannot understand the logic of this matter. Having released one who is looked upon as an arch agitator, we could undertake the far smaller risk of letting the other be free as well. To release that portion of the politically conscious life of India which was now gagged and bound might perform a tremendous service to India, to ourselves and to those who wished to see the gulf that separated this country and India bridged. We should be grateful to men like Mr. Gandhi for stirring India out of its stagnation. We must see that at one and the same time, India had a great opportunity of economic advance, but not at the expense of political advance.

PLEA FOR AN ENCOURAGING RESPONSE

It seemed there was now a hopeful sign. To throw Mr. Gandhi's suggestions on one side was not doing sufficient justice to the fact that Mr. Gandhi himself might have altered his position. Whether he had or not, here was a sign that the deadlock that previously seemed insoluble and unbreakable was giving way. Mr. Sorensen said that, in a cable to-day referring to the House of Lords debate on India, Mr. Gandhi had said, "I must confess that I am disappointed". Referring to his proposal Mr. Gandhi had further said: "If it is not accepted as the basis for friendly discussion and if permission is not given to me to see the members of the Working Committee who alone can speak with authority, then I must reluctantly come to the conclusion that the British Government do not want a fair solution of the deadlock."

Mr. Gandhi would have liked to have seen a warmer and more encouraging response. "Government could, if it liked to-day when Mr. Amery replies, give some positive indication that they are glad to see that Mr. Gandhi made these proposals to the Muslim League and that they hope the Muslim League will respond". Mr. Sorensen continuing said, "We ought not to ride the high horse in this matter. The opportunity of the present time seemed to be an encouraging one. I make a plea to the Government and to Mr. Amery who is firmly in earnest in this matter. Mr. Amery should strike a note which would bring forth from India an equal response; let him emphasise that the situation is more hopeful than it was, and that Mr. Gandhi is at least opening the door.

Mr. Godfrey Nicholson (Conservative) maintained that the prevailing evil in India was political uncertainty. We had to consider whether the Cripps method alone could remain the only means by which we hoped to bring India to freedom. There prevailed in India to-day a sense of being in complete vacuum. This was not a deadlock but a whole series of incompatibilities. Speaking of the effort towards solution of "this deep problem", Mr. Nicholson said, "If we are to succeed, we must

carry India with us and if we are to carry India with us, there must be no doubt about our intentions. I fear there is doubt and that hope deferred has made the heart sick. Sooner or later—I do not wish to hurry Government—we shall have to make a re-statement of our intentions. There is one quality above all needed in our relations with India and that is courage—courage to carry through in the face of misrepresentation. I am not a pessimist. I do not believe British and Indian statesmanship are anywhere near bankruptcy. If we hold the door open for the resumption, firstly, of Provincial Self-Government, and for some form of Central Government in the course of time, then Indians will come forward, who will take the reins and take up office. Do not let us talk as if there were an appalling deadlock. Give the situation time. Keep the door open. Let us decide in our minds what we mean by freedom and what we mean by the Cripps Offer. Let us make up our mind what we conceive to be our duty, make known our decision to the world and have the courage to carry it through”.

Mr. *Harvey* (Independent) described the debate as most remarkable, adding, “I have never been in any debate on India when we have had the same atmosphere and if we could only get our friends in India to realise that, it would be a great thing for the future relations between India and this country, and for internal development in India itself.” Mr. *Harvey* continued, “There is hope in the fact that Mr. Gandhi has come forward with concrete suggestions to meet the claims of the Muslim League. I hope we may have some response from Mr. Jinnah and the Working Committee of the Muslim League which is meeting to-morrow. Mr. Jinnah is a remarkable man and I hope he may feel that the eyes of many are on him at this moment and that the people in England are looking to him to make great steps from his point of view to meet the needs of his country. He will do a great service not only to Muslims but to India and the whole future civilisation if he can help to bring about some measure of understanding”. Mr. *Harvey* said they wanted to see every step for co-operation encouraged both on this side and in India. On the release of the Congress leaders, he added his appeal remarking, “It is surely a tragic thing that a man like Pandit Nehru, with his extraordinary ability, with his deep interest in the welfare of China and Russia, as well as the welfare of India, should be eating his heart out, unable to take part in constructive work for the good of his country, the good of the United Nations and the good of the whole world. We may say it is his fault that he does not come out, but I do hope that the way will be made open for him”.

Appealing for a fresh start, Mr. *Harvey* said: “Let us cease quarrelling over what has happened in the past and look forward together to the future in which England may co-operate in fellowship with India for the good of the whole world”.

Sir John Wardlaw Milne (Conservative) said, “Quite frankly, I am considerably disturbed and somewhat surprised at the tone of the debate, to-day. I am the last person who wishes to indicate we are not more than anxious to co-operate with everybody in India. I have heard that sentence ‘the necessity for co-operation’ at least 20 times to-day. We must deal with these matters in a practical way. It is no use continually getting up here and saying ‘Let us co-operate’ (hear, hear). Surely to goodness the whole world knows we are more than anxious to co-operate with India. Co-operation had been offered.

“The Cripps Plan—the plan which no nation in the world has ever put to the country with which it had relations like we have had with India—that plan amazed me with its generosity and to say now that what is wanted is for us to show our co-operation seems to be begging the question.” Referring to the statement attributed to Mr. *Rajagopalachari* that he “challenged British statesmen to produce an alternative plan”, *Sir John Wardlaw Milne* said, “Is that the best that can now be produced from India that again the British Parliament should be asked to do it. I do not know any better scheme than something like the 1935 Act because as conditions are in India, to-day, whatever they may be to-morrow or ten years hence, no one in this House and no thinking person in this country would be prepared to hand over India to one faction alone and that is what is demanded of us.”

He welcomed Mr. Gandhi's overtures to the Muslims and hoped negotiations with Mr. Jinnah would continue although they appeared at the moment to have broken down. He welcomed the Bombay Plan because he welcomed anything that would make for economic development of India, but let them realise the position: “Here you have the President of the Indian Federation of Labour rejecting the Bombay Plan altogether and claiming it a plan to exploit Indian workers for the benefit of Indian industrialists. They want self-rule for India, the same as Mr.

Gandhi does. But they do not want Mr. Gandhi's plan. I do not think the Indian people are such fools that they like us to get up and say 'Oh yes, we all want to co-operate.'

Sir John Wardlaw Milne continued, "What we have to realise is that it is impossible for this country to do anything that will really help beyond what we have already done and that the real move must come from India. Is there anything we can ask Mr. Amery to do, is there any declaration we can ask him to make that has not been made by this Government on behalf of this country? We want India to have her independence if she likes. What more can we offer her?"

Mr. *Montagu* (Labour) asserted it was about time the people of this country, including the Labour movement, woke up to the fact that there was a working class in India and there was organised trade union movement. The Depressed classes workers, organised and unorganised, and the untouchables were never so much as mentioned throughout these debates. 'It was an exceedingly deplorable thing because, after all, the question of the political future of India has to do with the enfranchisement, some day or other, of the vast majority of 400 million people.

Surely Britain was entitled to ask any political party in India what it proposes to do, what guarantees it had for the rights of minorities. Mr. *Montagu* said that to call the Congress with about one fifth of the membership of the Trade Union Congress in Britain so representative that all reins of Government were to be handed to it was not realism at all as far as the politics of India were concerned and its relationship to this country.

The *Earl of Winterton* (Conservative) said that in all the speeches during the debate there has been hardly a single reference to the position of the Muslim Party. The Congress had membership of no more than half a million and it was fantastic to talk about these people as if they led all India. "How can we expect Indians to take us seriously when we talk nonsense of that sort?" *Earl of Winterton* asked. Mr. *Jinnah* had said again and again and so had the supporters of the Muslim League that Congress derived its principal financial support from wealthy industrialists. We had no objection to that on grounds of principle. The Muslim League had made a further point that many of these employers of labour were pretty poor employers. "It is perfectly true", said *Earl Winterton*, "that both the Muslim League and the Congress are going to meet in the near future with a growing opposition from organised labour in India. At present, it was only a little cloud on the horizon but it might become a mighty thunderstorm and sweep away the Congress as it stands." It is not for the commons to make suggestions. It was for Indians and Muslims to come to an agreement. Mr. Gandhi had come to step forward to try and meet the Muslim League because his position was not so strong as it was *vis à vis* the Muslim League. If there was such an agreement, he thought we should make a clean cut after the war and the Dominion Status right out. He could visualise three or four Dominions in the general sense of the word bound together by some customs union in India.

He could see such Dominions entering into arrangements with us over matters of defence. What we required was not a great army based on India but air and sea bases. *Earl Winterton* said he thought some States would attach themselves to these four or five units and the British should try to protect their interests.

Sir Stanley Reed (Conservative) said, "There is a move from a purely sterile atmosphere of non-co-operation, civil disobedience and "quit India" and there is recognition of the fundamental right of the Mohammedan community for the security of their own religion, their own future and their own economic status. This is essential to any Indian settlement but these tendencies must be developed in India itself by Indians. They cannot be overrun by a dictator from this House or this country. When that settlement comes, it will not be just a settlement between Mr. Gandhi representing the Congress and Mr. *Jinnah* representing the Muslim League. There will be 60 millions of Scheduled Classes, a great army of trade unionists, a growing body of organised labour in every direction—all are equally entitled to full consideration and security under the constitution and we must see that they are respected."

Sir Stanley Reed added that we were moving very rapidly and getting very near to the date on which, under our pledge, we would have to establish a constitutional assembly. made without preparation was bound to stumble either into an unworkable improvisation or into an alleged settlement which was no settlement at all.

Mr. *Leopold Amery*, Secretary of State for India, replying said, that the debate had been most interesting. He complimented Mr. *Pethick Lawrence* on this very wise

and thoughtful speech with which he set the note for the whole discussion. "I do agree", Mr. Amery added, "with my Rt. Hon. friend (Mr. Elliott) that a division of anything into two may be more difficult to reconcile with ultimate co-operation than a division into a number of units. I agree with him, and indeed, it underlies not only the present situation in India, but any constitution which may be formed that economic development to be effective, must have the support not merely of passive acquiescence but involve something in the nature of patriotism. Therefore, to get the economic development of India as a whole, you must have behind it something like Indian patriotism. On the other hand, he held out South America to us as an example for the solution of the Indian problem. I confess, I was not altogether able to follow him. After all, when the present nations of South America came into existence over 100 years ago, that continent, nearly five times as large as India, was an empty continent; not only empty of population but, even more important, empty to history, with all its memories, conflicts and interlocking ambitions. The colonists who revolted from their European mother-countries were scattered along the coastlines. They had no serious frontier difficulties. They had no communications which would enable an effective central government."

"Now, Sir", continued Mr. Amery, "If we want a nearer parallel to India, let us come nearer home to Europe and more particularly to those regions of Central and Eastern Europe which have not been shaped by long history into clearly separated nations, but where Teuton and Slav, Moslems and Christians, have been fighting it out for a thousand years; and where the disappearance of two great autocracies, the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy and the Ottoman Empire, have left behind not peace and progress, but two terrible conflicts for which perhaps, the only ultimate solution is some possible form of European unity. Therefore, I should hesitate to say that we should, of deliberate purpose, jettison that Indian unity, which geography and 250 years of British influence have brought about.

RIGHT OF UNITS TO SEPARATE UNDER CRIPPS SCHEME

"But it is just this inherent and unescapable complexity of the Indian situation", Mr. Amery observed, "which both precludes rigid unity and yet forbids complete severance. Though His Majesty's Government was bound to address itself to this when it framed those proposals that the Minister for Aircraft Production took out with him to India just over two years ago, the whole objective of those proposals was to enable India, after this war, to attain complete freedom to unfettered control of her own destiny in the world, whether within the free partnership of the British Commonwealth or even without it, and an agreed constitution of her own devising. It was obvious to us that only under an agreed constitution could at any rate some measure of Indian unity be preserved. Any constitution which was based on the coercion of such a powerful element as the Moslem majority in North-Western and North-Eastern India clearly could not have lasted, but would have been bound to break down in eruption and civil war. It was in order to secure unity by agreement and compromise, and not that we favoured partition, that we insisted on the right of the predominantly Muslim provinces—a right already conceded to the States—to stand outside any constitutional scheme which imperilled their culture and way of life or lowered their status. The same stipulation made it equally clear that we were not prepared to make non-agreement an excuse for indefinite postponement of Indian freedom.

VICEROY'S RESERVE POWERS

"It is against this background of the indispensable conditions for the major problem of India's future constitution that we were further prepared," Mr. Amery continued, "for a bold and immediate advance by inviting party leaders to form the proposed Indian Government. Such a Government would necessarily have been under the existing constitution, that is to say, subject to the Viceroy's reserve power—a latent power that has never yet been exercised in the course of the last four years—but essential not only as a guarantee of continued loyal support of the war effort, but also as an actual guarantee to the minorities not only to a concrete and powerful element like the Moslems, but also other elements not so powerful as the Moslems. It is the only guarantee that a Government, once in power, would not use that vote to prejudice the constitutional future to their detriment.

"BRITAIN STANDS BY THE CRIPPS PROPOSALS"

"A member asked for an assurance that the promises we made two years ago still hold good. I will readily give that assurance. His Majesty's Government stand by the proposals that we then laid before India, and before the world, in all

their generous amplitude. We shall stand by them in the hour of victory as we did in the days of adversity. The shifting fortunes of war have played no part in their inception and they cannot be limited in their fulfilment. For the sake of India's peace, we must stand by the indispensable conditions which accompany them. In answer to Sir John Wardlaw Milne, I can say that, on that main issue, there is no other declaration we can make.

GANDHI'S OFFER TO MUSLIMS

"This brings me to Mr. Gandhi's recent gesture. The House will remember that, so far as India's future constitution is concerned, Mr. Rajagopalachari was the only Congress leader at that time prepared to admit the justice of our stipulation, that an agreed constitution could only be arrived at if the predominantly Muslim provinces were free to adhere or stand out. How far the formula is likely to be acceptable to the Moslem League which, I understand, is meeting in the next few days or, indeed, to Moslem or, for that matter, to Hindu opinion generally, is not yet clear. What is clear to my mind is that neither meticulous criticism nor uncritical commendation of Mr. Gandhi's proposal in this House will help what we all have at heart, namely, the removal of what is undoubtedly the greatest stumbling block in the way of an agreed foundation for India's constitutional future. We shall be wise to be content with the fact that an approach has been made".

GANDHI'S STATEMENTS

Mr. Amery continued: "Apart from that particular issue which affects the future, Mr. Gandhi has, through press interviews and statements recently, expressed his views as to what he conceives to be the immediate solution. These statements are not free from obscurities and reservations on particular points. I do not need to go into those, for they are, in any case, all bound up with and dependant upon one central demand upon which he does not leave any room for ambiguity. That is, the demand for the immediate recognition of India's independence under a Provisional Government, in which the only powers reserved to the Viceroy are those which deal with the control of active military operations. All reserve powers indispensable to ensure that the various functions of administration are co-ordinate with war effort and also those indispensable to safeguard the constitutional position for minority elements—all those are to disappear. Well, that is, after all, just the demand upon which the negotiations with the Congress broke down two years ago and were bound to break down. I will only invite the House to read Mr. Gandhi's statements side by side with those then issued by Congress leaders, to see that, in this respect, at any rate, there has been no real advance. Indeed, Mr. Gandhi now adds the further stipulation that India is to bear no part of the cost of her own defence. So long as those are the basis for his proposals, they obviously do not form even the starting point for a profitable discussion either with Lord Wavell or with the interned Congress leaders. They are, in no sense, a response to the Viceroy's invitation to Mr. Gandhi to produce constructive proposals. All we can do is to continue to hope that the time will come when we shall have before us proposals which will conform to conditions not arbitrarily imposed by us, but which are indispensable both because India is at war and because no agreed future constitution is yet in sight."

SOUTH-EAST ASIA COMMAND

Mr. Amery said that Mr. Clement Davies' detailed plan for an immediate solution of the Indian problem was based on bringing India under the South-East Asia Command. "I must remind the house that the South-East Asia Command and the India Command were one, up to not long ago, and were separated because it was more than one organisation could manage to deal with both operational needs and the immense problems of administration involved in making India a recruiting and supply base for those operational needs. The operational needs are indeed already under international control. They are directed in the first instance, by the Combined Operations Staff in Washington. They have, as their background, the Pacific Council which, at the times when it has met in this country, has been attended by representatives of India on the War Cabinet. None of these things can get away from the fact that, India, as a base, is a single administrative unity in which all elements of Government must come together and, in so far as it is such a unity, then, the essential difficulties which I have already referred to in connection with the proposals by Sir Stafford Cripps, are still there and are, I fear, not brought appreciably nearer solution by what Mr. Clement Davies suggests.

INDIAN ARMY EXPANSION

"However if the deadlock in the political field has not yet been resolved, there are other fields in which India has made great advances as well as encountered grave difficulties. Political leaders and their followers do not, after all, cover the whole infinite varied range of Indian life. Fighting forces too are in India and they embody a long glorious tradition of valour and loyalty. India's army has expanded from a nucleus of some 200,000 to over two million—the largest voluntary army in the world (cheers). That expansion has involved the stupendous task of equipment, supply organisation and training which could never have been accomplished without the resource and ingenuity of all concerned, British and Indian. No one has stated more emphatically than Lord Wavell, what he owes to his Indian divisions and Indian staffs in that first campaign in which, against an overwhelming army, he saved the Middle East and with it the Allied cause.

Indian divisions had, he said, won victories from the mountains of Abyssinia to the Apennines and from Damascus to the Arno. "Those who fought with them and those who fought against them have alike acknowledged their quality. Indian troops have held for the Allied cause the whole vast area of Iraq and Persia. They bore the brunt of our ill-fated retreats in Malaya and Burma and, to-day, they are effectively repaying old scores against the Japanese on the Burma front". Apart from that, there were some 200,000 serving overseas. In this unity in arms, racial and other differences between Indians and Europeans were transcended in one common brotherhood. There was no racial distinction in the army to-day. Some 35 per cent of its officers, a steadily increasing portion, were Indians. Those Indian officers have stood up well to the exacting demand of modern war. Mr. Amery said, "Some are already in command units and qualifying by their war experience, for higher commands in future years. Has not that fact a bearing on the underlying condition of India's future freedom, namely, acquisition of power to defend herself by her own forces under her own leaders? Has it no bearing on her future that, on demobilisation, something like half a million Indians will return to civilian life, who have been trained to technical service during war." That applied equally to the Royal Indian Navy and the Indian Air Force.

Mr. Amery gave figures showing the growth of Indian land, air and sea forces, and spoke of the immense contribution India had made to the Allied cause by the provision of munitions and military equipment and stores of all kinds.

STRAIN ON INDIA'S ECONOMIC STRUCTURE

Mr. Amery continued, "Measured in terms of money, the material contribution of India has already amounted to some 500 million sterling. It has been an invaluable contribution. It has made a great contribution to India's industrial capacity and has also involved a great strain upon India's relatively primitive economic structure, upon her limited transport facilities and not less upon that mere handful of senior civil servants, British and Indian. How they have stood up to their work over all these years is a thing this House ought to recognise. That economic strain was enormously accentuated after Japan entered the war and by the ever-increasing difficulty of furnishing India with imported consumer goods to match the ever-growing production for outside and the development of her industries for war purposes. That steadily increasing disparity between expenditure and consumption for the first two and a half years was so held in check that the wholesale prices only rose by 50 per cent. After the entry of Japan into the war, prices advanced in the course of 12 months by something like a 100 per cent, accentuated not only by the lack of goods but by lost confidence headed by a civil disturbance. It is to meet that situation that the Government of India has taken very vigorous measures over wide fields.

Mr. Amery mentioned also that India, in the last two years, had borrowed £326 millions internally, a sum by no means contemptible when judged by the extra-ordinarily limited surplus wealth which existed in India. Everything had been done to increase the import of consumer goods, including quantities of standard cloth, and drastic steps have been taken to see that it got on the market. He mentioned the selling of gold on the Indian market and the silver lent by the United States to ease the inflationary strain. As a result of these measures, the price levels had now been held steady for a whole year, and were lower than in any country in the Middle East.

"But the position is one which needs watching with the utmost care. By far the gravest consequences of the strain imposed upon India's economy has been the strain on the food situation. That has been and will continue to be, quite apart

from the war, an increasingly serious problem. It has, of course, been greatly aggravated by war conditions, by the cessation of normal imports of rice from Burma. By the general uncertainty of the military situation and political disturbances and no less, by the effect of inflation on the vast population of rural producer consumers who have been reluctant to sell their surpluses, seeing that their need for consumer goods could not be satisfied at reasonable prices or even satisfied at all".

BENGAL FAMINE

Regarding Bengal famine, Mr. Amery mentioned the appointment of a Commission to investigate the famine in Bengal, paid a tribute to its Chairman and other members for their exceptional knowledge of Indian affairs and added that its terms not only covered the past, but, what was more important the future. Its investigations would later cover the whole wider problem of famine in the provinces over the whole of India. "In any case, there can be no dispute as to the broad fact. A dreadful fact, that, in Bengal, last year, something like 700,000 human beings died as the consequence directly of starvation or, to a much larger extent, to the effect of the ever present endemic diseases on constitutions impaired by under-nourishment. There was a record rice harvest in January and the fear of recurrence of last year's famine in Bengal has definitely receded. Following on Lord Wavell's decisive intervention—to which a tribute has rightly been paid—the very first act of his Viceroyalty—and with the ability and energy of the new Governor, Mr. Casey at the disposal of the Bengal Ministry in their efforts to grapple with the situation, real progress has been made. The valuable help of the Army, particularly in regard to transport for distribution, has been continued and river and canal boats removed in 1942 for fear of a Japanese invasion have been restored," Mr. Amery observed. On the health side he gave details of hospital provisions and referred to the decline in the cholera epidemic. After mentioning the allocations of medicine, he said that last year there were undoubtedly serious local shortages owing to inadequate distribution arrangements. "I will not claim" he added "that even now the arrangements are entirely satisfactory, but at any rate the situation in this respect has been greatly improved."

FOOD DISTRIBUTION AND CONTROL MEASURES

Turning to the work of the Central Government, Mr. Amery said that the Centre worked away steadily at creating effective and reasonably uniform control, distribution and food prices throughout India. The difficulties which originally delayed effective co-operation between the Central Government and the Provinces had been progressively overcome.

"No measure", Mr. Amery added, "taken within India's own confines, would be wholly adequate to secure the best possible distribution of the internal resources and the confidence, which is essential for that purpose without some measure of help from without. It is not only that India was already an importing country before the war and that its population has since grown by twenty millions, but the immense increase in the armed forces, more particularly from this country and the United States, had added to what is in effect another province—a consuming but not a producing province—to the problem of food supply. The House can rest assured that neither the Government of India nor His Majesty's Government has failed to be alive to that aspect of the question of any moment in the last two years. The House has been told that some 300,000 tons of wheat will have been shipped to India in the year ending this September. I fully realise that the Indian Central Food Advisory Council have expressed disappointment with these figures, as compared with their own standard of one million tons a year of importation, with half a million added for reserve. That is a point that is only natural in view of India's own great anxiety, but the pre-occupations of His Majesty's Government over an even wider field are no less anxious and critical. There never seems to be a limit to the urgent demand for shipping and it is only by the closest scrutiny of the situation from quarter to quarter that those responsible can manage to scrape together the ships required of any great task."

"The question of finding shipping for further consignments of grain to India," said Mr. Amery, "is at this moment under the active consideration of the technical service directly concerned". On what he called the greatest of all problems—how to enable her natural resources and increased efficiency in their utilisation and in the development of new industries to raise the standard of living and production, he said, "There is no other way of bringing happiness to India's teeming millions or giving to India as a whole material strength and revenue, without which political independence would be little more than nominal. Mere numbers do not constitute either wealth or strength. Unless they are matched by increased efficiency, they are

indeed the greatest menace to all efforts to raise the standard of living or sustain political freedom.

DEVELOPMENT SCHEMES

"I agree heartily with Prof. Hill", Mr. Amery observed, "that there are elements in the problem which depend on social customs and religious pre-conceptions, which can only be dealt with by a slow process of education and a gradual change of outlook. That is all the more reason for bold and prompt action in a field in which Government can hope to produce early results. How urgent this has been is shown not only by the recent famine and anxiety about the food situation generally, but also by the progressive deterioration of the position shown by statistics.

After giving details of the £750 million agricultural development plan, Mr. Amery claimed that the Government of India could certainly not be charged with any lack of courage and imagination in facing the problem of India's agricultural development. The Government of India was bound to turn to agriculture first and foremost, because it was and must always be the mainstay of the great majority of her population. Industrial expansion could make an immense contribution to India's prosperity by balancing India's economy through furnishing a market, which could absorb a great part of the output of India's agriculture. In that respect, India was already the eighth industrial country in the world. India stood to-day undoubted on the eve of a great industrial advance.

"To that industrial advance accompanied, as I hope it will be, by corresponding social advance we here can only wish well," proceeded Mr. Amery. "The day has long gone by, when British industrialists tended to look upon India as their own preserve and to look upon Indian industry as an uneconomic intrusion on their domain. On the contrary I have found whenever I have discussed this problem with our own industrialists, universal readiness to welcome India's industrial progress, a universal desire to lend their co-operation in helping forward that progress and a confident conviction that in the growth of India's prosperity, there will always be an opportunity for British trade, provided we supply India with what she needs, and not simply with what we have been accustomed to sell in the past."

Mr. Amery said how strongly that vision of India's industrial future had appealed to her imagination was shown by the eager reception accorded to the plan put forward by a group of Bombay Industrialists. An even bolder plan laying greater emphasis on agriculture than on social reform has been put forward by the Indian Federation of Labour. What mattered in these schemes was the boldness of their conception. The Government of India had shown no sign of failure to appreciate the greatness of the opportunity before it in this respect.

Continuing, Mr. Amery said: "As Mr. Pethick Lawrence has truly said, progress in other directions cannot be fully sustained if there is a fundamental disequilibrium in the political structure. All I want to say is that these reforms are the essential requirements to provide the material foundations of the individual standard of living and collective resources, without which Indian freedom would mean very little, either at home or in relation to the outside world. At any rate, there can be no reason for not pushing ahead with these reforms, while conditions for a political solution are maturing, so that at whatever stage the new constitution comes into being, no time will have been lost in giving it the best possible start, nor is it too much to hope that in the light of practical difficulties and the immense opportunities for Indian reconstruction, even political difficulties may find a truer perspective in relation to the immense political opportunity before Indian statesmen."

"I am voicing the general sentiments expressed in the course of this debate", Mr. Amery added, "when I say that we look forward undoubtedly to the satisfaction of India's natural aspirations to unfettered control of her destiny as a partner in the British Commonwealth and as a member of the comity of nations, fully worthy to stand as equal with any nation in the world (cheers). We all look forward to that and we also wish her to start on that new chapter of her history, under the most favourable auspices possible—at peace within herself and secure from aggression from without and some measure of unity is essential for that purpose—able to play her part in contributing to the peace of the world, able to make her contribution to the welfare and to the culture and the thought of the world and enjoying in ever-increasing measure prosperity, health and happiness." (cheers)

The International Monetary Conference

India's Proposals Rejected

India's second proposal to the International Monetary Conference at Bretton-wood (New Hampshire) was rejected on the 6th July 1944. It was an amendment presented by *Sir Shanmukham Chetty*, regarding the help through the proposed world money fund to economically backward nations, such as India, China and others.

Sir Shanmukham said: "I am greatly disappointed at the attitude of the conference, and especially the United States delegation, towards the Indian amendment seeking to mention specifically resources of economically backward countries as objectives of the policy enunciated in the joint statement on the fund."

He explained: "The statement refers to balanced growth of international trade and maintenance of high level of employment as the definite objective in the working of the fund. It is stated that in these terms it does not meet the case of backward countries like India and China. The mere growth in volumes of international trade will not necessarily benefit those backward countries."

Sir Shanmukham Chetty elaborated that expanded imports and exports between Europe and America, for example, would not benefit Asiatic countries. He maintained that the fund only provided for European and some South American countries, which have already established industry but need to reconstruct and develop it. He said that the fund did not provide for the setting up of new industries such as India propose to do. Sir Shanmukham Chetty said: "What India aims at is more balanced international trade, meaning that India should also be in a position to produce and export finished goods. If the standard of life of the vast millions in Asia is to be raised, these countries must be helped to industrialise themselves on a large scale. A purely agricultural country cannot raise its standard of living."

He declared: "The Indian amendment was intended to enable these countries to get help from the United States and the United Kingdom in supplying those capital goods needed for industrial expansion. The position taken by the Indian delegation was consistent with the objectives of economic policy as stated by Mr. Morgenthau in his opening address to the conference." Sir Shanmukham Chetty then quoted Mr. Morgenthau as saying "world prosperity can only be built up by an increasing number of prosperous customers, and prosperity like peace is indivisible."

Sir Shanmukham stated: "The Indian delegation attempted through the amendment to translate this noble sentiment into practice. To our surprise and disappointment our amendment was opposed by the United States delegation."

The British Labour Party Conference

Demand for Release of Indian Leaders

A big surprise was caused at the Labour Party Conference in London on the 15th December 1944 when, in defiance of the Executive, who opposed it, delegates carried a resolution on India which called for the release of Indian political leaders to facilitate negotiations to end the deadlock.

When the Labour Party Conference resumed to-day a composite resolution on India, submitted by the National Union of Railwaymen, was debated. The resolution declared: "This Conference, being of the opinion that the granting of freedom to the people of India to establish an independent Indian National Government will be a decisive factor in the fight against Fascism and towards the unification of all anti-Fascist forces, urges the immediate ending of the political deadlock by negotiations with all leaders of the Indian people, with a view to the formation of a responsible National Government which will rally the entire population in India to the anti-Fascist cause. With a view to facilitating the negotiations we call for the release of Indian Political leaders."

Mr. *Charles Bridgus* moving the resolution, said that India was like a great running sore in the side of the British Commonwealth of Nations. The Executive sent a deputation to Mr. Amery and put their point of view, and there the problem seemed to have been left. The Viceroy, in his speech in Calcutta, said that the Government of India has done everything they possibly could and the next move must come from the Indian side. How could negotiations be conducted from the Indian side if the people who could put forward the Indian views were inside prison dungeons? If the resolution was carried, he expected to see the Executive taking a much firmer line in the matter.

Mr. Bridges added: "We can be a great nation. Our battle-ships can go from sea to sea, and our armies from land to land. But as long as this poverty and destitution and this terrible situation exists in India, it is a blot on the whole community in this country and the Labour movement. We must throw our energy into this fight. The Indian problem is as great a problem for the Labour movement, as any of the great domestic problems which have been before the Conference this week.

The Member of Parliament for West Leyton, Mr. R. Sorensen, said that we should release Indian political prisoners who for years without charge or trial had been languishing in custody.

A prospective candidate for the Sutton division of Plymouth, Mrs. Luch Middleton, said: "The key to the Indian problem is in Downing Street and it lies in the hands of one man alone. Mr. Churchill can go to Quebec, Washington, Casablanca, Teheran and Moscow. If the Government are really in earnest with regard to India, why cannot Mr. Winston Churchill go to Delhi as well and there meet the Indian leaders."

The Constructional Engineering Union put forward a resolution declaring that no time should be lost in resuming negotiations, with the ultimate object of India being given a place in the British Commonwealth of Nations similar to that enjoyed by other partners.

INTERRUPTIONS GREET COMMITTEE SPOKESMAN

When Professor Laski called upon Mr. James Walker, Member of Parliament, to reply for the Executive, a delegate shouted, "I protest against Mr. Walker being called up to speak on this. He is an unfit representative of the British Working class." Professor Laski immediately jumped to his feet and said, "You sit down and don't be insulting. The Executive is the body appropriate for choosing those whom it wishes to speak on its behalf." The delegate again tried to protest, but Prof. Laski said: "You have no basis in your protest except in your natural insolence to Mr. Walker."

When he rose to speak, Mr. Walker said: "I am sorry there are some people in the hall who do not seem to like me very much. If they do not like me, because I have the habit of speaking in a forthright manner about some things they come to the rostrum and talk about—well, they will just have to put up with it. They ought to be able to take as well as give in our debates".

Mr. Walker said that the Executive accepted the resolution of the Constructional Engineering Union. They opposed the resolution of the National Union of Railwaymen, because it carried the conference much further than the past declarations. In effect it would mean we quitted India to-morrow. None of the Allied nations, including Russia, would wish us to quit India before the Japanese were defeated. Great Britain must carry our duty to Indians as well as to Burmese and defeat the Japanese in order to give India a chance for political self-government. The Cripps Offer had the backing of the Labour Ministers in the Government and it stood to-day. When the Indian political parties formulated a constitution it would be carried out. The British Government would cease to have any governing authority in India and India would possess full and complete self-government.

SUPPORT FOR RADICAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY

There had arisen, Mr. Walker said, another party in India—the Radical Democratic Party. The Radical Democratic Party, a working class party, stood for the same objects as the Labour Party—the lifting of standards of life of the working class of India. It was not subsidised by the Government of India. It wanted free self-government for India and was demanding an extension of franchise for every citizen in India so that a complete Democratic India could be evolved. These people were gaining strength all over India. "The Executive yields to none in its determination to bring about self-government for India, but we do not believe that we shall be carrying out our duty to the Labour movement in this country, or to the people of India, if we simply adopt the irresponsible attitude of washing our hands of the whole affair and leaving Indians to settle it themselves in the only way it would be settled when people feel so strongly."

After Prof. Laski declared the result of the voting on the resolution, there was an uproar for several minutes. One delegate shouted to Mr. Walker, "Put that in your pipe and smoke it". Mr. Walker reported: "I can take all that comes to me, and you can't." This was the second time during the week that the Conference had acted against the wishes of the Executive.

The Convocation Addresses

The Mysore University Convocation

The following are extracts from the Convocation Address delivered by Rajadharmapravina Diwan Bhadur K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar on *September 30th, 1944.*

Gathering up the varied advantages you have gained under the fostering care of your Alma Mater, you are, most of you, about to pass into a wider world where you will come under new conditions, which will impose unaccustomed duties and responsibilities, but also offer enlarged freedom and scope for talent and initiative. The subject of first interest to a young man about to start in life is naturally the search for a career. This, at all times a somewhat difficult matter, has in these later decades become increasingly hard. While education, both secondary and higher, has made fairly rapid expansion, there has not been a corresponding increase in the available openings for the products of such education. Every avenue of employment from Government Service to the independent professions, is or is on the way to become overcrowded. The development of trade and industry, till quite recently, has been too slow to absorb more than a very small percentage of the qualified unemployed.

In most countries it is coming to be recognized that large scale unemployment is a very grave social evil, which can only be effectively tackled by the full use of the authority and resources of the State. To fit educated youth with appropriate occupation has always been a rather perplexing task. In the peculiar circumstances of India it is one of special urgency and importance. The intelligence and energy of young manhood must have sufficient and suitable outlet. If legitimate openings are denied, then the temptation to follow out rash and reckless courses may prove difficult to resist.

There are people who, lamenting what they regard as the over-production of graduates, would counter the phenomenon by making education more costly and difficult, especially in its higher grades. A few would not hesitate to restrict admission to schools and colleges in drastic ways, leaving the disappointed many to shift for themselves. Not a few would take away from higher education what is at present one of its chief attractions, namely, as a gateway for merit to the better paid appointments in the public service. Some would be content with insisting on special or additional qualifications as a means of reducing competition and at the same time for ensuring greater efficiency among those employed. Others would narrow the range of selection, without particular reference to efficiency by means of communal ratios and class preferences. Needless to say, devices which serve but to contract, instead of enlarging the prospects of employment for large numbers, will only aggravate the real evil.

Ways and means for relieving the tragedy of unwanted and idle talent cannot be indefinitely put off. The task of finding suitable remedies, which will not narrow the benefits of higher education, requires to be taken up seriously and in a broad-minded spirit. The matter is one which concerns alike the Government, the University, and the public. The primary responsibility, naturally, rests with the Government, as the supreme guardian of the interests and welfare of the people, not to speak of its unique position as the largest employer of labour and intelligence. It is up to the University to consider, among other things, how far its course of instruction can be endowed with a greater measure of relevancy to the after-careers of pupils. The fact that some of the existing courses, as in Medicine and Engineering, do directly lead to professional competency, is sufficient proof that the equipping of students for practical life is not beyond the purview of recognized schemes of study. An immediately practicable and useful departure would be the institution of new or alternative courses with a definite vocational utility or trend, to which pupils with little or no aptitude for academic subjects could be switched off at the proper stages. This would have the incidental advantage of relieving the occasional over-crowding and congestion in some of the classes, and also of obviating the not uncommon spectacle of melancholy processions of students wandering from class to class and from college to college in the search for admittance. Then there is the very helpful part which can be played by public bodies, industrial organizations, and classes and individuals generally who are possessed of influence and patronage,—

if their sympathy and co-operation be enlisted—in providing attractive openings for an increasing number of University men.

In the meantime, you the new fledged graduates can but make the best of the situation. This is rather better at the moment than it might have been, because of the great demand for trained personnel for services connected with the War. The choice of a profession is, when all is said, an individual matter, dependent on necessity, opportunity and personal inclination, just as much as in the matter of choosing a partner for life. It scarcely lends itself to practical advice of a general kind. But I will say this, that you should not make a haphazard choice, led by an idle desire to follow a beaten track, or drift from lack of imagination and energy into the first opening that offers; nor should you be influenced solely by the pecuniary or other superficial attractions. It is at least as important as anything else for your future happiness and success that the profession of your choice is congenial to your interests and your temperament, and that it is one for which you have the requisite aptitude and capabilities. Once you have made your choice, you have of course to stick to it and make it the serious business of your life. You should gain mastery of its rules and principles, its unwritten standards and conventions, and spare neither time nor patience to acquire skill and readiness in applying your knowledge. I need hardly add that, in striving for success, you will use such means only as are strictly honourable and as your better nature will approve.

What work you undertake (and this applies equally to work outside your profession) must be done as well as you can; to ensure this, you must refrain from taking on more than you can efficiently deal with. The temptation to overstrain the energies is one to which ambitious young men are prone; but it must be firmly resisted. You cannot afford to neglect the requirements of physical health in the stress of professional labour. Business success and a comfortable bank balance are poor compensations for an enfeebled constitution and diminished capacity for the rational enjoyment of the good things of life. A too close and pertinacious attention to the call of business is apt to get a person into a narrow groove. The springs of culture will stagnate and eventually dry up, if you cut yourselves away from the refining influence of art and music, if you neglect those humanizing studies which serve to broaden the mind and help it to remain fresh and alert, and make no serious attempt to keep abreast of the trends of advancing knowledge.

You must not be like those short-sighted and self-centred persons who are so engrossed in themselves or in the making of money that they have no time to spare for their duties as citizens and members of society. The education which you have received brings with it fresh opportunities and also added responsibilities. Instead of being the recipients of the influence of others, you will from henceforth stand in positions whence your own influence will largely tell upon others. Your new responsibilities cannot be properly discharged unless you take a keen interest in the events and movements of the day, and keep yourselves conversant with important questions affecting the country and the people. Your minds must be receptive of new facts and new ideas, and able to appreciate other points of view than your own. But do not be carried away by catch-words and party-cries, and do not slavishly echo a more forceful person's voice. No self-respecting person with pretensions to education will blindly accept ready-made opinions, from whatever source, be it a book or newspaper or platform orator. It is best in every way to form your own independent judgment on the data available to you. Only as you can stand firmly on your own feet and see your own way clearly will you be in a position to give a sound lead to others who may look up to you for advice or guidance.

Leadership is not a matter of possessing a following, however numerous and influential, but implies a certain capacity for constructive direction. No country can attain to greatness without leaders wise as well as valiant; but no country need despair as long as its seats of learning can produce men and women of vision and sanity of judgment, with the intellect, character and physical vigour which will fit them to guide their fellows aright. Never were the services of such more urgent and pressing than at this supreme moment when India's destiny is in the balance; and the need is not confined to politics, but extends to all other spheres of national life. The hour often finds the man; and it may be that some of you, the products of this University, are cast for that arduous role.

At any rate, it can be said of most of you and your generation that, through the corporate life of school and college, the friendly rivalry and the team spirit of games, the intelligent participation in debates and discussions, the activities and

amenities made possible by the University Union's social work among the poor outside the University walls, and things such as these, you have had useful preparations, not only for leadership, but for that which is no less important, the capacity for concerted action. Nothing great or lasting can be accomplished in social life without willing and organized co-operation. Given this and the spirit of mutual accommodation, which is prepared to yield on unessential points of difference in order to secure unanimity on essentials, there is practically no limit to what can be achieved in the way of national unity and well-being.

Even the communal disagreements which have grown into such regrettable prominences in recent years should be amenable to friendly settlement in an atmosphere of reciprocity and neighbourly understanding and consideration; the more so because they are not to any large extent due to religious causes, but are grounded mainly on divergences of motive and viewpoint affecting social, economic and political interests. A reasonable spirit of genuine compromise has, at all events, better chances of composing differences of this kind than mutual denunciation or one-sided appeasement.

There are many directions, besides sectional politics, in which the public spirit of educated youth may find ample scope for useful service. To help the illiterate masses to rise above their age-long condition of stagnation is a great mission, increasing in importance with the growth of the national spirit in India. It requires organized effort, not through paid officials alone, but to a large extent by voluntary agency, devoted to the spreading of popular education and enlightenment, the improvement of traditional methods of agriculture and industry, and the raising of the general standards of living. Another fruitful field is the reform of injurious social customs which, having largely outlived their original purpose and utility, now hamper progress or cause needless humiliation or suffering. Life must be made worth living for all; and the first step towards this is to alter or eliminate, in a spirit of cautious firmness, all such sources of mischief as offend against that supreme ideal. The elevation of the status of womanhood is a third great sphere in which there is need for sympathetic and concerted action. The seclusion of women, with its apothecia of the purdah, is bound to disappear, as it is indeed already doing. The fact that there are so many of them among the new graduates is itself a significant indication of a better time coming. In that auspicious future women will surely play an increasingly useful part in social and public life. This makes it all the more necessary that their facilities for education should be amplified, and that it should be on lines appropriate and adapted to their place and functions in the home and outside. Women should undoubtedly have a just measure of property rights (—a matter in which the Mysore State was the first to take legislative action—), and likewise an adequate part and voice in public affairs.

There are, of course, various other lines of progress, which will suggest themselves to you. But in the case of all alike, their significance and effect at a time like the present can only be realized by viewing them, not independently by themselves, but against the great background of national rehabilitation. For we are living in one of those momentous periods of revolutionary change which come in the wake of a protracted and devastating war.

The greatest War of all time is swiftly moving to its climax. Already, while it has lasted, it has inflicted untold misery and suffering on millions, and spread death and destruction on a scale hitherto undreamt of. Its influence on moral standards, whether between nations or among individuals, has not been altogether beneficial. But, as against this, it has served to quicken many virtues usually dormant, such as fortitude, fellow-feeling, intense love of country, heroism, self-sacrifice. It has in many different ways changed the aspect of civilization; and more than this, it has altered the angle from which men are accustomed to view their own interests and those of their fellows.

War is no blessing even in disguise; but it has some mitigating features, and so is not an unmixed evil. It can be placed to its credit that it makes possible large-scale innovations and advancements which, but for it, would never have been attempted. This present conflagration has compressed into the space of a very few years developments—scientific, mechanical, economic, and other—which might have taken centuries to bring about. Against the dislocation of established conditions of life, the inflation and scarcity, the vexatious restrictions on individual freedom, and the over-widening control over private action and discretion, may be set the fact that it has led to a far-reaching process of nationalization of essential material assets and of the enlistment of human intelligence and inventiveness in the common cause. In these and other ways the War has helped to

demonstrate the almost unlimited possibilities of organized planning and co-ordinated activity. It is no exaggeration to say that, if all those tremendous efforts, those unequalled resources and talents, that concentration of enthusiasm, self-denial and determination, which have been devoted to the supreme purpose of winning the War, could be diverted, when it is won, to the restoration and reconstruction of national existences on a wide front, mankind would find itself lifted to an almost unimaginable level of well-being and prosperity. The result cannot but be improved, both in performance and in quality, by the fact that it would be brought about, not by fear and compulsion as in war time, but mainly by willing co-operation and free initiative functioning within a comprehensive and approved national plan.

Several countries have already taken up in right earnest the vital and complex question of post-war reconstruction. In India the time cannot be far off when she will be in a position to manage her own affairs, and there will rise a vast number of problems clamouring for attention. Those of you who can should begin from even now a close study of these problems and the manner in which they were being tackled elsewhere. No doubt, circumstances vary from country to country; but it should be possible to learn something from the example and experience of other peoples, and occasionally even to profit from their mistakes. Soviet Russia affords the most striking instance in history of what resolute national planning can do in entirely changing the social and economic character of a vast territory with racial, political and other conditions somewhat resembling those we have here. In not more than twenty years, at a time too when the imminence of war had not begun to act as a goad, Russia's far-sighted leaders achieved a complete industrial and agricultural revolution, which has reacted powerfully on the cultural and all other aspects of the national life. It has also, beyond a doubt, put Russia in a position to wage a gigantic war, with ever mounting and impressive success, against a powerful and ruthless enemy. Nazi Germany, it is true, achieved equally spectacular results in an even shorter interval; but she did this through much more questionable totalitarian methods, and then employed the resulting strength and resources for unscrupulous purposes of aggrandizement and oppression. A notable illustration of bold and statesmanlike planning, on a comparatively limited scale confined to social security problems is the famous Beveridge plan, which is still under discussion in Britain and has not yet been implemented. Here in India various important matters, such as educational reform, agricultural improvement, increased food production, famine prevention, public health, marketing and transport facilities, the extended use of machinery and distribution of power, monetary stabilization, and so on, are being considered by special committees and departments. Notable spade work, some of which has already attracted much interest, has been done in the same field by able and experienced public men and bodies. You will have plenty of material, therefore, in the way of results and recommendations, to study, digest and form your own opinions upon.

Meanwhile, if you yourselves are hoping to take some useful and active part in building the India of the future, you will have to make very clear to yourselves what is the sort of future you are looking forward to. It is not one in which not only will more wealth be created, but that wealth will be more widely and equitably distributed; where effective measures will be put in hand for eliminating those great enemies of progress—poverty, ignorance, disease, and compulsory idleness; where standards of living and comfort will be generally raised, the purchasing power of masses materially increased, and the duty of finding work for the able and willing accepted as a national obligation? Would you not claim for all persons no less than for yourselves a due measure of life's opportunities, in the way of ensuring to each individual the full development of his personality, of providing him with such vocational training as may be suited to his capacity and aptitude, and thereafter of putting him in the way to obtain appropriate occupation? Would you tolerate social arrangements which imposed or perpetuated artificial inequalities not related to merit or character, or interfered needlessly with legitimate form of self-expression? Would you not require of any future polity that may be evolved that it should be democratic in spirit and substance, that it should safeguard the fundamental rights of free citizenship, and that it should give to you and others like you a proper voice in the ordering of matters touching your own interests, local, personal and social? It is questions like these which you must put to yourselves and consider in all sobriety; for upon the answer to them will depend the kind of world you will be helping to build, and the conditions and materials you will contribute to the work of reconstruction.

It may, possibly, occur to some among you whether, in the circumstances in

which our country is placed, it would not be best to follow the method of wise architect, and build from the bottom upwards, securing the foundations, instead of from roofing to ground level. The work might begin with a real and substantial extension of the democratic principle of self-government to the smallest units of popular life and common interest,—the village, township, factory, or, in general terms, the compact and convenient neighbourhood. This would leave to the people themselves the management of their own immediate concerns, and at the same time serve as basis for further devolutions of collective responsibility on larger and larger groups. The process would find its natural culmination in the autonomous State, founded on affinities of language, manners and customs, and cemented by the bonds of loyalty and constitutional rule. A broad framework of self-government in ascending stage of expansion will, without doubt, be capable of supporting the vast dome of a great Indian Union, offering ample shelter for all peoples and all varieties of culture, and abundant inducement for that close partnership among free and equal States which is necessary for internal solidary and external security. The very substantial advantages evolved during a hundred and fifty years and more of the British connection, in the way of a coherent political structure and a growing identity of national interests throughout the vast geographical unity of India, should not be lightly abandoned without adequate substitutes being provided. On the other hand, the independence which consists in the self-sufficient isolation of a number of rival sovereignties jealous of each other is not perhaps the safest guarantee of national freedom.

This takes us to a region more or less of uncertainty and speculation; and so I stop, my object being simply to make you think about various vital questions for yourselves. The future may not altogether conform to your expectations. It is nearly always the case that visions are rosier in prospect than in realization, and that achievement falls far short of the ideal. But this does not detract from their value as objective and as inspiration. A clear conception of things not yet in being will itself tend to invest them with substance and shape. Without the uplifting power of our ideals we should be but as creatures crawling on the ground. The greatest men of all nations, the outstanding leaders, the spiritual teachers, the famous heroes, the selfless benefactors, all have been in their own way idealists but with a strong sense of reality; in other words, they were dynamic personalities.

Youth is eminently the season of hopes and ideals. It is true enough that disillusionment often follows in their wake,—it may be because the hopes are pitched too high and beyond the measure of one's capacity, it may be because the ideals are insufficiently tempered with the elements of good sense and hard fact. But not on that account should you underrate their importance. Entertain lofty aspirations, cultivate generous ideals, but give to them the sharp edge of discipline and practical knowledge; faith and confidence will then bring accomplishment within reach.

The world into which you, my young friends, are about to go forth may be full of difficulties and discouragements; but the resolute mind will find in it sufficient room for personal advancement and distinction, and abundant scope for unselfish service. You may not all of you, or all the time, win worldly success; but you can and should always strive for something much better, the approbation of your own conscience. Use your opportunities, then, well and worthily, and in a manner befitting your new position and standing. Preserve by your attitude and by your conduct in life the best traditions of your University. In its name and on its behalf I bid you farewell, wishing every one of you pleasant, useful, and honourable future.

The Travancore University Convocation

The following are extracts from the address delivered at the Sixth Convocation by Sir V. T. Krishnamachari, K. C. I. E., (Retired Dewan of Baroda) on Saturday, the 11th November 1944:—

The war is now nearing its end and victory is in sight; and we are entering upon an age of reconstruction in which the basic ideas on which civilisation rests are being tested so that a new order may be evolved. All over the world, men's minds are thinking "of a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling

in safety within their own boundaries and which will afford assurance that all men in all lands live out their lives in freedom from fear and want." In our own country plans of post-war development, economic and social, embracing all aspects of national life are being drawn up by the governments, with the object of raising the deplorably low standards of living. As His Excellency Lord Wavell has said: "We must lift the poor man of India from poverty to security; from ill-health to vigour; from ignorance to understanding." These plans are not ideals to be realized as and when circumstances permit, but definite projects to be executed within the shortest period of time, and everywhere ample financial reserves are being built up to enable this to be done. The plans include within their scope agriculture, including Animal husbandry, Forests, and Fisheries; industries, major and minor; communications; electric power; and social services in which are comprised education on a nationwide scale with provision for compulsion for boys and girls between the ages of 6 and 14; medical relief, public health etc. The governments of advanced Indian States have also taken their share in this great movement. The Travancore government have given a notable lead; as you know, they have prepared very comprehensive plans for post-war improvements and are accumulating a reserve fund, which is expected to amount to nearly rupees eight crores, for their execution. All this means that a much more extended use will be made of science and scientific research than in the past; and graduates in India will be called upon to play a great part in this difficult task of rebuilding the level of national life.

In many respects graduates of recent years of this and other universities in India will be more fortunate than those that completed their studies before the war. Many of these latter were faced by the daily spectre of unemployment; the depression that prevailed in 1929 and the following years made it extremely difficult for them to obtain positions in which they could utilise for the benefit of their countrymen the knowledge they gained in the universities at so much sacrifice. Happily, this soul-killing experience will not be yours. On the other hand, there will be much difficulty in securing, in sufficient numbers, the qualified men needed by the governments in India for their plans of reconstruction. As Professor Hill has said:—"The first of India's scientific needs is to strengthen and expand education and research in biological sciences, in medicine and its associated subjects, in physiology and biochemistry, in genetics and all applications of biology to fisheries, agriculture, public health, pest-control, animal and plant diseases and forestry. There must also be better facilities for teaching and research in Physics, Chemistry, Metallurgy and Engineering without which industrial prosperity could not be obtained." Provincial Governments and States should regard it as their first concern to establish a sufficient number of institutions for the purposes described by Prof. Hill, so that reconstruction may not be impeded. What is important is the widest diffusion of the scientific spirit and the new order of values it creates. Nor will the need for the social sciences—sociology, philosophy etc.—be less insistent. Many of India's problems are social and the readjustment of an old social order to suit modern conditions will demand trained thinkers in large numbers. As has been well said "Contemporary society is veined with the blood of science; no aspect of life remains unaffected."

No form of social service is nobler than that of assisting the masses of India to a better life. This privilege will be yours and I wish you all every success in whatever capacity it may fall to you to take part in this great endeavour. Only one thing is important; what you undertake, you must do in the true spirit of service, as a labour of love.

I now come to another topic which is much in the minds of all of us today—the constitutional problem of India.

India has been offered the full status of a Dominion in the proposals of the War Cabinet made in March 1942—the Cripps proposals. This offer stands. The conception of Dominion Status represents the high watermark political thought has hitherto reached. As you will recall, the report of the Inter-Imperial Relations Committee of 1926 describes the group of self-governing communities composed of Great Britain and the Dominions in the following terms:—"They are autonomous communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the Crown and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations." The basic ideas underlying the conception are: Firstly, Great Britain and the Dominions are associated on a footing of complete freedom and equality. Every community is at liberty to develop according to its own genius and tradition. Secondly, the common link is the Crown which is the symbol of the unity of the Commonwealth and an integral part of the constitution of each one of them.

Thirdly, unity of political action is not secured by control of policy by Britain or by legal or constitutional provisions, but is based on the possession of common ideals. The British Commonwealth has always been a powerful influence for peace; and it is the pattern on which a world order for securing peace can be evolved.

My conviction is that India can attain its highest political destiny as a Dominion. As a result of the British connection India has achieved a sense of unity which did not exist before. The British rule has enabled us to check the dissimilar tendencies in our society and evolve a sense of common citizenship. India has also imbibed from the British connection the love of freedom and rule of law which are at the root of the conception of Dominion Status. Besides, modern India has been considerably influenced by British culture and thought, British history, and British political institutions. The war has shown the kinship of ideals in the fundamentals of life between Britain and India. When in the "Testament of Beauty" the poet refers to the democratic way of life and says that:—

"The high goal of our great endeavour
Is spiritual attainment, individual worth,
At all cost to be sought and at all cost pursued,
To be won at all cost and at all cost assured."

he expresses the central teaching of Indian thought.

9. The late Mr. C. R. Das welcomed the goal of Dominion Status for reasons which he explained thus:—"To me the idea is specially attractive because of its deep spiritual significance. I believe in world peace, the ultimate federation of the world and I think that the great Commonwealth of Nations called the British Empire—a federation of diverse races, each with its distinct life, distinct civilisation and distinct mental outlook if properly led with statesmen at the helm, is bound to make a lasting contribution to the problem of knitting the world into the federation of the human race. I think it is for the good of India, for the good of the world that India should strive for freedom within the commonwealth."

There is another aspect. India is the test of the commonwealth principle. If the principle is applied to India—with history, culture and traditions different from those of Britain and the Dominions—it would be one of the supreme achievements of history; and India as a Dominion will be a link between the civilisations of the East and West: "It would build a bridge of understanding" between the two civilisations.

The establishment of a Dominion constitution for India immediately on the cessation of hostilities should be the joint effort of Britain and India. I am confident that the best minds in both countries working together can bring about agreement on essentials among the important elements in India's life. If this be not possible the procedure should be that followed in regard to the Act of 1935. The British Government should arbitrate on the outstanding issues and all parties must accept the awards till they are replaced by agreed solutions.

At the same time, we in India should realise that the war has radically changed the character of our internal problem and that we should now re-examine it in a new setting and from a fresh point of view. I shall mention two important considerations.

In the first place, the world has become one in a real sense and its parts, however remote, are closely linked. As Mr. Wendell Wilkie has said:—"The high-ways of the world are crowded. From Hongkong to Narvik, and from the North Pole to the South, there are no empty seas, no air spaces which are not traversed, no land where interests on many people do not meet and may not conflict." Interdependence is the keynote of the new order and everywhere, recognising this, powerful countries are organising new measures of co-operation with other countries in important spheres of national activity. This is the trend of world events—the forging of new links. The lesson to us in India is clear. The food problem for example has shown that the economy evolved in all parts of India over decades is organically connected and that the slightest disturbance in one place can have serious repercussions all over the country.

Secondly, the coming era has been rightly described as that of the "common man." All over the world, the main duty of governments will be to formulate and execute plans for social security. India is no exception. The gravest menace we have to face is the low level of the national income—millions of people living in conditions perilously near the starvation level. The energies of all the governments in India will have to be devoted, for as long a time as we can foresee, to the single problem of raising the standard of living; differences, religious or provincial, do not come into it at all.

Do not these two factors alter the nature of the problem of inter-communal relations in our country? On this subject, the best advice we can have has been given by His Excellency Lord Wavell. He said:—"That two communities and even two nations can make arrangements to live together in spite of differing cultures or religions, history provides many examples. The solutions of the problems have varied.....in Canada, the British and French elements reached a federal agreement which operates satisfactorily; the French, Italian and German elements in Switzerland agreed on a different form of Federation. In all the above there were religious as well as racial differences. In the United States many elements, racial and religious, have been fused into one great nation with a Federal structure, after the bitter experience of a disastrous Civil War. Ireland has a sort of Pakistan, though the analogy is of course only relative. The Soviet Union in Russia seems to have devised a new modification of its already flexible system which will also no doubt repay careful study. These examples are before India for her constitutionalists to study.....But man cannot alter geography."

As regards the Indian States, they have repeatedly declared that they welcome the attainment of Dominion Status by India and that they would be prepared to co-operate with British India in setting up a central government for the effective co-ordination of matters of common concern, on condition that, in other spheres, their autonomy is not affected and they have freedom to develop in accordance with their distinctive genius and traditions. As Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar said, only the other day, "No Indian State has a right to exist which is unwilling to come into line with the all-India national policy of objects to the erection, creation and maintenance of a central authority charged with the duty of looking after the affairs of India as an integral unit."

I earnestly hope that these internal questions of ours will be reviewed in the light of the revolution in thought created by the war. If they are examined in the light of these changes—that all parts of the world have become interdependent and that the only preoccupation of the governments in India for many years will be the raising of the level of living of the people—I am confident that, with the help of precedents elsewhere, a working arrangement can be effected which will be in the interests of the millions in India.

16. Before concluding I would like to remind you that the real object of education is to make us understand life and its significance. Most of you will derive this from one of the great religions of the world. I would commend to you the following advice from Lord Haldane who did more for the maintenance of high university ideals than any one in his generation. "What is the lesson of it all? It is that you must aim at the largest and widest view of life and devote your highest energies to attaining it. This view of life with its sustaining power will come to you, if you strive hard enough, in one form or another according to temperament, intellectual and moral. To some it will come in the form of Christianity, to others in that of some other high religion.....To yet others it will come in a more abstract form in the shape of philosophy. To yet others Art will bring the embodiment of the truth that the ideal and real, the infinite and the finite, do not exist apart but are different aspects of a single reality. Such a faith if it comes will, as the experience of countless thousands in different ages has shown, help you in sickness or in health, in poverty or in wealth, in depression or in exaltation. Only, the faith must be a real faith. No mere opinion, still less mere lip-service, can supply its place. It necessitates renunciation of the lower for the higher and the renunciation must be a real renunciation—extending if need be, to life itself.....To those who are worth most, there comes home early in life the conviction, that, in the absence of a firm hold on what is abiding, life becomes a poorer and poorer affair the longer it lasts. And the only foundation of what is abiding is the sense of the reality of what is spiritual—the constant presence of God who is not far away in the skies but is here within our minds and hearts."

The Agra University Convocation

The following is the text of the Convocation Address delivered

by Sir Mirza M. Ismail K. C. I. E., O. B. E. on Nov. 18, 1944.

Not many years ago, there were only six universities in India. There are now fifteen, and soon there will be many more. This is made inevitable by the increasing complication of our civilization, and the growth of our population, our commerce, and our wealth. Each university will have its own separate task to undertake, differing from that of any other. Each must work out its own salvation in its own way, and any idea resembling centralization of control, direct or indirect, would, in my opinion, be prejudicial to their growth and development. Naturally there is, and always will be, need for co-ordination, and for mutual consultation and influence. In the higher reaches of learning and discovery they will certainly arrive eventually at some scheme by which they supplement each other's work, thereby avoiding waste and raising standards to the highest possible level. But also in ordinary university education, every one of them must be willing to respond to the general influence, so that, for example, there may be uniformity of standard, however variable and individual the methods and courses may be.

It is ridiculous that a first class post-graduate degree in some universities should mean no more than second class in others. Both practical convenience and academical rectitude demand that there should be equivalence. It is a scandal that the matriculation of some universities should be years lower than those of other bodies, so that intermediate classes elsewhere are flooded with people who can hardly understand a word of spoken English.

There are so many discrepancies, indeed, and in many universities there is such desperate need for all sorts of reform that one can understand the temptation to create a central grants committee, or whatever it may be called, with complete coercive power by means of the purse. I am convinced, however, that nothing can justify such a method. The absolute independence and individuality of universities must be maintained. But in all academic affairs their mutual influence must be immensely strengthened by the strengthening of the Inter-University Board. It should have the most drastic power of non-recognition drastically used, branding without friendly scruples and without remorse that which is academically disreputable. As for what is administratively disreputable, that is inevitably an affair for local governments, though, even in this, the Inter-University Board might exert itself in the examination of general principles, and might make an advantageous study of the appalling types of traffic that in some universities have resulted from so-called "democratic" methods. Though, in considering this inter-university question, one naturally thinks still more of the constructive possibilities of a free system of mutual co-operation, among the universities of India.

There is one matter pertaining both to the dignity and efficiency of universities and to their mutual influence in which this university has set an example to others. It has realised that the standard, in every sense, of university work depends almost entirely upon the quality of the men on the staff of the colleges; and that, therefore, the salaries must be such as to attract men of the very highest quality. Here is a most difficult problem. There are so many colleges which, with the best will in the world, are handicapped by meagre resources. Yet there is no escape; there can be no compromise. Teachers of second-rate quality will not do if we are to do justice to the young people of this generation. I believe that this university has gone far towards solving this problem, and its good example must have a notable influence in the country.

We must have first-rate men. But it is to be remembered that "first-rate man" does not necessarily mean "a man with a first-class degree". Many of you will know whom I mean when I speak of the greatest professor of English Literature in England within the last fifty years, whose qualification for a professorship of English was a third class degree in History! A dangerous example, the application of which would certainly land me in a absurdity! But I am sure you will agree with what I mean. Quite apart from variations between universities, and between different subjects and different generations within the same university, a man's academic worth, not to speak of his personal worth, is often far above, and often far below, his ranking in his university examination. I mention this because I think there is a general tendency to define a man for ever by the class of his degree, and this is

extremely likely to be an incorrect definition of him. And indeed it is almost as likely to flatter as to depreciate him.

In making college or university appointments, a man's worth must be the only consideration; this is a sphere in which there can be no consideration of community. How disastrous it would be to choose medical officers, or one's own doctor, on communal principles! It would be equally disastrous to choose in this way those whose function is intellectual and moral leadership. Again, these first-rate men, paid first-rate salaries, must also be treated in a first-rate way, so that their work may be the very highest of which they are capable. If college teachers are required to lecture almost on a school timetable system, lecturing perhaps four or five times a day six days a week—all I can say is, that is not a college, and these are not professors or lecturers! They cannot be. This problem also has been tackled by Agra University, and the suggestion that reform might go still further is only an attempt to strengthen the hand of the university. In the south, as you know, colleges do not, in general, work on Saturdays, and I believe that this two-days week-end is essential to any man who wants to keep abreast of scholarship and produce original work. This arrangement is made difficult in the north, because other holidays are so numerous, but their random relief can never take the place of the scholar's Saturday and Sunday. And as for totality of hours, if we let colleges require of a man of twenty-four periods, eighteen hours, of lecturing a week, we shall simply get that sort of lecturing, and it will reduce our good men to hacks and keep most good men away. And to distinguish mathematically in this matter, or in the matter of salaries, between those who take post-graduate classes and those who do not, seems to me rather hazardous.

Of similar importance to first-rateness of professors is first-rateness of courses, and this is why the idea of the three years' degree course is of critical interest and importance. It is frequently said that the pass degree course in India is not and need not be a really university affair, and it is in the post-graduate classes that a man really becomes a university student.

Is this really true? If it is true, are we to accept it and be quite comfortable about? Surely we must challenge and change such an idea. If degrees are not degrees, they should not be called so. But I believe there is a general movement among the universities to see that their pass, as well as their honours, degrees are genuine *university* qualifications. Now this is most obviously the intention in Delhi. In the three years' course there is such continuity of study, such opportunity for gradual understanding by the maturing mind, such leisure as it were to think and grow, that one feels we really have reached here something more truly academic than the normal two years' degree. I think that this change should be very seriously considered by all universities.

And now that this principle of continuity is approved, even at the pass degree stage, what are we to think of our present broken post-graduate courses, where two years is considered too long to trust a student (though in a small class, under the guidance of a professor), so that he must be pulled up after a year by the Previous, and dominated by the thought of it from the first day of term, and consigned to a final year of hopeless effort if he has not found his feet by Previous time, and therefore has lost his "class" already? The university idea demands that a post-graduate student shall be given freedom to grow into his subject.

This university has always been conscious of its responsibility towards the rank and file of the students, and has never neglected them. I am sure that it shares the general worry about the inadequacy of the education given to them in universities throughout the country. It would be [amusing, were it not in reality rather tragic and humiliating, to hear the remarks of military commentators on our graduates who come before them as candidates for commissions. The simple and pregnant remark made by one of them the other day was, "You really *must* educate these people better". Now surely the kind of quality for which these selectors of military officers are looking—so vainly that the proportion of the rejections is enormous, quite apart from rejections on purely physical grounds—the kind of quality that a military officer should have is, in the main, just the sort of thing that we should be seeking to cultivate in all our undergraduates. They should be well informed; they should be alert, and accustomed to use their brains; they should be able to think clearly, without emotional distraction; they should be able to express themselves clearly and correctly, and they should have a certain capacity for leadership.

Is not this just what we should aim at in our university colleges? You might say that leadership can belong only to a few; but still a certain degree of leader-

ship must fall to the lot of all the tiny proportion of our people who become university graduates. I do not wish to dwell upon this matter, or to speak about the revision of curricula and methods which we in Jaipur have thought might meet this need in a new university.

But I should like to consider, for a moment, one aspect of the failure of universities. Where are the men who in the days immediately to come, are to place themselves at the disposal of the country in its public life?

The great need of India is the need of men. The world to-day is above all else a practical world, and it demands results. What it is looking for is men who can and will do things.

Think of the enormous development of the requirements of the country in respect of public bodies, even now, as compared with what they were even twenty years ago. The country is dotted over with legislatures, each requiring not only members, incorruptible, earnest, self-sacrificing, tolerant, co-operative, but also ministers with the same utter freedom from axe-grinding and a still greater breadth of view and restraint of behaviour. Take again the enormous development of municipal life all over the country, for which we require equally honourable, incorruptible and strenuous men, if these municipalities are not to degenerate into something very perilous to the well-being of the state.

Where are we to get these men if not from the universities? How are we ever to get them unless the universities and all their colleges are determined that their atmospheres shall nurture such virtue and their daily routine shall give scope for its practising?

Speaking of municipalities, may I, without grave peril, say a word about your famous city? I do not know—I am an utter stranger to this place—how far either the Government or the public of Agra are satisfied with the outward appearance or with the sanitary condition of this city. May I, however, say frankly that it presents a most dismal and woe-begone spectacle even to the most casual visitor? If I may give only one instance, I happened to drive along the Jumna Road not long ago. It looked to me so utterly untidy and neglected. And yet what could not one make of such a road? The road skirts the river Jumna—the river was full at the time I saw it—with that noblest of all architectural monuments standing in all its beauty in the distance on the river's bank, and with another magnificent structure, Itimaduddaula's Tomb, on the opposite bank. On the other side of the river rises, as you know, the massive Red Fort, surmounted by the famous "jharoka" from which the Emperor Shah Jehan is said to have gazed during his long confinement on the wonder which he had created. Why such a splendid opportunity of giving the city one of the finest roads imaginable is neglected, it is not easy to understand.

Surely, the citizens of Agra should bestir themselves, and, with the help of a benign Government, make their city worthy of the historical monuments which it possesses, and to which it owes all its fame and not a little of its prosperity.

But this, alas! is the tale that can be related of almost every city in India. How is it possible for any progress, inward or outward, to be achieved if the people get accustomed to living in an unhealthy and insanitary environment, and are habituated to filth and squalor? Squalor and enlightenment cannot exist together.

It is a sad commentary on the public life of our country that so many of our municipalities should be found so utterly lacking in efficiency and enterprise. It is here that the universities should help the country by producing men of the right sort. How is it possible for this country to progress and prosper so long as she is unable to produce a far larger proportion of men of the right mental calibre and character? It is undoubtedly a fact that our hopes are centred now as never before upon our youth. Men trained in old schools of thought, men wedded to tradition and precedent, and worn by the mental and spiritual struggle to adapt these to new conditions, seek and deserve relief from further responsibility. It is at such a time that you, graduates, are in training for entry, at no distant date, into the front line of service.

Graduates, I should like to suggest to you certain characteristics which may be regarded as indispensable evidence of a good education, not one of them should be lacking in any one who is recognized by his university as its graduate.

(1) Correctness and precision in the use of language. There is a whole philosophy of this. It is not merely a practical asset; both its causes and its effects lie deep in mind and character.

(2) Refined and gentle manners; for manners reveal the man, are the reflection of fixed habits of thought and feeling.

(3) The power and habit of reflection. An educated man must become able to study and think without the supervision of others. He must be—to some extent—a thinker, not a mere imitator. And his thought must be dispassionate.

(4) Sufficient knowledge of history, in its broadest sense, to enable him to understand the main achievements of man, and to see the past as background and origin of the present.

(5) Desire to improve his knowledge and to acquire the power to do so and to enjoy the things that are most worth while.

The roots of all these fine growths are certainly within every one of you; and I am sure that many of your teachers have sought for them, and day by day have done all they could, in kindness and in wisdom, to bring them to maturity. Those who have had such teachers and now must leave them will miss them sadly, and perhaps for a time will feel even stranger and more diffident than others in the larger world you are entering now. Yet you will soon feel the strength with which they have inspired you and you can never lose what they have given you of their own generous life. New associations now begin for you—and with that great idea of association—inter-dependence, I should like to close my address to you. For remember, not independence but inter-dependence is the law of our life. It is in ministering to one another, in bearing one another's burdens, in sharing one another's joy, that we realize our humanity and truly live. Such is the personal life, and such is the way of national and inter-national health, safety, and prosperity. Go out into the world resolved to serve your country in a spirit of true loyalty and devotion, forgetting the petty differences that divide men, regarding all the people living in this land as your own brothers.

The Nagpur University Convocation

The following is the text of the Convocation Address delivered by *C. Rajagopalachariar* on November 25, 1944.

The total number of students undergoing University education in India is about 1½ lakhs. You hold nearly 5,000, that is, you are responsible for three per cent of the total number of the University students in India. Universities play a supremely important part in the system of education in any country. Their standards, their methods and their requirements have a large share in the shaping of the system of education right through to the bottom. Universities should serve to raise the intellectual tone of society as a whole, to cultivate the public mind and to purify the national taste. They should enlarge and at the same time give sobriety to prevailing ideas. They should by producing men with trained minds and well equipped understanding facilitate the exercise of political power by the people. It is only if people can elect enlightened representatives to act on their behalf that democracy can do good and flourish. Apart from these utilitarian functions, Universities should refine the intercourse of private life. Applying these tests to Universities in India, the Sargent Report arrives at a disappointing conclusion. Let us remember that the report is not the production of ill-disposed and discontented nationalists. It is the considered official report of a committee guided by a very capable and conservative English adviser who must be inclined to justify the policy and work hitherto pursued in the field of education in India. The report says that much remains to be done before the Indian Universities can be regarded as fulfilling their true functions.

The Committee is of the opinion that the activities of our Universities have not been duly related to the practical needs of the community as a whole. This is very severe condemnation. The political and economic condition of the country is mainly to blame for the deplorable state of unemployment among University graduates in India. 20 per cent of them, it is estimated, are wholly unemployed. 50 per cent are in jobs for which an ordinary High School education should have been enough. Only 30 per cent, it is calculated, can be said to have secured employment of a type in keeping with their attainments or commensurate to the time and money spent on their education. When we enquire into any evil, we come up against multiplicity of causes and generally discover a vicious circle. Dealing, however, with a particular institution it is well we examine the defects in

that institution although there may be collateral causes and defects elsewhere. If we followed true and equitable principles of national expenditure, the output of the Universities should be limited to the actual absorption-capacity of the community. Otherwise the waste involved would be most justified. Our Universities are largely dependant on college and examination fees. They are unwilling to take any step which must mean a drastic reduction in fee-income. They do not therefore feel inclined to reduce admissions and bring them to the level of the suitable employment available in the country. They may talk about planning, but they have no mind to plan their own out-turn to suit the actual requirements of the nation. On the other hand, students and parents of students have become the victim of what may be called a new gambling habit. A few prize-jobs are available and everyone who has acquired the necessary previous equipment seeks to invest time and money in order to qualify for the mere chance of obtaining one of these prize-jobs. The lucky ones are not necessarily the best, for communal considerations also come in when the allotments are made. Those that get the prizes are of course happy and have no cause to complain. They are in no mood to see defects in the system. The rest, and they are the vast majority, eighty per cent. are thrown upon their own resources after having lost in the gamble. These proceed ruthlessly to oust those that possess only a High School education in the competition for ordinary jobs for which High School education is enough. The wise and careful are ousted by those who have spent time and money on an education not relevant to the jobs themselves but who have lost in the gamble for higher prizes. The evil thus spreads. The system drives boys who have satisfactorily finished the High School course to a scramble for University education, in order that they may not be pushed out in the competition for employment. This explains the remarkably high proportion of students in India resorting to Universities out of the total High School products as compared with the proportion prevailing in Britain and Germany. One out of every three High School pupils goes to the University in India, whereas in the western countries mentioned it is less than one in seven.

What I have said is not the outcome of a bullock-cart mentality and anti-higher-education psychology developed in me by continued association with Sevagram. You can read the Sargent Report and find full justification for all that I have said. Yet, as that report admits, this does not mean that India is over-provided with University education. Calculated in relation to the total population India is the most backward of all civilised nations in University education. In Germany the number of students in the Universities was before this war 1 to 690 of the total population; in Great Britain it is 1 to 837; in the United States it is 1 to 225; in Russia it is 1 to 300. In India it is 1 to 2,206. The economic structure of the body politic should be re-built. Things should be planned and not left to speculation and individual exploitation. The University programme should be an integral part of a scheme for the whole of the national life, its present activities and its hopes for the future. There should be no waste and no unemployment or misemployment of men and women trained at great expense.

It is a matter of congratulation that the old war against affiliating Universities as distinguished from unitary Universities on the model of Oxford and Cambridge has ended with the Sargent Report. It has laid down in clear terms that affiliating and examining Universities are a necessity in India, because in a vast country like India higher education cannot be concentrated in a few selected centres.

The Sargent Report has rightly observed that there is nothing to be said for uniformity at any stage of education in a country of India's size and variety, and that there is great need for constant experiments at all stages. One experiment that requires to be made at once is at least the partial use of the regional language as the medium of instruction in colleges. The dominant position of the Universities prevents genuine efforts at a change over from English even in the High Schools, although it has been made clear beyond all doubt that High School instruction to be efficient must be in the mother-tongue, the latest re-affirmation of this being in the Sargent Report. The language of instruction is a thing quite distinct from the language of technical terms and a change over in the one need not wait for an overhauling of the other.

You did not invite me as one with any special qualification to advise on matters of education. You have done it, I presume, because of my service in the political field. You would like me to tell what I think at this moment when our national aspirations have received rebuffs all round and it appears that our political luck is at its lowest point. Even His Excellency the Chancellor, not to speak of the new graduates, may be surprised if not disappointed if I conclude my address

without making some remarks on the political situation, of course in language and manner suited to the academical atmosphere of this gathering.

A friend in Canada recently sent me a marked copy of a Canadian magazine containing a contribution of the Rt. Hon'ble Malcolm MacDonald, the British High Commissioner in Canada. The article seeks to explain British intentions towards the Colonies and towards India after the war. The British High Commissioner says that the primary purpose of British administration, even among the primitive races in Africa, has been and will be to train them to stand firmly on their own social and political feet. I do not know what General Smuts on the one hand or the natives on the other may have to say on this point. But let us see what this high British official says about India. No one can predict yet, says he, when any particular colony will reach the goal of complete self government. But so far as the British Government and the British people can determine it, the time for its arrival in India has been fixed. For many years past, says he, the British Government have been anxious to press ahead with reforms which would result in the assumption by India of the full powers of a sovereign nation. He says that certain practical difficulties prevent fulfilment and that these difficulties exist not in British policy but in India. We are told that partly the Princely Indian States complicate the issue, but the primary difficulty is that the Hindu and Muslim communities have not yet been able to compose their political differences and to agree upon constitution of a self-governing India. The British High Commissioner in Canada is certain that if the people of India could agree among themselves, their complete national freedom either as a Dominion or as an independent nation outside the Commonwealth is assured at the end of this war, as the British Government have agreed as soon as the war has ended to implement this policy in the letter and the spirit.

You are well aware that I hold the view that these pronouncements should be taken at their full face-value and constantly placed before the world, so that when the time comes the British may be stopped from backing out of the position. In spite of this policy that I recommend to Indian nationalism, I must say that reading this article of the British High Commissioner, one is reminded of a Mahabharata story, which is well known in India. When the truthful Yudhishthir said on the battle-field "Dead is Aswatthama the elephant," the Machiavellian leader of the Pandav forces loudly blew his conch as the word 'elephant' was uttered. The message was partially jammed and Drona the Commander of the Kaurav Forces had to die having heard from the lips of the truthful Yudhishthir that his son Aswatthama had died. A half-truth is worse than a lie. What the British High Commissioner in Canada has said and British propagandists all over the world are saying is not the whole truth judged from their present conduct. Let us not be misled by the blast of conches.

Does Britain wish to present these two points about the Princes and the Muslims as mere arguments and excuses for a policy of drift and negation, or does Britain feel unhappy over these two difficulties and wish to overcome them if possible? If the latter is the case, we shall accept any just and fair award that will end these difficulties at once. A court of arbitration may be constituted to the satisfaction of the Allied Powers or of Canada and the United States where all this propaganda is done. Why should we wait for the end of the war in the Far-East as well as in the West? Will the establishment of a representative government at the head of affairs in India be a greater distraction than the Presidential election in America? And are there not compensating advantages even if we should have to suffer a temporary distraction?

"Princely India", as it is called, cannot complicate the issue if Britain makes up her mind. We know how the British Governors-General have dealt with the Princes in the past and are still dealing with them when they are bent upon something. The stories of Oudh, of Nagpur, of Jhansi and of Satara can be read even in school books of Indian History. The difficulty about minorities is a problem that presents itself and is disposed of in every part of the civilised world. We may and should conciliate every minority, but even the most powerful minorities cannot be allowed to veto for all time the lawful wishes of the majority. The majority has never objected to an equitable distribution of power and responsibility and has always been agreeable to the most careful and particular protection of every civic, economic and political right of the minorities that is known to the civilised world.

When war broke out in 1939 and threatened to spread over the whole world, the Indian National Congress desired that to enable India to play her part in it, the people of India should be declared free and entitled to full self-government. The Congress made it clear in repeated resolutions that it did not adopt an attitude of

pacifism or neutrality in relation to this war, which it knew it could not do even if it wished. It declared itself ready and willing for the fullest association with the Allies provided her claim for a status of independence and equality with the other free peoples of the world was admitted. The Indian National Congress made this position as clear as was the obverse of it, namely that it protested against India being coerced into belligerency without recognition of her free status.

The issue was not handled by the British Government in the manner that the situation demanded. As a result mutual distrust developed and became fixed as a chronic disease so that even His Majesty's Government's declaration on March 11, 1942, to which no exception could be taken hardly made any impression on the people of India. Still, had more patience been shown by the British mission in the negotiations that took place in Delhi in April 1942 and more earnest co-operation been forthcoming from the Viceroy, the issue might have been solved. But as everyone now knows, greater attention was directed to propaganda as to who was to blame than to a settlement of the issue itself. I do not claim for the Indian leaders that on their side they made no mistakes in this connection. Blunders on one side could not bring disaster if on the other side were developed compensating tact, patience and statesmanship. We could have saved the situation in spite of Viceregal non-co-operation if we had these qualities in extra-measure. Instead we succumbed to the temptation of competing in pride, impatience and distrust and the negotiations broke down. The British Government were not prepared to go far in taking risks to appease Indian nationalism or in extending trust to those who showed so much distrust. They preferred to be content with such co-operation as they could get on their own terms and banked on the resources that they could commandeer with the help and power of the physical authority they exercised in this country. They decided to fight Indian nationalism along with the Axis. They adopted methods of non-co-operation as well as of repression in conducting this battle. They met every symptom of discontent with repression and adopted the method of passive resistance against all proposals for a solution of the deadlock. This policy continues and our own errors of pride and lack of statesmanship have helped the British. The future is full of danger for world-peace. Wisdom calls for a satisfactory solution of the Indian problem before the peace-treaty of 1945 overtakes the world.

The honour of an invitation to address the graduates of this University was extended to me on more than one occasion before this, but I was prevented for one reason or another from enjoying the privilege. I am very grateful to the authorities of the University for repeating the invitation in spite of my defaults. I understand that the invitation to me has displeased some of the people who hold the view that there should be no conciliation of Muslim opinion by any recognition of the right of separation for Muslim tracts in the future constitution of India. On behalf of the University authorities I must point out that the invitation to me was much older than the recent negotiations. In fact, I owe an apology to the late Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Kedar, for my inability to accept his invitations during his terms of office. Again on behalf of myself let me ask those who apprehend evil from my address, Is the case for undivided Hindustan so weak that it can be endangered by a speech of mine on this occasion? Such fear does no credit to the strength of your conviction. Obviously you doubt your creed. Or is it your view that these graduates who have gone through an intellectual course which has qualified them for various Degrees in your University are yet so poor of understanding that they cannot safely stand a single assault on my part? It would do little credit to your confidence in University education if you think its products should be kept in intellectual purdah lest the purity of their beliefs and opinions may be corrupted?

I know that the University authorities do not hold such views and that I am giving perhaps undue importance to a stray dissenter. But I feel that I had better point out the error of even one person who has such apprehensions. Our national problems are difficult and cry for solution. No one, least of all University men, should hold the view that truth is protected by suppression of opinion or that a University education that entitles one to a Degree is yet not good enough to enable one safely to hear some contrary opinions on national questions.

And what is the heresy I am guilty of? I stand for a solution of the Muslim issue on terms which have now obtained the approval and adherence of the acknowledged captain of our national affairs. The terms of solution are open to anyone to examine and criticise. By all means let us prefer to let things remain unsolved rather than agree to anything dishonourable or tyrannical, but it is not dishonour or submission to tyranny to allow the majorities in any area to be in more than subordinate charge of the affairs of these areas, which is the offer that we made to Mr. Jinnah and with which he is not satisfied.

Muslim leadership has, in my humble opinion, shown an incapacity for courageously following up its own declared policy. It is ever the case, that we show more courage when demanding something which the other party will not give, than when it arrives and claims our acceptance and responsibility. The dangers and troubles of a sovereign separate State become more obvious when it is offered than when it was demanded and refused. The Muslim League obviously prefers controversy to the responsibilities of government. It finds a sense of success in functioning as a well-disciplined party in opposition to any advance towards democratic rule in India, which is easier than the undertaking of a separate state in the present world. It is not the champions of unitary Government, not the Akhand Hindustan leadership, but the Muslim League itself that has dealt a severe blow and caused a set-back to the Pakistan claim. If the League's contention is that Pakistan cannot maintain itself without the inclusion of non-Muslim areas within its boundaries, it is a fatal admission against the case for separation and makes the argument for united India unanswerable. Yet this was one of the concrete claims over which negotiation broke down. May be that this is all to the good. It gives time for everyone to think more about it. If the Muslims can reconcile themselves to a united and federated India, they can have it and an honoured and even a privileged place in it. If the Muslims want a halfway house in the shape of a Confederation of free units in voluntary combination without prejudice to their potential sovereignty, they can have such an arrangement too. If they do not want to be a unit in any Federation or Confederation but want to be a separate sovereign State as was said when they met at Lahore in 1940, they can have that also, but we have stated the just, fair and feasible conditions under which they can have it.

Then we come to the seemingly greater constitutional obstacle to Indian freedom and Indian democracy, namely, the treaty-protected autocratic rule of Indian princes in extensive tracts sprawling all over India. Their able ministers speak two languages—one the language of the modern world, of democracy and progress, when they criticise the Muslim League's attitude, and quite another language when they seek to hold on to the privileges derived from Treaties, Engagements and Sanads, entered into during the time of the East India Company. They claim alliance with the King of Great Britain and sovereign status as against Indian nationalism. They claim as a corollary the right of non-accession to any Indian polity based on democracy to which they do not individually and specifically give their approval. In internal administration they refuse to march with the times and have so far failed to give to their own people the political rights that the people of the provinces in British India enjoy under statute, although there is no difference whatever in the condition, education and culture of the people of the two intermingled areas. The talk of their own genius and tradition and development along those lines is just dust in the eyes of the foreign critic. They use the phrase internal autonomy meaning thereby the maintenance of personal rule and opposition to the movement of democracy percolating into their domains. They claim under treaty with Britain the help of British military forces to protect their authority as against their own subjects. As Professor Coupland has described it in his recent book, the gatherings that take the name of legislative assemblies in some of the most advanced of these Indian States are still mere Durbars that add colour to the grandeur of the personal rule that prevails in those areas. Psychological illusions of democracy are sought to be created with the help of large nominated blocks that vote to order silently to neutralise any popular vote. The Madras States, Mysore, Hyderabad, the Central Indian States, the Eastern States, the West India States, the Rajputana States and Kashmir, form together a great sprawling patch on the map of India and are a greater logical impediment to the aspiration for unitary democratic rule in India than the vague and unparticularised desire of the Muslim League to form a sovereign State out of certain areas in the northwest of India and in East Bengal. What I have said about the absence of constitutional government in the Indian States does not mean that some of the Princes and their capable officials have not done a great deal for the prosperity and happiness of their people. Indeed in some matters autocratic rule can achieve quickly what takes considerable time and management in democracies. Some of the States have advanced beyond British Provinces in certain matters that do not affect the personal authority of the princes and their ministers. But good government is no substitute for self-government, as Dadabhai Naoroji quoting Campbell-Bannerman said 38 years ago, and is still as true as ever before.

That India has a great future is certain. My faith is as strong as ever, but we must shed the fond dream of driving the ball into the hole in one stroke. We have to work up to it and work positively. We must abandon the notion that is in

patriotic to be in the wilderness and that if we avoid present responsibility, the great prize will drop on us as a gift of the Gods in return for the *Tapasya* of abstinence. We should cease hoping that by some magic our persistent refusal to help ourselves will outwit both the enemies of our freedom abroad and the opponents of nationalism at home and that till then we have only to be patient. Let us not imagine that by persistent abstinence from exercising partial responsibility we shall achieve both our objectives at one and the same time, that of bringing about internal harmony and confidence in place of discord and distrust, and of wresting full power from unwilling Imperialists who have our country and its people in their grip. If we wish to advance in our programme we must seize such opportunities and such power as and when they come, and use them to heal the diseases that have developed in the body politic. We should use them to build up the habit of a common purpose cutting across clans, creeds and communities and to establish social and economic conditions that will help us to become strong as a united people and sustain the responsibilities of freedom. The cry will be raised that this is defeatist mentality and that I advocate surrender. Of such clap-trap we have had more than enough. To give up an illusion is not surrender but wisdom, especially when that illusion leads us to leave the field free to Imperialism and those that thrive on it, to corruption and the full play of all anti-national forces. The confidence that if we seize opportunities and take up power and responsibility we can build up is not defeatism but the contrary of it. Subjection has developed diseases of all kinds and I firmly believe that they cannot be healed by merely remaining in the wilderness and allowing reaction to do full mischief. By all means, let us keep our aim and our inherent right to a revolution intact. Let us not be committed to a course that takes us away from the goal and the path leading to it. But let us not discard precious opportunities for building up. The handiest and most effective tool for constructive work that rebuilds a nation is the government machine.

The journey along the route that I advocate may seem long, but it may prove much shorter than it may now seem. On the other hand the heroic short-cuts that appear in the map of our day-dreams may be nowhere available on the actual field and serve only to leave the enemies of progress in full and free possession. I advise this on its own merits but let us remember also that when this present war terminates, as a result of experience gained therein by the belligerents, the status of international sovereignty will be curtailed in material respects, "Inter-dependence, not independence" will be the international slogan raised by the Great Powers. Excepting America, Britain and Russia, all the peoples of the world will be less than sovereign. None of the small States properly so called or the States, which though big in size and population must lag behind in military and economic organisation, will be truly independent. All of these will be treated as legitimate fields for the activities of the International Police, which is another name for the tripartite forces of the Great Powers. But or rather therefore India will not be worse off than most of the so-called independent States of the world, if she takes up her own responsibility under any fairly decent settlement. The quality and numerical strength of our population are such that in spite of all that I apprehend may happen in the world immediately after this war, I am certain that we shall one day be a great well-governed people at the head of the liberated peoples of the world leading them in civilisation. Let me hope that you who have received Degrees this year will see that day in your life-time.

I congratulate you on the attainment of your Degrees, in particular the women-graduates. Do not be depressed either by your unemployment or by your environment. Even if you do not find work suitable to your equipment and commensurate with the labour you have bestowed on your education, remember your role as University men and women and do what you can to raise the intellectual tone of society, to purify the public taste, to make people broad-minded and to bring refinement in private life. In such endeavour you will find your happiness whatever may be your rank or condition. God bless you all.

The Patna University Convocation

The following is the text of the Address delivered at the Special Convocation of the Patna University on the occasion of its Silver Jubilee Celebration by *Sri Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan* on the 30th November, 1941:—

I am deeply grateful to the authorities of the Patna University for their kindness in asking me to speak on this memorable occasion when the University is celebrating its Silver Jubilee. When I received the invitation, my first feeling was one of doubt—doubt, whether I had anything to say, that would not be a tedious repetition of things more adequately said before, unless, avoiding that, I fell into the trap of developing some original solution of the world problems. Fortified by the hope that truths can bear repetition, I shall not amuse you with any novel tale of our civilisation, its cause and cure.

As institutions measure their lives, this University is very young, and your distinguished Vice-Chancellor, who has served for four terms, though old in years, is young enough to see visions and act on them. The address, which he recently gave at the inauguration of the Utkal University, reveals his obstinate idealism and constructive patriotism. Though he there reminds us that he is only a "matribulate," we know that he is a typical University man, sane, tolerant, and devoted to the service of learning and good manners. When he retires at the end of the year from the Vice-Chancellorship of this University, he can look back upon a singularly varied, interesting, and satisfying life, and in his period of retirement—may it be very long—he may yet see his University play an important part in the life of the province, and his country grow into a self-governing, contented and helpful partner in the federated commonwealth of nations.

Though this University has had about twenty-five years of life, some of its institutions are much older, and the traditions of University life in this city have been of great antiquity. Patna¹ and its neighbourhood have been the stronghold of a tradition so remote and uninterrupted as to startle our mushroom vanities. "As far, O Ananda, as there are noble places of residence," says the Buddha, "as far as merchants travel, this will become the chief town, the Pataliputra, a centre for the interchange of all kinds of wares."² Shortly after the death of the Buddha, the capital of the kingdom of Magadha was shifted from Rajagṛha to Pataliputra. Under Chandragupta Maurya, a vast empire was established which absorbed the dominions conquered by Alexander the Great. Pataliputra was even then famous for great teachers of secular learning. Canakya propounded a scheme of government and political strategy which influenced the minds of the ruling classes for centuries. The great grammarians (Panini, Patanjali,³ Vararuci) were associated with this place.⁴ Asoka, whose edicts graven on rocks and pillars in all the provinces of his vast empire, preach in simple and familiar language the great truths of goodness, gentleness, charity, and mutual respect had his capital at Pataliputra.⁵ His councils were held here, and his missions of peace and piety set forth from this place. Many great teachers of Buddhism, from Moggalliputta and Upagupta, came from these parts.

Jainism spread from here to all parts of India including Afghanistan. It was in Pataliputra that the eleven Jain *angas* were compiled about 300 B. C. Digambara Umasvati and Aryabhata flourished here. After the fall of the Maurya dynasty, the Sunga line came into power, and its founder Pusyamitra repelled the forces of the Greeks, and performed the famous 'horse sacrifice', according to Vedic rites. This incident shows the rise of the Vedic religion. Under the imperial Guptas (4th and 5th Centuries A. D.) Pataliputra became the centre of a Hindu revival. A Vaishnava religion (which absorbed the beauty and gentleness of Buddhism) developed, insisting on love and charity to all mankind. Yuan Chwang found the city in a decadent

¹Archaeological evidence shows that the modern city of Patna is built on the site of the ancient Pataliputra.

²Rockhill: *The Life of the Buddha*, p. 126.

³Patanjali illustrates the use of a certain preposition by the expression, *anusonam pataliputram*. Pataliputra is situated on the river Son. Even during the visit of Megasthenes, it was situated at the junction of the two rivers, the Son and the Ganges. Apparently the bed of the river Son has changed its course.

⁴Cp. *sruyate ca pataliputre sastrakara pariksa atropavarasvarasu iha paninipin-gala iha vyadhi vararuci patanjali iha parikeitah khyatim upajagmuh.*

⁵Of him H. G. Wells writes in his *The Outline of History*: "Amidst the tens of thousands of names of monarchs that crowd the columns of history, their majesties and graciousnesses, and serenities and royal highnesses, and the like, the name of Asoka shines, and shines almost alone, a star. From the Volga to Japan his name is still honoured. China, Tibet, and even India, though it has left his doctrine, preserve the tradition of his greatness. More living men cherish his memory today than have ever heard the names of Constantine or Charlemagne."

condition, and speaks to us of the monuments of past magnificence. The city was restored to power and prosperity under the Pala king, Dharmapala, 810 A. D. and flourished for a while. Epigraphic evidence reveals the glories of Pataliputra till the 12th Century A. D., when it passed under Mohammadan rule. Sher Shah, in 1541, built the fort of Patna which soon became a centre of trade and attracted European merchants. The Jesuits founded a settlement at Patna in 1620 and the English had their own base by 1657. In the years that followed the Battle of Plassey, Patna became a great military centre. On the 12th December, 1911, the new Province of Bihar and Orissa was constituted with Patna as its capital.

The viharas from which this province derives its name, were the Buddhist counterpart of the gurukulas of the Vedic period, with their *rajs*. They were the resorts of Buddhist monks and nuns for study and meditation. "To give viharas to the samgha, where in safety and in peace, to meditate and think at ease, the Buddha calls the best of gifts. Let then, the able man, regarding his own weal, have pleasant monasteries built, and lodge there learned men."¹ As learned men began to lodge in viharas, students were attracted to them, from various parts of India, as also from distant Java and Sumatra, from Ceylon and China, from Tibet and Korea. These viharas were centres of Buddhist study for nearly twelve centuries. Fa-Hien (399—414 A. D.), who spent three years in this city collecting rare Buddhist scriptures, speaks of two viharas or monasteries at Pataliputra, with six to seven hundred monks and thousands of students.

I-Tsing tells us that at Nalanda he saw not only those who were apprenticing themselves to the religious life of a monk, but also those who had no intention of renouncing the world, and so acquired general learning necessary for the life of the householder. In the words of the biographer of Yuan Chwang, the subjects studied included "the Vedas and other books, the Hetuvidya, Sabdavidya, Cikitsavidya, the Atharva Veda and Sankhya." In the first or the entrance course a knowledge of the following branches of study was required: Sabdavidya or vyakarana, grammar, slipasthanavidya or arts and crafts, cikitsavidya or medical science, hetuvidya or logic, and the adhyatmavidya or the science of self.

During the Mohammadan period in Patna were established many madrasahs. Sikhism also influenced the people, Patna being the birthplace of the Sikh leader, Guru Govind. Pataliputra has thus been famous for its retreats of spiritual life and seats of learning, secular and sacred. The author of *Kathasaritsagara* speaks of it in eloquent terms.²

The University whose Silver Jubilee we are celebrating today, is built on the site and should continue the tradition of Pataliputra sacred to memory, consecrated by legend and immortalised by history. The University of Patna was founded in pursuance of the policy of the British Government which assumed charge of the moral and material progress of this vast country in the middle of the nineteenth century. The first of the Indian Universities is the University of Calcutta, which was founded on 24th January, 1857, and in the course of that famous year, the Universities of Bombay and Madras were also established. These Universities were however only examining bodies, while the colleges affiliated to them undertook direct teaching. In 1882, the Punjab University was founded, which paid more attention to oriental learning than others; and Allahabad was founded in 1887. At the end of the last century Calcutta University exercised jurisdiction over a large part of India—Bengal, Bihar, Orissa, Assam, the Central Provinces, Burma and Ceylon. A University spread over such an area cannot be expected to exercise adequate control over the affiliated colleges, or help in the advancement of learning or efficiency teaching. A Commission was appointed to suggest measures "as may tend to elevate the standard of University teaching and to promote the advancement of learning." The Act of 1904 helped to make some of the Universities into teaching ones. In 1915 the Government of India issued a Resolution favouring the development of new teaching and residential Universities, and restricting the area over which the affiliating Universities had control by securing a separate University for each of the leading provinces of India. In pursuance of this policy the Universities of Dacca, Aligarh and Benares, Rangoon, Patna and Nagpur were established.

To satisfy the needs of the province of Bihar, which was the major partner in the newly-created province of Bihar and Orissa, and affiliating and examining

¹ *Cullavagga*, VI. 1. 5.

² *śad idam diyyam nagaram mayaracitam sa pauram ata eva namna pataliputram ksetram laksmiearasvatyoh*

University of the old type was established at Patna. Now that Orissa has become a separate province, it is only natural that it should have a University of its own and we are all pleased to welcome the establishment of the Utkal University, and find among us its first Vice-Chancellor.

Through modern Universities Western Culture has become an effective factor in our cultural evolution. The country is reborn after years of trouble, and her culture renovated through contact with the west. All the signs of a great Renaissance, the surge for freedom in all sides of life, the new conception of a national patriotism and public spirit, are stimulated by western thought and criticism.

When we stand on this site with its stones worn smooth by the tread of uncounted generations, when we incline before the monuments of the creative effort of earlier ages, the Brahmanical, the Buddhist, the Hindu and Moghul, in supplication for the renewal of strength, we are impressed by the deathlessness (mṛtyu-njayata) of the spirit, that, though bent to earth, rises buoyant from the pressure of cruelties and inspires us to new life. Generation have come and gone, standards of faith and courage have risen and fallen, but the spirit of the race is immortal, renewed from age to age in the great souls who most shiningly embody it. The history of this city is a mirror of the continuous development of Indian life and culture, which is not a haphazard collection like an album of old photographs, but a living organism where the life-giving currents still operate. They do not disappear though they change their incidence. The ability of the Indian mind to gaze backward, while moving forward, has made for both continuity and progress. In every civilisation there are certain constants as well as certain variables. The great constant of Indian culture, is the spirit which is not the product of one century alone, but part of a great vital thrust that had taken other forms in the far distant past, and will take still other shapes in the unknowable future. This spirit of India, which it is hard to analyse and hard to explain, is one in which all Indians in different ways share, this strange and exalted feeling is that there is a kingdom not of this world which is within our grasp.

In the ancient system of education the three main aims of human life were recognised. We are producers, citizens, and men or human beings. We all need to make a living, the best that conditions allow. We all live in a society, and so should be good members of it. We require a scale of values, an idea of the good life. The efficiency of a community depends on the vocational or technical training given to its members, its cohesion on the civic and social virtues cultivated by its members and its quality on the spiritual direction, the sense of values adopted by the society. The main purpose of education is not exhausted by the first two, by the acquisition of knowledge and technical skill or the social virtues. There is a hunger which will not be appeased by these. The soul of man is created for the vision of the Supreme. In its possession, though it were only a faint gleam caught from a great way off, is happiness. Bereft of it the human spirit is in torment. We need the attainment of wisdom which makes for spiritual freedom. Sa vidya ya vimuktaye. The spirit of Indian culture is dominated by the ideal of the integral or the whole man. In the cosmic staircase which the Taittiriya Upanisad describes as consisting of five stages of matter, anna, life, prana, the simple consciousness of the animal or primitive man, manas, the intellectual consciousness, vijñana, the integral consciousness of the spiritual man, ananda, we are of the fourth and must grow into the fifth order of awareness. Initiation into a higher life, rebornness, dvitīyam jānma, is the purpose of education. We are born into a world that is visible, phenomenal, material and directly observable, the world of science and law; there is another world behind and beyond this world, the invisible, interior, spiritual, felt rather than perceived, sought rather than observed, the world of spirit. To this world of spirit there is an element in us which responds, which makes us trust in a Reality that is beyond the perception of the senses, beyond the scope of logical reason. We bow before the transcendent Reality which we cannot hope to enclose in any formulae formed by the human mind, but it is the source of the ideal that inspires the life of humanity. There is the pressure of the spirit in man, the force that inspires us to seek the better, not only in the order of knowledge but in the order of life.

When we get beyond succession, when the soul's ground touches essential Being, we find the inexhaustible fount of peace; the peace based on a deep confidence in God. It is the inward tranquillity of mind that looks beyond anxiety, conflict, destruction itself, that knows that pain and evil, even the world's dark future is enfolded in a deeper imperishable life, that gives us the eye of compassion with which we can see the cruelty and injustice of life, the violence of the strong,

and the sufferings of the weak. When the Upanisads declare that we must know the Self, when the Buddha asks us to seek bodhi, or enlightenment, when Jesus warns us that only truth shall make us free, they are pointing out in different ways the insufficiency of secular learning and the inadequacy of mere humanism as a guide to life.

The great teachers of ancient times were not only learned but virtuous. Yuan chwang gives us an account of the teachers, Brahmanical and Buddhist, whom he met.² They had a disdain for the allurements of life, for its pleasures and prizes which were spread before them in vain. These strangely enfranchised beings lived in the world but were yet outside its jurisdiction. They carried on their duties with a decisive detachment and helped their pupils to become aware of a kingdom which is not of this world.

This University in the immediate future will have to develop a post-graduate school for sciences and letters, and establish professional and technological institutes. If the young of the province are to be prepared for life in a modern society, the University will have to provide facilities for training in the scientific, agricultural, and industrial departments. These developments will have to take place, war or no war. In the hour of her worst peril, Great Britain did not say 'let us win the war first before planning for the future.' Educational development is a part of the general plan for national reconstruction, which, of course, will include health and social security. If the University develops along these lines, it will carry out the traditions of the ancient University settlements but it will be disloyal to them if it overlooks the essential, spiritual aim of all education.

Your University is a war baby. It was founded in the midst of World War I and has come of age in the middle of World War II. We are all of one mind about the cruelty and injustice of war. Let us not hide from ourselves the actual meaning of war. Its history is written across all the skies in blood and fire, disclosing the shame and disgrace of our civilisation. War means the shrieks of the mutilated and the dying, the screams of children cut down or torn to pieces by shrapnel, in bombed cities, day after day, week after week, for years, leaving behind, when the war is over, thousands of soldiers, sailors and airmen, blinded, maimed and mutilated, spitting blood out of their lungs, or beating their heads against the walls of mental hospitals. The conscience of mankind, which is not in the hands of a few ambitious politicians who manipulate the state machine, declares that war is the blackest of all crimes in human history. There is a profound feeling that, if we are to win the peace, if wars are not to occur again, we must bring about fundamental changes in the heart and mind of the modern world.

The most dangerous period is not the years of war when we struggle for victory, but the years when war ends and we serve to win the peace. In the exaltation felt at the ending of a long agony, we will be tempted to overlook the measures necessary to ensure the close of a gross, selfish epoch and the beginning of a happier era for tortured mankind. The statesmen will be busy as in 1918 with the forms of settlement but what happened in the years between the wars

² "There are men who, far seen in antique lore and fond of the refinements of learning, 'are content in seclusion', leading lives of continence. These come and go (lit. sink and float) outside of the world, and promenade through life away from human affairs. Though they are not moved by honour or reproach, their fame is far spread. The rulers treating them with ceremony and respect cannot make them come to court. Now as the State holds men of learning and genius in esteem, and the people respect those who have high intelligence, the honours and praises of such men are conspicuously abundant, and the attentions, private and official, paid to them are very considerable. Hence men can force themselves to a thorough acquisition of knowledge. Forgetting fatigue they 'expatriate in the arts and sciences,' seeking for wisdom while 'relying on perfect virtue' they 'count not 1,000 li a long journey'. Though their family be in affluent circumstances, such men make up their minds to be like the vagrants, and get their food by begging as they go about. With them there is honour in knowing truth (in having wisdom) and there is no disgrace in being destitute. As to those who lead dissipated idle lives, luxurious in food and extravagant in dress, as such men have no moral excellences and are without accomplishments, shame and disgrace come on them and their ill-repute is spread abroad."

Extract from "*On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India, 629-645 A.D.*" E. T. by Thomas Walters, and after his death by T. W. Rhys Davids, and S. W. Bushell, London, Royal Asiatic Society (1904), pp. 160-61.

shows the inadequacy of political settlements and the need to educate the spirit of man.

Indian thinkers understand that peace or *santi* is born of control of greed and selfishness. The Chinese make out that there can be no peace without harmony (*ho*) and equality (*ping*). "Peace," said Augustine, "is the quietness of order, is the disposition, which, according to the likeness or unlikeness of things, assigns to each one its place." It is an organic, balanced condition of society. It is charity, intellectual charity, mutual understanding in which all those who believe in civilization, humanity, order should co-operate. The success of any political settlement will depend on the economic and intellectual, the moral and spiritual factors. It would be disastrous to devise the mechanism and neglect the human forces that regulate it.

The world has been burning for five years, and even when it was not on fire, it was steadily getting madder, more frightened, and more full of anxiety, unrest and hatred. The blindness of prestige, the arrogance of a master race, the fear of economic loss engaged the minds of the ruling classes in almost all countries. A philosophy of life which exalts lust for conquest and dominion, which makes a religion of war and a cult of mass murders, which puts gangsterism into uniform and calls it patriotism, which looks upon murder and atrocities as noble acts of duty, has been in the ascendant. There are laws against those who set a house on fire or murder another man, but if we burn whole cities and kill thousands of men, there are no penalties provided against such acts. The false philosophy has to be defeated in the world of thought.

Nazism is not a sudden accident in the pattern of history. If it were so, we might hope to secure a peaceful way of life, when once Nazism was crushed. The pre-world suffered from a fundamental malaise in which not only the Axis powers but all nations had their shares. A world of slave empires, racial discriminations, industrial struggles, and wastages of human life through preventible unemployment cannot make for peace. So long as we perpetuate such a world, we shall not have peace though we destroy the Hitlerite regime.

If we would find the real cause of the contemporary tragedy when men live in a hell of hatred and destruction, when the means of happiness provided by the resources of science are within our grasp, we have to look deeper than the political catastrophes or the economic disasters of a mechanized industrialism in which starvation and overproduction exist side by side. Never before in the history of man has it been possible for us to create the world in which we wish to live. In the past the desires of men were not difficult to discover, but the means for their satisfaction were not available in an adequate measure. Now, thanks to the marvels of science and technology, the means are available, but the act of spirit is lacking. In ancient India and ancient Greece, the seers imagined great ends and built great civilizations, but they failed, as the possibilities of good life were denied to large numbers, possibly due to the insufficiency of resources. We have today enormous resources, but are unable to imagine great ends and so ruin is staring us in the face. The contrast between man's greatness and his wretchedness, between his power and weakness, between his opportunity and his plight is due to the failure of spirit to man's incapacity to frame and strive for great ends, the real values of the individual soul, and the ends of the State which are not prestige, power or dominion, but the happiness of love, the joy of home life, the worship of God, the pursuit of truth and beauty through science and art. The world's descent into barbarism is due to an anti-democratic philosophy of life.

Sensible people are sceptical, disillusioned and unhappy as the whole development of recent thought which culminated in world-war is anti-democratic. Owing to our preoccupation with the scientific method, which has given us marvels and revolutionised society, we failed to understand the value of the individual who is the creator of all science. As our study of the object—nature and society—increased, our attention to the subject, the inspirer of all values diminished. Copernicus seemed to destroy the old, comfortable assumption that the earth was the centre of things and by disclosing the vast extent of the material universe, dwarfed the importance of man. Darwin thought that the species which survived were obviously those which were best fitted to survive. When we take this principle out of its biological context and apply it to human affairs, we believe that there should be no interference of the State in economic affairs. Man's productive activities, economists tell us, are governed by their own laws and the less they are interfered with, the better will they function. Economic activities, we are told, are not to be judged or directed by normal considerations. The pursuit of enlightened

self-interest, Bentham declares, would lead to the greatest good of society. Freud suggests that the pattern of the adult mind is fixed in the relationships between a child and its parents formed unconsciously in early infancy. The individual is not, in any effective sense, responsible for his conduct. The behaviourist hypothesis dismisses the mind altogether. Mind is simply the sum of reflex actions of the nervous system, its responses and reactions. The scientific estimates of man, as biological, economic, psychological or sociological, have a strong hold on a considerable section of mankind. If we speak of religion and philosophy, plausible explanations which explain them away are offered. Religion, to Freud, is an immense superstructure, growing out of an infantile conflict with the father; to Marx, it is an instrument of social domination; to sociologists, it is animism or wishful thinking. More than the scientists or the philosophers, those who followed them seized isolated fragments of truth and exalted them into wide generalisations and became leaders of sects or schools of new thought. These exponents of new smartness use all the machines of publicity and impose themselves on impressionable minds and fill them with doubts about the value of the human personality. The gradual loss of the old simplicity and integrity, the progressive elimination of the human individual, has affected the roots of our life.

Yet there is the unappeased need in man to love and adore, to dare and risk, to suffer and sacrifice himself for causes. Lay religions of tribe and nation, of blood and race are exploiting man's aspirations for the high and the noble. The world has become pagan and barbarous. We have mastered the world and the self but sold ourselves to the devil.

When we therefore turn to the spirit of Indian culture, it is not a mere nostalgic longing for the past. It is necessary corrective for the civilisation which has taken a wrong turn, for the culture which has disintegrated. It offers a new integration of life, bringing religion and science, politics and business into a unity. If we are to make a better world, we must become different men with different standards and aspirations. The great tradition of philosophy—Indian, Greek, Muslim and Christian, recalls us to our unity in the rational nature, our unity in the supreme end towards which we all should strive. Each one of us has by virtue of his manhood and not birth or social status the right to exist, the right to keep one's body whole, the right to seek those good things through which a rational creature may perfect himself, and the right to travel toward eternal life along the road of one's conscience. Human dignity requires that all men should be treated as men, not as things. We must enjoy, in the words of Asoka, *danda samata* or equality of all before the law, *vyavaharsamata*, political or social equality. Each one should have an opportunity to achieve, according to his effort and his condition, his human fulness, to attain the fruits of wisdom and virtue whether he is digging the earth or governing a State. Social justice demands the free participation by each one of us in the good things, material and cultural, which will help him to gain that inner liberty, which is obtained by knowledge of the truth and mastery over self.

We have in India a double legacy of generous tradition and a blighting discord, a spiritual elation and an obstinate disease. We have preached equality and practised social inequality. The rigours of the caste system, the treatment of the Harijans are opposed to the spirit of Hinduism. Centuries before Christ, Yajñavalkya, who was a native of Videha (in North Bihar), laid down the maxim: "Let no one do to others what he would not have done to himself."¹ Many of the great leaders of Hindu thought and practice have denounced caste arrogance and proclaimed the equality of all men and women. As a rule, it is the privileged who have started movements of liberation for the down-trodden. The history of human progress is largely a record of the repeated efforts of exceptional men who found life based on servitude, insufferable and who set out to change it. In India we have had many protestant reformers like the Saiva and Vaishnava saints, Basava, Ramanand, Kabir, Dadu, Nanak, Caitanya and Namdev, who taught social equality. At the present time, it is Gandhiji who lights a lamp of hope in the hearts of millions of the down-trodden. More than ever today, the world is crying aloud for revolutionary reconstruction and sensitive men are in the front of every great upheaval of human spirit.

The Allied nations are fighting to maintain the right of nations to live their own life, the right of individual men to freedom of thought, speech and political action against brutal tyrannies which would deny and destroy human rights. In other words, we are fighting to release the whole earth from private and political oppro-

¹ IV. 65.

priation to the beneficial use of mankind. We affirm that we stand for persuasion against force, for the many against the few, for freedom against slavery, for knowledge against ignorance, for unfettered inquiry against authoritarian dogma, for reason against unreason. We fight that we may survive as free peoples. If the objectives which the Allied nations proclaim are implemented at the Peace Conference, if there is a real change of heart, if imperialism is abolished, if race discrimination is given up, if a world court and organisation are set up, the world may grow into a better place.

In this war, Britons, Americans, Russians, South Africans, Poles, Indians and Chinese are in action tide by side. They look not at each other, but in the same direction. They fight for the common objective of a federated commonwealth of free nations. They have been fighting on land, operating on sea or in the air under combined Allied direction in all parts of the globe. In spite of the diversity of peoples and governments involved, the common cause has called forth in an unparalleled way the brotherhood of nations. If we can co-operate in the art of war, if peoples of different races and nations can work together in a fighting partnership, cannot we show the same spirit of co-operation and brotherhood in achieving tasks not less strenuous than those of the war? The brotherhood in arms should develop into a brotherhood in peace.

We teachers have also our part to play in the development of the world community. We must teach boys and girls that civilisation is a co-operative endeavour and all nations have contributed to it. In every educational institution, we may teach the pupils, not only legitimate pride in one's own tradition and love of motherland but also the brotherhood of nations which modern conditions of life demand, the futility of wars and militarism, which mean the withdrawal of immense human resources from constructive service to society, the need for universal co-operation to the advantage of all, the respect due to the great men of all lands and the necessity for the practice of toleration of all creeds.

It is empty rhetoric to proclaim great ends without organising the conditions which make these ends possible. Where the Allied nations have the power, they should even now set about implementing their ideals. The Indian situation at the moment is full of anxiety, but there is no ground for despair. The demand for political freedom is universal. There is no country in the world which would not rather govern itself anyhow than be ruled by another. Political subjection is the root cause of our progressive degeneration in character. Sir Thomas Munro's letter to the Governor-General, dated November 12, 1818, sums up the situation: "The strength of the British Government enables it to put down every rebellion, to repel every rebellion, to repel every foreign invasion, and to give to its subjects a degree of protection which those of no Native power enjoy.....but these advantages are dearly bought. They are purchased by the sacrifice of independence, of national character, and of whatever renders a people respectable." To be deprived of the freedom to solve the problems of one's country is the most depressing form of spiritual degradation that can be inflicted on thinking man. No amount of material improvement can compensate for the loss of spiritual dignity. There may be great difficulties in being free. It requires effort and vigilance. But freedom is the essential condition of the true life for the people. Subjection sterilises a nation's genius for civilisation. Political freedom means a great release, a soaring of the spirit, which will mean a healthy renewal of creative activity. If Indian people are politically restless, if politics have become an 'epidemic', it is not unnatural or unintelligible.

We are not concerned today so much with the maintenance of past glories as with the organisation of future progress. All schemes of post-war reconstruction assume a national government. In spite of British rule for over 150 years, the country is still an uneducated one. Twelve per cent of the people as a whole and only five per cent of the women are educated even to the degree of being able to read and write. The type of education which even the few get produces large numbers whose opportunities are disproportionate to their ambitions, and who are therefore transformed into misfits or enemies of society.

Mr. Sargent, with great imagination and resolute purpose, has suggested a radical reorganisation of our educational system from top to bottom. His objective is "to outline the minimum provision of public instruction which would place India on an approximate level with other civilized countries...The expenditure involved is admittedly heavy. The experience of War suggests that when a paramount necessity can be established the money required can and will be found. It is for India to decide whether the time has arrived when a national system of

education is a paramount necessity." Only an Indian government, broad-based on the will of the people, can implement the suggested scheme of educational development.

Professor A. V. Hill, after his recent visit to India, gave the House of Commons a ghastly account of the health of the country, its morality from preventable diseases, its semi-starvation, its barely imaginable poverty. He spoke in a tone of great urgency about the physical misery of the country. Expectation of life in India is twenty-six years against the British sixty-two. Only half the people born in India reach the age of 22 years while in Britain two-thirds reach the age of 60. 50 per cent more food is wanted in India for decent health and the undernourished are a prey to ill-health, infection and disease. Professor Hill believes in "the direction of all the methods of modern science and technology (including medicine, agriculture, education) to the fuller use of natural and human resources and the betterment of the life of the people." The Russian example demonstrates that modern scientific methods can raise very quickly the level of national efficiency and prosperity. Like Russia, India is a land of peasants; only 16 percent of her people live in towns of over 5,000 people. The vast majority are peasants and their urgent needs are more food, better food and health. The record of the Government in the past produces impatience and bewilderment. Only a popular Indian government can shake us out of our lethargy, combat illiteracy and superstition and promote industrial development. Professor Hill affirms that "progress in national development could be sensibly quicker under a purely Indian government, able to furnish an urgent sense of national purpose and daring to apply the necessary rigour of persuasion or compulsion."¹

Through a conspiracy of circumstances, India is not only undernourished, she is ill-educated and over-strained. The vast majority of Indian people have no chance of full development, and are suffering from almost universal deprivation and misdirection, and yet her potential wealth for human culture and civilisation is immense. H. G. Wells observes: "In spite of the tangle of circumstances that has frustrated the self-realisation of all but an infinitesimal fraction of the Indian population, its contribution to the synthesis of human thought have been such as to justify the belief that the World Revolution will release a vaster amount of understanding and serviceable intelligence from this agglomeration of peoples than from any other part of the globe."² A free India will be able to make effective contributions to the culture and civilisation of the world.

The British Government have declared their readiness to recognise and accept immediately after the war a working constitution framed by the Indians themselves. But if the Indians, at present, are unable to do so, the responsibility for it is partly the Britishers'. The British Government has been in absolute power in this country for over 150 years but has so used its power as to create cleavages which today seem to be unbridgeable, and the suspicion is widespread that the British wish to retain in their own hands the effective reality of power and so are not anxious to help the Indian people to overcome the differences. It is an age of historic movement that we are living. Britain, by her long connection with India, is entrusted with the proud and fortunate duty of assisting India, by example, by sober friendly counsel, by material aid in the establishment of a just democracy which is impatient with feudal rights, which is intolerant of organised privilege, which aspires to see poverty abolished and an honourable social equality ensured to every person alike. This is possible only in an India which is united and self-governing, though not self-sufficient or self-contained.

With the increased interdependence of the modern world, the independent nation-state is becoming more and more unfit for the organisation the world needs. A world organisation, working through regional groups, is an urgent necessity. Of such groups, the three prominent are United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the British Commonwealth of Nations. The strength of the British Commonwealth depends on the recognition of the unqualified nationhood of its members. When the Dominions feel that they are free to shape their own life and destiny, they become equal partners in the common enterprise of working for a fellowship of nations. If India is granted full freedom as the other dominions have, she will be happy to be within the British Commonwealth of Nations. When Gandhiji was asked to explain what he meant by his 'Quit India' formula, he said that he understood by it that India should be entirely free to choose

¹*Spectator*, 9th June, 1934.

²*Phoenix*, p. 157 (1942).

whether she should belong to the British Commonwealth of Nations or not. He added that he was certain that she would choose to be a member of the Commonwealth, if she were entirely free. The demand for independence is a cry born of despair. The Cripps' offer contained the proposal for Dominion Status with the right of secession expressly acknowledged as part of the Constitution. So the question of Independence versus Dominion Status loses all point.

A federal democratic state with autonomy for the Provinces and the States, should be our aim. Geographically, economically, and culturally, India is one and indivisible. In a recent work, edited by Mr. O'Malley as *Modern India and the West*, he observes: "Whatever other elements of unity may be lacking, India is united by a common culture, which for many centuries has been characterised by remarkable continuity."¹ To this cultural continuum, all races and communities, that have their home in India, have contributed. Indian music and literature, sculpture and painting, art and architecture, life and manners and even religion and philosophy show the influence of varied traditions. Any attempt to break up this unity, to divide the country into independent sovereign states will be a tragic mistake, which will hurt the interests of all communities and the country as a whole. It will be disloyalty to the ideals aimed at by our statesmen, Hindu and Buddhist, Moghul and British. We may redraw the boundaries of provinces, but we should have a central authority to administer vital subjects of common interest like defence and foreign affairs, communications and customs. It will be a tragedy, which every patriot should try to avert, if India, which is one in political subjection, gets broken when freedom is achieved.

If the Hindu-Muslim differences today are so acute, they are not entirely of our making. At a time when the people were beginning to think and feel along nationalist lines, we were invited to look ourselves, not as citizens of a nation, but as partisans of a community. Separate communal electorates were set up against the expressed wishes of the vast majority of the people. The nationalist impulse has been seriously hampered by these clever devices and we have now the demand for the division of India. Even if we bring about territorial readjustments, we cannot avoid the problem of minorities. So long as there is the fear of the domination of one community by another, steps will have to be taken to secure the legitimate rights of all. Perhaps an impartial commission will have to be set up at the centre charged with the task of protecting the interests of the minorities.

University men have special duty in dissipating the cloud of ill-will and misunderstanding and promoting inter-communal harmony. Political leaders on both sides, who have a superb confidence in the validity of their own prejudices, pervert historical truth to suit their own theories. When Bury said that history is a science, he meant that it must be released not only from the temptations of rhetoric but also from obscurantist obsessions and political prejudices. The interests of all the Indian people who have had a common history are the same in the matter of politics and economics.

A self-governing democratic India is not feasible so long as the Princes remain outside the Federation. A third of India and a fourth of her people belong to the Indian States. Their territories cut across the roads, the railways and the rivers of British India. Many of the progressive rulers are ready to join an Anglo-India Federation in which the States and the Provinces will be free to develop along their own lines in friendly accord with each other.

The States have no external sovereignty. The British Government represents them in external affairs and protects their subjects, when residing or travelling abroad. Inter-state relations are all conducted by the British Government. The States have different degrees of internal sovereignty. Political upheavals all over the world indicate that the only safety of the Princes lies in the support of the people and not in the treaties that bind them to the Crown. Again, even the Paramount Power has transferred responsibility for government to the people, where it has direct sway and so the rulers, protected by it, have to follow the example. Besides the States today are fighting with the Allies on behalf of democracy and against tyranny and they cannot legitimately stifle the movement for democracy and freedom in their own territories. Many of the States have introduced popular institutions and are showing great capacity for adaptations which is the only condition for survival. The power of paramountcy will have to be transferred to the Central government where power will be shared by the Provinces and the States. This government will deal with all matters of defence, foreign policy, finance and power to intervene, should government show signs of collapse in either the Provinces or the States.

¹ *Modern India and the West* (1941), p. 1.

At the time of the Cripps' offer, H.H. the Maharaja of Kashmir welcomed it and pledged his full support to it. I have no doubt the patriotic princes would be quite willing to deal with the Indian people and co-operate with them in the building up of a free and prosperous India.

Let us realise that a revolution is in progress in our country, which vested interests may delay but cannot prevent. It is for us to co-operate with a future from whose consequences we cannot escape, while yet the chance of co-operation is not altogether closed down. The evolving dynamic of history makes for a democracy, political, economical and social and the Universities must educate the youth, not for the world that is dying but for the one that is struggling to be born. It is too much to hope that this University, which is celebrating its Silver Jubilee today, which has inherited values, values which are older than modern civilisation, will work in the next twenty-five years for the emergence of a commanding aim, an overarching purpose, a magnificent resolve, which would capture the imagination of our people, drown our quarrels, override our disputes and make us ashamed of our own littleness and help us to build a free and prosperous India ?

The Utkal University Convocation

Dr. Sachchidananda Sinha, addressing the first convocation of the newly created Utkal University at Cuttack on the 2nd. November 1944 said :-

I shall not be wrong in thinking that you all want "swaraj"—the term which was used by His Imperial Majesty King-Emperor George V, in the course of his Royal Message (sent through his revered uncle, the late Duke of Connaught) on the occasion of the inauguration of the Indian Legislative Assembly, in 1921. Now it is all to the good that a country should have economic freedom and political independence, if her people but possess the capacity and character to retain once they have acquired them and to hold their own against all aggressors. But what if the people do not possess such capacity and character, for want of which they are more likely to lose these most precious gifts—howsoever received or obtained—as soon as they are acquired. How did India come to lose her independence? What was it that led to the establishment of British rule, throughout the length and breadth of this large country, or rather sub-continent—as large as Europe minus Russia—and what was it that had enabled the British to retain their undisturbed possession over their Indian territories for a longer period than the rulers of any important dynasty in India? And how is it that, in spite of our strenuous efforts, the goal of Indian Swaraj seems almost as distant to-day as it was a quarter of a century back?

I wonder if any of you, with all your desire to obtain independence, have cared to answer these questions to yourselves, after a careful study of the subjects involved in their consideration—the history of your country, its sociological condition, the capacity and character of your people, and also those of the British, whom you are so anxious to replace in the government of the country. To those who would care to grasp these questions, I would commend the serious study of the second part (dealing with India) of the late Professor Seeley's illuminating work, "The Expansion of England," which (though published over sixty years back) is still by far the most instructive exposition of the subject. If you will but study it with an open mind, you will realise the truth enunciated by Mahatma Gandhi when (replying, some years back, to the address presented to him by the Madras Corporation) he stated his conviction that "swaraj would be the inevitable result of the enlightened awakening of the masses of India, which was a hardy tree of patient growth, and required the patient toil of men and women."

I fully share the conviction that the diffusion of sound political knowledge among the Indian masses is the only practical method for generating their "enlightened awakening." Remember that though an "emotional awakening" of the masses may be possible to bring about by inducing them to do certain things under the stress of an exciting impulse, their "enlightened awakening," which Mahatma Gandhi desired to usher, can only be brought about, slowly but steadily, by the diffusion of that sound political education which will require "the patient toil of men and women"—the effect and influence, of which have not yet been brought into full play in our public life, and on our political activities, by reason of "emotional awakening" having cast its shadow on them.

IDEAL SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT

Almost all educated Indians regard Democracy as an ideal system of Government. But Democracy is at present assailed in many quarters in the West itself, by serious doubts about its success as the best form of Government, and is said to be on its trial. It is no longer felt as certain, as before, that the basic assumptions of the theory of Democracy are absolutely tenable and sound, and it is now held by many highly qualified political thinkers that these assumptions, when subjected to searching criticism do not ring true—though there is a possibility of a swing again, in the opposite direction. "Government by the people as a whole"—was regarded by Abraham Lincoln as the hall-mark of Democracy, its one differentiating criterion from Oligarchy, the government by only a part of the people. But the greatest historian of antiquity, Thucydides—in his world-famous history of the Peloponnesian war—had put into the mouth of the most eminent political leaders and the greatest statesman of ancient Greece, Pericles, the definition of Democracy in the following terms:—"Our constitution is named Democracy, because it is in the hands not of the few, but of the many." But the definition of Pericles—however suited or applicable it might have been to the city-States of ancient Greece—is wholly impracticable if applied to larger areas, except by the method of the election of representatives, which system is regarded by many historians of constitutional development as the most important contribution made by our British fellow-subjects to the progress of mankind in good government.

An eminent American authority on constitutional subjects, Mr. A. L. Lowell, sums up, however, his views on the soundness of the theory of Democracy, in the following terms:—"The conception of government by the whole people, in any large nation is, of course, a chimera; for wherever the suffrage is wide, parties are certain to exist, and the control must really be in the hands of the party that comprises a majority of the people." And so ultimately the theory of Democracy breaks down in actual practice into a government by only a majority of the people—thus postulating two parties in the State, and in its Parliament. And far from being "the government of the people as a whole," it is in practice only an Oligarchy in disguise. In the result, Democracy becomes the government (of a State, or a nation) technically by the people as a whole, but practically by a majority only. The latest and sternest critic of parliamentary democracy is Mr. Bernard Shaw, whose "Everybody's Political What's What" (issued in September last) is a remarkable work for out-spokenness on the subject of parliamentary and responsible government, which many of us in this country set high store by. Writing at the advanced age of eighty-eight, with more than six decades of experience of public affairs, Mr. Shaw—one of the keenest intellects in Europe—opines that "the British party system should be scrapped ruthlessly."

But this system—with all its limitations—has the obvious advantage (as emphasised by Lowell) of maintaining a political equilibrium or balance, in the State, between anarchy and absolutism, since for its efficient working it requires at least two major political parties of which one favours a greater and larger measure of individual freedom—a drifting towards anarchy, without desiring or working for anarchy while the other favours more and more centralisation—thus drifting towards absolutism, without desiring or trying for absolutism. Too much drift either way, when it is likely to disturb the balance, arouses a more or less general protest, and the voters then place the other party in power—which restores the political balance, the most important concomitant of Democracy. Thus it is a political system, which, in its present form, has not been long enough established, in the world, to be said of it that it will necessarily suit the sociological conditions of all races and peoples, since it is a complex and complicated machinery of government, requiring special conditions for its success, which have not yet been found to exist even in all the countries of Continental Europe, or of the two Americas.

A SELFISH DEMAND

Nevertheless there is practical unanimity among educated Hindus—and their view is now very largely shared by the other communities also—that the early, if not immediate, establishment of not only democratic, but full responsible, government (the system in which the Executive is responsible to the Legislature) is absolutely essential to India's well-being; and Britain's refusal to yield on this point till now has but served to evoke much bitterness against that country, and to produce tremendous acerbity of feelings against the British—which finds daily, nay, hourly, expression in the press, and on the platform, in India. The argument that Indians should train themselves for political independence by rehearsing, in the course of an

unduly long series of years, if not decades, the whole drama of British history from William the Conqueror to King George VI, is regarded by educated Indians to be as senseless a demand as it is believed by them to be selfish, since they contend that the same process by which Nature compresses ages of biological evolution in a few weeks of early embryonic life in the mother's womb, applies equally to political evolution. These are but a few of the many arguments that—along with the political and the economic ones, with which you are familiar—are regarded as cogent and conclusive in favour of India's claims to immediate economic freedom and political independence.

The case for India's attaining swaraj is, in my opinion, so absolutely incontrovertible on much higher grounds than those usually urged in its favour, that it requires no resort to doubtful political methods or sharp tactics. Confining myself to the moral side of the problem, I would say that the desire for independence springs in the human breast from the psychological phenomenon that an environment which constantly suggests a subject people's dependence, incapacity and inferiority as compared or contrasted with the position of vantage of its foreign rulers, has the inevitable effect of debilitating, degrading, depressing and suppressing the ruled in their own estimation not to say in that of others—thus reducing them from the high level of humanity to that of lower creation. The daily and hourly, conscious and subconscious suggestion of the inherent inferiority of the ruled, as compared with the rulers, is thus the ineradicable defect of an alien domination. This is an insuperable defect which even the best foreign rule—such as that established in India by the British—cannot, in the very nature of things, ever be free from, and the sooner it is realised and tackled, the better would it be for all concerned—whether the rulers, or the ruled. I can tell you from my experience that there are, in almost every British Indian province, public men and others, who had been members of the Central, or a Provincial Government and who have lived to see not only Secretaries, but even Under-Secretaries, to Government, in their time, elevated as members of the Government of India, and even to the ranks of Governors in various provinces—while they themselves (in spite of their knowledge and experience, gained from inside, of the working of the administration) had been but ploughing the sands or, at best the lonely furrow, since their retirement from office. You will easily recall what but a few years ago threatened your own province but which was only avoided, at the last moment by reason of a very strong protest by the then Ministry backed up by public opinion, throughout the country. Nor is it all. Except once (in 1921) and that for less than a year, no Indian has been appointed a permanent Governor of an Indian province and the recent photographs taken of the Governors' Conferences at Delhi—the Viceroy sitting in the midst of eleven Governors not even one of whom was an Indian—which had appeared in the press, had evoked feelings which I have no desire to describe. Those amongst us who repeat the slogan that it is not high offices that matter but it is the constitution alone with does, have yet to learn that it is men who mould systems and transform even defective ones to subserve the end in view. All these facts clearly point their own moral if they do not adorn a tale. A system of administration so galling and humiliating to the self-respect of the people of this country as the one that obtains at present carries condemnation on the very face of it and the point needs no elaboration at my hands.

But apart from the psychological aspect of the subject to which I have invited your attention, there is another no less important, to which (in his Romanes Lecture for 1902) on 'The Relations of the Advanced and the Backward Races of Mankind' the late Lord Bryce—well-known as the author of two monumental works, 'The American Commonwealth and modern democracies'—drew pointed attention as bearing on the ethnological and the sociological sides of the effect of foreign rule on a people less advanced than their rulers or of a different race, or colour, from them. After having laid down the proposition that "the aversion to colour reaches its maximum among the Teutons", Lord Bryce discussed at length the troubles that, in the nature of things, are bound to arise frequently between the rulers and the ruled, where they belong to races not only marked off by colour, but also in sociological conditions. I shall quote a passage from the very striking observations of Lord Bryce:—"The social relations of two races which cannot be fused raise problems even more difficult, because incapable of being regulated by law. Law may attempt to secure equal admission to public conveyances or public entertainments. But there are injuries which cannot be prevented. Impunity corrupts the ordinary man; and even the better sort suffer from the consciousness of their own superiority not merely in rank, but also in strength and volition. One must have lived among a

weaker race in order to realize the kind of irritation which its defects produce in those who deal with it, and how temper and self-control are strained in resisting temptations to harsh or arbitrary action. It needs something more than the virtue of a philosopher—it needs the tenderness of a saint to preserve the same courtesy and respect towards the members of a backward race as are naturally extended to equals."

These are facts which cannot be challenged or disputed by any impartial observer. It is much to the credit of the British in India that such acts and incidents, as were mentioned by Lord Bryce had been steadily on the decrease, on their part, consistently with the rise of a sense of higher self-respect, as the result of the diffusion of education, among Indians. But the broad sociological facts and ethnological conditions, enunciated by Lord Bryce, stand good for all time; and have got to be taken into account in considering the problem, which admits of but one solution—the economic freedom and political independence of the dependent country and its people. That seems the only solution of the problem, which concerns the destinies of about four hundred millions of human beings—nearly from one-fifth to one fourth of the population of the world. Thus by incredibly slow, painful, and reluctant steps, many of us, who started public life long years back, with far different views on the political problems of India, have been driven to this irrefutable conclusion that the only remedy, for the very unsatisfactory and deplorable situation in this country, is the establishment of swaraj, as soon as possible.

COMMUNALISM

Speaking about the communalism Dr. Sinha said, "The source of the poison of communalism, that has been for now nearly forty years corroding our national life is to be traced elsewhere though we ourselves are not entirely free from blame for the growth of communal movements and tendencies. Those who will think over the matter dispassionately and impartially, will have to admit that the responsibility of the British Government for the present situation—however well-intentioned their policy—has been no less great in this matter. That being the position, it will always be very difficult for nationalist leaders to drive out the evil of communalism from the land so long as it is freely and almost aggressively, recognised, not only in the administration of the country but even in its constitution."

The Allahabad University Convocation

The following is the text of the Convocation Address delivered by Col. Sir Kailas Haksar, Kt., C. I. E., LL.D. on November 4, 1944 :—

Half a century, all but two years ago, when this my *Alma Mater* was herself a stripling aged nine years, I came to these hallowed precincts to receive the sheet of parchment, which entitled me to flaunt a Hood and Gown and put after my name, in their inverted order, the first two letters of the English alphabet.

During these years since 1896, a period relatively short from the standpoint of intellectual and moral advancement, what immense strides this academic centre has taken, how its activities have broadened, how obviously higher the standard of knowledge, in its multifarious aspects, has risen!

No one will question that this accelerated progress, in particular the conversion of the University from the mere affiliating and examining to the unitary type has, in the main, been due to the ambitious enthusiasm and unremitting toil of a worthy father and a worthy son, both inspired by love of learning for its own sake.

I, therefore, marvel at you Mr. Vice-Chancellor, that despite your discernment and the wide field of selection that lay before you, you should have chosen to unearth a fossil to deliver this Convocation Address unless it was your purpose to exhibit to the young graduates assembled here to-day the contrast between the past and the present in order to suggest to them that the law of evolutions is operating in the sphere of knowledge, as elsewhere, that the recent rapid progress is only the earnest of more rapid progress to come and that therefore they owe it, to themselves no less than to their country to exploit to the full their wonderful opportunities.

In any case, while your incomprehensible choice has heightened my feeling of embarrassment it has equally deepened my sense of the honour you have done me by calling me to my present task. I will content myself with saying simply but in all sincerity—"Thank you very much."

To those young persons who to-day join the time-honoured guild of graduates I would say: Life is not just a wonderful adventure as you should make it; it is also a wonderful privilege. Hence it imposes great duties. As the poet-philosopher, Lucretius, neatly puts it "Life is given to none in fee-simple, to all in usufruct." It is more still. Life is a racial heritage.

You stand between the Past and the Future: the world is yours to enjoy, to organise, and to reconstruct. Your lot is cast in these sad times of turmoil and tribulation, but so has been the lot of countless others in the past. Remember—

"The troubles of our proud and angry dust
Are from eternity, and shall not fail.
Bear them we can, and if we can we must.
Shoulder the sky, my lad, and drink *your ale*."

To-day Mankind anxiously asks if there be no way out from gloom and horror into life and light. Centuries hence in different circumstances but with human nature little, if at all, changed, Mankind may be asking the same question. But such a reflection should not make you hesitate to blaze now the trail for great movements that you hope will build a happier world. You are put into the world to live and if you can to be happy. You can neither live nor be happy without displaying energy, without fighting, but your energy and your fights are vain, indeed harmful to yourselves and others, if you forget that you have a duty not to Posterity, that is too much to demand, but a duty to Humanity in your own short day.

Man's personality needs growth and development in its four different aspects—Intellectual, Physical, Aesthetic, and Ethical. These are the four facets of a complete life and the attainment of this consummation is dependent on self-culture for which you can derive guidance from the store of accumulated Knowledge which will be available in increasing measure as time goes on and wisdom reveals her face from behind the infinite folds which, in spite of the advance of civilization, still hide her. It is up to you to make of man—the jest and riddle of the world—its out-standing glory.

Resolve then to:—

"Follow Knowledge, like a sinking Star,
Beyond the Utmost bound of human thought:—"

and as Tennyson recommended, to combine Knowledge with Reverence so that Mind and Soul may be in accord.

Yet here incidentally a word of warning. You may wallow in books and acquire a name for great learning but Wisdom as distinct from Knowledge comes from thinking about what you have read not from mere reading.

John Richard Green, the historian wrote:—

"I know what men will say of me, 'He died learning.'" Whatever men said immediately after his death in 1883, it is doubtful, if comment to-day beyond admitting his picturesque style says much except that it is a pity that he misunderstood so much, of what he tried to learn. None the less the hope of this honest man was no ignoble one. Let men say of each of you "He died learning", and it may be, that you will get the chance of continuing to learn even after your farewell to this short life.

It is your duty to train and develop your Mind and acquire Knowledge, as much Knowledge as you can possibly obtain. Knowledge is like a deep well, fed by perennial springs and your Mind is the little bucket that you drop into it. Keep your bucket shining and you will get as large draughts of crystal Knowledge as you can assimilate. The brain, which is the physical organ of the Mind, is one of the two precious products of the aeons of Evolution; the other is the imponderable "Social Instinct."

At all events remember that.—

"New occasions teach new duties: Time makes ancient good uncouth,
They must upward still and onwards, who would keep abreast of Truth,
Lo before us gleam her camp-fires! We ourselves must pilgrims be,
Nor attempt the Future's portal with the Past's blood-rusted Key."

At the outset, I referred to the present period as "the sad times of turmoil and tribulation" and the lines I have just quoted that "new occasions teach new duties."

I must elaborate both these points. For a proper appreciation of the dictum that "the old order changeth, yielding place to new" let us cast a rapid glance at our world's history as pieced together by the Sciences of Geology, Biology and an ever-growing host of other 'Ologies' and as preserved in ancient records—surviving monuments of a bygone Age, since disinterred, and the written page.

Science has demonstrated that life only appeared on Earth in the Lower Palaeozoic Age in the shape of small shellfish and seaweeds, etc., when over half the period of one billion, 600 million years had already run. So it has to be realised that Man's appearance on the Earth had been preceded by the Age of Fishes, the Age of Coal-swamps, the Age of Reptiles, the Age of first Birds and first Mammals, etc., etc.

Do not let this narrative shock any of your preconceived notions of your cherished beliefs. You must keep an open mind and you must have the courage to face the truth. And for the comfort of your souls you may realise that this process of evolution may very well have been divinely ordained. No one can contest the belief begotten of Faith in a Creator whose Design is beyond the reach of logic based on demonstrable evidence and proof.

But to keep to my point, namely, that Change which means unfoldment by a continuous process of evolution, is a Law of Life. Just take a peep into the Kaleidoscope where you will see figures some eight or nine thousand years old, and you will recognise them all. You begin with Sumeria and early Egypt, you see the primitive Aryans, you get a view of the Empire of Darius, you witness the Greeks and Persians, the megalomania of Xerxes, and the glory and splendour of the Age of Pericles. You pass in review the Empire of Alexander the Great, you observe with reverence and awe, Siddharth Gautam and you get a bird's-eye-view of King Ashoka's Empire, dotted over with his bronze and engraven edicts. You now reverse your "joy-tube" a little, you see the profiles of Confucius and Lao Tse, you see Rome and Carthage. You see the Huns and you alight upon the Byzantine and Sassanid Empires, you see the great days of the Arabs, the panorama from Cordova to Baghdad, Samarkand and Bokhara; further back you see the Mongols and obtain a view of Chingiz Khan, Ogdaï Khan, Halaku and Tamer-Lane, and so on, Empire that "fall successive and successive rise", changes occurring in every quarter of the Globe. Meanwhile, Art, Literature, the Science of Politics, Religion every phase of human life and activity is undergoing change, change and transformation,—God fulfilling himself in many ways. What wonder then that human society, human institutions, all that the will of man has planned and wrought, have their day and cease to be. You have then to regard the glittering Present against the background of the hoary Past and realise that "the Knowledge of to-day is the ignorance of to-morrow."

To-day there rages a global war which has plunged Humanity into the direst misery. And one wonders whether the words of Aristotle and Byron were prophetic?

The former described how "States passed through tyranny, oligarchy democracy, and back to tyranny" again and the latter versified, sententiously, the vagaries of the human lot.

"There is the moral of all human tales;
'Tis but the dull rehearsal of the Past.
First freedom and then glory—when that fails;
Wealth, vice, corruption—barbarism at last."

But if you are a man of Faith, a convinced believer in the Law of Evolution you cannot be a faint-hearted pessimist.

Some do what is Good, others choose what is Better, but you should love only the Best and hold fast to it, whatever befalls.

Tolstoy said, "The highest wisdom is not founded on reason alone nor on those worldly sciences of Physics, Chemistry, History, and the like into which intellectual Knowledge is divided. The highest wisdom has but one science—the science of the whole. The science explaining the whole creation and man's place in it."

Tolstoy's philosophy of history was developed by applying to events on a large scale one great fundamental law that can be observed operating in the lives of individuals.

Not until a man has liberated himself from the immemorial emotional delusion that he and his Earth are the centre of things and his mind something other than a purposeful function of matter determined by necessity; not until then will he begin to approach his goal as a human being. The evolution towards a truly human status will inevitably issue in Tolerance, the Rule of Reason and the annihilation of all dark aggressive instincts.

Contemporary form of thought, critical and objective, deems itself far exalted above former religious forms. Yet it, too, forgets its limitations in that it is also a form of thought. And I have the intuition at this moment that the past forms of thought will some day be the future forms and may look down with a smile upon our entire critical period. I know the argument that all Gods are but the mirrored images of our own corporal nature, and if an elephant were to believe in a God, it

would have to be an elephant. But this is no disproof of the being of Divinity but only a proof of the narrowness of the mortal mind limited to its own law of imagining. I do not belong to those who believe in a heaven in Heaven. But neither am I to be reckoned among those materialists who believe in a Heaven on Earth provided merely by better laws and machines. Both beliefs are too lazy, too easy, and so must be suspect.

It is a commonplace for each generation to say to the next that it did not have its successor's educational facilities; but whatever the truth may be, in my own particular case, I think I was unlucky during my University years. I am no historian and no scientist, but my later life might have been richer, had the History and Science teachings, of the 'eighties and 'nineties been innately less repellent than they seemed to me. History in those decades was striving to get away for sentimentalism and the service of causes and to become "Scientific." Ranke and Mommsen had done wonderful and necessary research work in Germany for European and Ancient Roman History, work such as a century later we are only starting to think about for India, but History, as those professorial giants envisioned it, could not deal with moral judgments and yet remain "Scientific." How false was such a view the perverted teachings of von Treitschke and his pinchbeck imitators have amply shown. Still claiming to be "scientific" historians, they invented a new morality to suit German national heroes whom a claimed "greatness" was to set above normal moral standards. It only needed Nazism to go the whole way and out-nietzching Nietzsche to land a country in a sorry mess.

History (it was chiefly English History) as taught in Indian Colleges in my academic days was certainly not what Bolingbroke claims to have read somewhere namely that it is "Philosophy teaching by examples." English historians had not yet claimed to be "scientific." They were quarreling violently among themselves. A few days ago I read some amusing rhymes in a letter from Stubbs to Green—this was before Stubbs' researches had upset some of Green's most romantic statements, and the two were still in speaking terms. To quote the lines may relieve the tedium of this Address:—

"Froude informs the Scottish youth,
That parsons do not care for truth.
The Reverend Canon Kingsley cries
History is a pack of lies.
What cause for judgments so malign?
A brief reflection solves the mystery
Froude believes Kingsley a divine.
And Kingsley goes to Froude for history."

The word was unknown then, but as a student I subconsciously held the view with which Henry Ford was later to secure headlines in the papers:—"History is bunk."

Needless to say I have jettisoned so puerile a view years ago. I had forsworn the idea years before I read Lord Acton's impassioned claim for morality in History. You will find it in his Inaugural Address as Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge. But an inhibition remains; I am inclined to suspect the ablest historian of misleading his readers unless he emphasises ethical values even at the expense of art. In no branch of study, in no phase of life, can morals be ambulatory.

In my student days it was fashionable to be a materialist and to some extent I was in the fashion, but the Science of my days was an unsatisfying diet. It certainly did not study the whole man and his needs, make it clear to him where his highest welfare resides and point the way to its attainment. It deliberately ignored all man's higher faculties, his highest needs, and had started on its course of hypnotising the so-called cultured world into the belief that a study of the laws which govern the lower aspects of man constitutes the sum of knowledge.

Science to-day is growing wiser. We see now that Science must be directed aright and such a direction can only come from an attempted understanding of life as a whole, as correct an attempt as each scientific *guru* and each would be scientific *chela* can reason out for himself.

Only a correct understanding of life can give a right direction to Science; and the so-called sciences that profess to study man in his needs and objectively (that is to say, without any reference to the fact that besides being an animal he is also a reasonable being) are as specious and ineffective as would be a science that professes to know everything about an egg while remaining in ignorance of the one important fact that out of it can come a living creature.

The same blindness, which also pervades Philosophy, Education and the whole of modern culture, makes the very faculty of reason, which is the greatest gift with which man has been endowed, at its first appearance seem to be an unmitigated misfortune, since in its exercise he sees in his reflections only a denial of life, without realising in what direction a reasonable life can be sought. But in reality these sufferings are but the birth-pangs of a new awakening consciousness that perceives for the first time that all that he had formerly believed could give him happiness can give him nothing without showing him at once in what true life consists, and how he can live in accordance with its laws.

The desire for happiness is the desire for universal welfare, the desire for universal goodness; and once reason has ascertained that these are unattainable in the satisfaction of personal ambitions, then it inevitably seeks a different form of life in which such desires can be realised. And such a life not only exists but lies waiting to be entered as soon as the level of animal-personal consciousness has been transcended, and man, rather than save himself, is willing to lose himself in higher service.

To a man governed by reason, the renunciation of the welfare of the personal life is as natural as that a bird should fly instead of running with its feet. Because a bird runs with its feet, that is no proof that it cannot fly; and because the majority of men believe that the whole of life consists in the satisfaction of material desires it does not mean that this is natural for a man, and that his true life does not consist in transcending these desires, and so attaining the level of spiritual, or, if you prefer it, reasonable, consciousness.

But what I have been saying is in no sense a plea for the rejection of science. On the contrary the "new duty" owed by every one of you, to your country and indeed to humanity at large, in consequence of the world's altered situation is thoroughly to familiarise yourself with the body of Nature's laws discovered by all the sciences that have so far been developed and built up. Indeed, it is your duty that you, the young brains of India, should, sooner rather than later, add to the world's stock of scientific knowledge.

The study of Science is indispensable, too, for us Indians *en masse* from another standpoint. We have been, over centuries, gradually caught in the tightening meshes of a wide net of superstitions to which the sanction of Religion has been quite wrongly imparted. This in India, as elsewhere in the world, has resulted from the exploitation of human credulity and of the apprehensive state of mind begotten of fear or actual distress. Superstition has arrested our progress and brought our true Religion, which has a philosophic outlook and is based upon eternal verities, into disrepute in the eyes of the indiscriminating. Unhesitatingly, I assert that "popular religion" in India finds no warrant in the teachings of the Vedas, the Quran, and the Zend Avesta, or in the teachings of Gautam Buddha, Mahavir, and Guru Nanak. On the contrary, all those sources of spiritual enlightenment inculcate fearless action in the service of the one God through the service of humanity and indeed of all God's creature.

You must, therefore, study Science in the same spirit in which an Intending wrestler builds up his bone and muscles in order to overthrow his foe remembering that the most formidable enemy of man is "AVIDYA"—Ignorance.

Make your intensive study of science a preparation for the discovery of the secret of man's true Destiny—the discovery of what lies beyond the scope of experiment and the grasp of Reason.

You will admit that the most eminent Scientists of the world, Physicists and Biologists, indeed explorers in every scientific field have had an intuitive feeling, nay more a glimmering—as through a glass darkly—of something which lies beyond the reach of their line of exploration.

Let me now turn to typically mundane matters which form the substance of the so-called "burning question of the day"—Nations, the State, Constitution War, Social Services, Economic Reconstruction, and the rest.

The first basic fact that the world has to accept is that Humanity is one and indivisible. The unity of mankind should be one of the most sacred principles of the civilised mind's creed.

The Anthropologists divide mankind into several "races" according to their complexion, stature, cephalic index, character of face, shape of nose, texture of the hair, etc., etc. But who can gainsay that all men and women belong to the species *Homo Sapiens*?

What are the feelings uppermost in the civilised mind to-day? Horror of War and a longing for lasting Peace. War has been admitted to be an immeasur-

able folly, an inexpiable crime, an unpardonable sin, a homicidal madness, an outbreak of savage fury, and a recurrent catastrophe that maims and mars human civilization. But it has still to be realised that it can only be abolished by abolishing the sovereign Nation-State and establishing in its place the sovereign World-State. No other palliative will cure this age-long deep-seated malady. Pacts, Treaties and Conventions among the Nation-States have been found to be illusory and ineffective.

A great student of History and a great authority in his special line—M. Valbert has recorded that :—

“From the year 1500 B. C. to 1860 A. D. more than 8,000 Treaties of Peace, meant to remain in force forever, were concluded. The average time they remained in force is two years.”

Take the last thirty years and you have the Treaty of Versailles, the Anglo-German Naval Treaty, the German-Polish and the German-Czechoslovakian Treaties, and the Russo-German Pact.

Take the first of this group—the Treaty of Versailles which concluded the first Great War. That war, it was averred was fought to end War. While it lasted it was being proclaimed that at the end of it all the people of the world would be given the right of self-determination. It has been very aptly remarked by an acute analyst that “that conflict, terrible, and enormous as it was, ended nothing, began nothing and settled nothing. It killed millions of people; it impoverished the world.”

The peace of Versailles was a purely political peace and the League, which that Treaty instituted, a political organisation. It was an attempt to patch up human affairs while accepting existing Governments and existing conceptions of the State as inevitable conditions. This was the necessary consequence of the survival of the idea of the Nation-State. The Nation-State fosters the mentality of a selfish Nationality which will always seek money and power by crushing and robbing other Nations.

To end war those who lead nations must become cosmopolitan in politics and, if they sincerely desire that the world at large should enjoy peace and make progress, they must awaken to the fact of a mysterious law which ordains that no progress can be made without sacrifice. The creed of the world should be Meliorism for Meliorism is the gospel of Progress-plus-Personality. Meliorists we must be. We have had so much of the optimist who proclaims that we live in the best of all possible world and of the pessimist who fears that this is true.

War is the most prolific parent of a vast variety of evils. For one thing it increases economic inequality within a State.

Green wrote of the war between England and France (1793-1815) “The war enriched the Land-owners, the Farmer, the Merchants, the Manufacturer, but it impoverished the poor. It is indeed from those fatal years, which lie between the Peace of Luneville and Waterloo, that we must date that war of Classes which still forms the main difficulty of English Politics.”

Hence, possibly, the palliative, in the present day, of the Beveridge Plan as the principal measure of Post-War Reconstruction—a step beyond the dole to the unemployed, yet in the basic view, a mere placebo, leaving the fundamental question untouched. What is more, is it impossible that the ostensible insistence on the banishment of poverty may have for its real purpose the increase of the poor man's purchasing power in order that he should consume the goods which the Industrial organisations infinitely extended by the War's need for the production of munitions, must produce after the war is over, in order to ensure the continuity of huge profits to the multi-millionaire capitalists?

“A time like this demands
Stong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinion and a will,
Men who have honour, men who will not lie,
Tall men, Sun-crowned, who live drop above the fog,
In private duty and in private thinking.”

If this was true of the Age of Pericles how much more true it is to-day! Therefore, the present day youth of the world must boldly issue its Declaration of Independence and join the ‘Open Conspiracy’ outlined by H. G. Wells.

I fear I have given you too many quotations and perhaps those already a shade hackneyed but at this stage let me give you a motto :—

‘Six words there are that plead with me each day,

I ought, I must, I can, I will, I dare, I may.

I am also reminded of Aristotle's great saying :—

"Plato and Truth are both dear to us ; but it is a sacred duty to prefer Truth." And it takes courage to declare for Truth however mentally honest you be. Nor can I forget Voltaire's Epigram : "the cowardice of the honest ensures the success of the scoundrels," though it is a question whether any coward can be an honest man.

But I have permitted myself a long digression from my main point, namely, the evils of the Nation-State. In joining voices with great modern minds in the condemnation of this type of State, I am anxious not to be misunderstood. The recommended abolition of the Nation-State does not at all imply the abolition of the Nations. Certainly not. On this point I rather subscribe to the view of that remarkable woman Pearl Buck who has said :—

"All of us need a physical home to love and cherish to improve and beautify. All of us, for convenience in daily life, if for nothing else, need a sound and useful local political organisation. There would be chaos if there were no Nations or National Governments. But to insist that Nations must be the chief groups of mankind is to day to insist that a small province ought to have been the limit of man's thought yesterday, when already he thought in Nations. Today, man's thoughts include the Globe."

The history of mankind from the 16th century onwards has been a story of political and social misfits and *pari passu* an effort, however unconscious, on the part of man to adapt methods to suit new conditions. Conditions, however, changed so rapidly that the adaptation lagged behind, for man, in general, hates voluntary change. Nevertheless, the urge to reconstruct the whole scheme of human society in accordance with former experience has never abated.

There has perforce been a great change in human conditions, due to a change in the spirit of human life. The change has gone on side by side with the increase and expansion of knowledge and is subtly connected with it. There has been an increasing disposition to treat life based on the common and the more elementary desires and gratifications as unsatisfactory, and to seek relationship with and service and participation in a larger life. This is the common characteristic of all the great religions that have spread throughout the world in the last twenty odd centuries—Buddhism, Islam, and Christianity. These religions have engendered forces that have helped to evolve a self-respect in the individual and a sense of responsibility in the common concerns of mankind that did not exist among the populations of the earlier civilizations.

As means of quicker travel and communication have multiplied, these forces have naturally spread and affected the intercommunication and interaction of men with one another. The world has grown smaller. How small the world has become during the last less than one and three quarters of a century (1776-1944) was well brought out in an address by Hon'ble Henry Wallace, Vice-President of the United States. He said :—

"To-day, measured by travel-time, the whole world is actually smaller than was our little country then. When George Washington was inaugurated, it took 7 days to go by horse-drawn vehicles from Mount Vernon to New York. Now Army bombers are flown from the United States to China and India in less than three days."

But despite the world having thus contracted the great majority of human beings have still to see the human adventure as one whole.

At present they are obsessed by the air of permanence and finality in established things. As yet they accept current reality as ultimate reality. As the saying goes, they take the world as they find it, little realising that it has changed beyond recognition, and the changes that must come hereafter will be in geometric progression, if only because by the abolition of distance everyone has become next door neighbour to everyone else, and the silent revolution of thought that has occurred, and is occurring, is world-wide.

In such a situation for anyone to think in terms of out-moded forms of Government, however you veil or disguise them, betokens a deplorable lack of imagination, giving rise to the most deceptive wishful thinking. Such disguises may possibly delude the pigmies of Central Africa still outside the orbit of present day world thought, but can they meet, effectively, and for any length of time, the requirements of India whose peoples increasingly participate in the enlightenment common to the whole world ? It is only possible to uphold, in this country, a form of Government out of tune with the spirit of the age, by all manner of violence,

internment, imprisonment, repressive laws, censorship, propaganda, perversion of education and, in general, by various evil acts.

Your country is invited to compose its differences that is to reconcile all interests and parties to a common aim, and, having done so, to frame a self-governing constitution which will safeguard all interests including of course, those of the Power that has brought you into the present war and, having ruled this country for a century and a half, believes itself to have acquired some prescriptive rights.

It is unlikely that you will be called upon actually to take a hand in constitution-making but no one should ignore the fact that assuming such a constitution ever becomes a *fait accompli* and withstands for any appreciable length of time the forces of the as yet indistinct and dark future, you as the youngest section of the country's adolescent population, stand to be longest ruled by this constitution.

This gives you the right to say upon which category of rock the foundation of the constitutional edifice should be laid.

When the lines of the present Constitution Act of 1935 were being explored, one of the suggestions that was pressed by the Indian Members of the Round Table Conference was that fundamental Rights should be embodied in the impending constitution. The reply was that such Rights which were well understood and in fact acknowledged and in operation could not form part of a Legislative Enactment. What were eventually incorporated in that Act, however, were the special responsibility and the discretionary powers of not only the Governor-General, personally, but also of the Provincial Governors thus reducing the so-called "big step" forward to a nullity.

Whether the contention about the exclusion of fundamental rights was valid or otherwise, you are nevertheless entitled to remind the framers of the future constitution—your countrymen—of their own belief that such Rights should be suitably incorporated in an instrument which will govern and mould your lives.

To digress for a moment, you have all heard of the Atlantic Charter which was pronounced by the Prime Minister of England to be not applicable to India for the reason that its main principles had already been formally declared to be the objective of Britain's Indian policy. The 3rd article of this Charter which proclaims the principles of the National Policies of Britain and the United States reads:

"They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of Government under which they will live; and they wish to see Sovereign Rights, and Self-Government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Before going further I may quote some sentences from the Prime Minister's broadcast speech (21st March, 1943—seven months after the signing of the Atlantic Charter on the 14th August, 1942) which are as follows:—

"In Europe lie most of the causes which have led to these two world wars. In Europe dwell the historic parent races from whom our western civilization has been so largely derived..... Here is a real opportunity for what I once called 'bringing the magic of averages to the rescue of the millions.....'"

Now if the Atlantic Charter is not to embrace India for the additional reason that its third article contemplates the restoration of Sovereign Rights and Self-Government to those who have been forcibly deprived of them and India, as a whole, had no Sovereign Rights and Self-Government at the date at which Britain became the Paramount Power, what are the basic principles upon which you would ask that the future constitution of your country which Britain graciously intends to permit your leaders to frame, should be founded? I suggest for your consideration that you might seek guidance from the immortal, because essentially true, words of Jefferson which he made the basis of America's Declaration of Independence, nearly one and a half century ago. He said:—

"We hold these Truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among those are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights Governments are instituted amongst men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of Government becomes destructive of those ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it."

If all those, including yourselves, who have passed through the portals of their respective Universities during the last five years adopt this credo and unitedly voice it whenever the occasion demands an expression of the aspirations of India's youth, you will have taken an effective part in politics, in other words you will have done your part and done it nobly. I venture the opinion that you can do worse than read, mark, and inwardly digest those words. If you do, you will, by

implication, declare that India must be free, so as to order her future in accordance with her genius and to decide for herself the manner of her association with the International world order of the future.

In spite of frequent insistence by leaders of the Allied Nations that after the present holocaust a better world than Humanity has so far known is coming into being, I fear the prospect of the emergency of an equalitarian world state is far from bright. Races, religion, wealth, climate, geography all constitute divisions against which you, the youth of to-day, will have to fight. The dying words of Edith Cavell, "Patriotism is not enough" were a prophesy of the Great War in which we are to-day involved. And the real roots of the present war lie deep in the essential difference between those who cling to the old concept of the Nation as a division-unit of mankind and those who see the new concept of the peoples. We owe a deep debt to Science for she, more than anything has taught us to think in terms of the Universe. The very business of working with scientific methods, of thinking in scientific terms, as well as the fruits of science, have led us to universality. The scientifically mechanical means which have brought nations close together physically have at the same time destroyed the mental and spiritual boundaries of those nations, so that to-day there are folk in many nations who are closer together, through their ideas and their feeling and desires,—through their temperaments than they are to other persons of their own nation and race. If to-day, therefore, the Big Powers, seek to make 'Nationhood' the chief division of man and the chief cause for which this war is being fought, they are doomed to fail, for too many have found a larger cause, To-day man's thoughts include the Globe.

And yet there are still in every country, India included, some among the mighty, whose minds belong to yesterday, and these will try with all their strength to force the world back. It is a very stubborn strength, since stubbornness and lack of perceptive imagination are almost invariably team-mates.

The mind that only knows what it has seen is the mind that arrogates to itself, too, the valuable attributes of realism. But true realism is not to be found in the reactionary mind. That mind lives in a dream of the past. The old gospelites, who sing of the religion that was good enough for their fathers and is therefore good enough for them, are, whatever their religion, not good enough for victory in this war. If arms could win any war, they might be able to win this war, for yesterday's men can handle a gun and shoot it off as well as anybody. But if man is to show himself superior to brute force he has to show himself capable of winning the peace.

Were the present War just like so many of its countless predecessors, then I would feel as hopeless, as apparently did the author of some lines published in the *Observer* in 1940. Sadly he rhymed:—

"After the quarrel the victor's laurel
To him who gave the final thrust.
And what's the moral? What use the quarrel
If Cain be damned and Abel dust?"

But happily this war is a revolution as well as a war. The great powers either can recognise this fact to-day to their advantage or they can recognise it to-morrow to their cost. The word "revolution" has taken on evil associations because it has been so often accompanied by hateful acts. But, stripped of those hateful acts, it means simply a great change. A revolution of people and such a revolution has taken place in India and will and must not be burked or suppressed, except at the cost of much misery which would not be confined to this country.

It may be, according to some unimaginative people a counsel of perfection. Yet in the common interest of a vast mass of humanity it appertains to wise statesmanship to set India free to carve out her own destiny. India need not shed tears over her exclusion from the intended beneficiaries of the Atlantic Charter or the "Four Freedoms." India only wants her freedom in order fully to co-operate with the Nations of the world in preventing Injustice, Aggression, and their concomitant War, in the future.

Europe has been frozen into, perhaps, is still freezing into nations. Its peoples enamoured of their comparatively recent discovery of nationality seem unable to think beyond national units. Where religious differences in the past caused localised wars, horribly bitter as they were, nationality to-day causes World Wars; and the nations show no sign of shame.

It is lucky for Asia that the peoples inhabiting that continent are still thinking in terms of people. Nation is not important to any of them. China is the Chinese people. India is the people of India.

This war is basically a conflict between the concept of national supremacy, and the concept of the equality of peoples in a free world.

If this seems simplification let not to-day's big, powerful nations be afraid of simplicity. It is only the strong who dare to be simple, who dare to reduce great problems to their essentials. Simple questions go deep and their answers, if they are honest, go deeper still. People ought to know—history teaches it, life's experience confirms it—that no great stride forward is ever made for the individual or for the human race unless the complex situation is reduced to one simple question and its simple answer.

How shall this war be won for the freedom and happiness of mankind? The simple answer, clearly indicated by the present temper and the heart-deep conviction of the people of the world is, that lasting victory and abiding peace will come only by sacrificing everything the dominant nations have which denies that for which they do not yet seem willing to make. Materially they have shed all that they like to have and are equipped for an all-out effort—but spiritually they are not. They want to freeze their souls, as they have frozen foreign and enemy assets, until after the war. It cannot be done. No great war can be won without the spirit behind the weapons. The mind must be clear and the soul free, before men can fight a "War for Freedom" and win it. It is now time, therefore, and high time for the Big Powers to see what they are willing to give up for the freedom, I say even of their own people, in a free world. First must come the sacrifice of race prejudice. Let them prove to their Allies everywhere in the world that they have seen wisdom and therefore, will not permit Imperialism and human inequality to survive. Unless such proof is given now, there can be no victory, no enduring peace.

No man, it is true, can cut himself off clean and instantly from his Past. No change among people comes in the twinkling of an eye. Yet there are more pleasant than one that can be made now for a swifter process.

This war is between peoples, and the battlefield is everywhere. The Allies fight in every nation and on every soil. While their Armies and Navies and Air Fleets swarm over the world, the leaders of the big nations must not lose sight of the real war which is between the Haves and the Have-nots and must not forget that the present catastrophic conflict will have been waged in vain, if at the end of it the seeds of tares are driven underground by the colossal tractor which is tearing up the Earth's surface and if the "Toad beneath the Harrow" is further pricked by the toothpoints until after a while he croaks all the louder.

In other words, if this war, as is professed, is in fact a war for the liberation of people it must assure the Sovereign equality of peoples throughout the world. Discrimination between peoples because of their race, colour, and creed must be abolished. The age of Imperialism must be ended as a result of the realisation of its debasing evil effects.

It is unlikely that what has been said here to-day will be heard outside and pondered over at any great distance from us. Yet I may take this opportunity to remind people of other climes of a fact already known to them by the admission of their own historians. That fact is that India, an unhappy land to-day, stripped in the race of material advancement, inhabited by people who are serfs, vassals, and bondsmen psychologically as well as politically, this India had, thousands of years before the now successful, prosperous, and mighty but also unhappy West emerged from a state of stark barbarism, evolved and developed a high and progressive civilization. The development of that civilization had been the glory of our forefathers; its decline was the disgrace of their descendants; our present inglorious laps from its ideals is our own personal shame to-day. To attribute India's decay to some such material cause as malaria or any other is a facile explanation as unsatisfying to the intellect as it is to the heart. For that civilization had been achieved by the valour and energy of her own people. Those people appreciated two qualities in a special degree—bravery and truthfulness. They preserved the achievements of the greatness of old in two epic poems which are the vehicles of moral teaching to this day.

They held up Rama to the admiration of the people as an ideal man. Rama, who embodied in his person self-abnegation, the courage to face hardships, valour, faith in Right and in the goodness of human nature and thus presented to the world a high ideal of domestic duty combined with a deep regard for and a willing deference to public opinion. And if I mention Rama, I may not—in the firm hope that more and more of the gentler, sex, will cross the portals of and add lustre to our universities—forget to mention Sita—perhaps the greatest heroine that has adorned the pages of any history or legend in any country. She was the embodiment of love, purity, duty, and sacrifice. If India's daughters are true to her and

the great ideals she exemplified in a life fraught with trials, they will surely play a great part in the moral regeneration of India and the world.

The people of India also developed the doctrine of religious toleration and the Emperor Ashoka enumerated it in his Edicts. Since that date (Second Century B. C.) the Hindus and Buddhists have not persecuted any one for his doctrines and worship. But one passive virtue or a host of passive virtues is not enough. Passive virtues makes small demands on valour or energy.

My young friends, should the dream of your leaders come true and yet get an opportunity to manage all your affairs yourselves, let me hope that the conduct of young and old alike will conform to the ethical standards enshrined in the country's Epics and fully represent a revival of our ancient tradition of justice, toleration, valour and energy.

This brings me to a point which is labouring within me for expression and I must disburden myself, even though I may appear to sermonize. I feel that I must not let the occasion pass without saying, if not to the present audience, at least to a wider one.

The fact that for a few centuries we have been a subject people with the result that opportunities for rising to our full stature have been denied us, has operated to weaken our moral fibre and has bred some vices in us, the principal being fear of candid speech. This lies at the bottom of the charge of 'slave mentality' which is levelled against us and explains the 'inferiority complex' which is, not always unjustifiably, imputed to us. Even our characteristic virtue—Courtesy—is undoubtedly marred by a substratum of timidity or moral cowardice. We regard the straight, plain-spoken man as blunt, curt, and ungracious.

Not only with those from whom we may have expectation of favours or whose displeasure we may have reason to fear but even amongst ourselves we often resort to circumlocution and prevarication. We camouflage the truth, we sugar-coat it—just out of tenderness for the other man's feelings. This is an entirely false idea of courtesy. It is better to be frank and true than polite and false. When courtesy gets yoked to insincerity it becomes a Social Evil. It is kinder to hurt a person's feelings for a moment than to deceive and mislead him for a life-time, and purposeful courtesy, courtesy which has an eye to the main chance, is dishonesty and therefore contemptible. Polite you must be but strictly within the limits of veracity. Truth must be spoken unflinchingly, fearlessly, and without regard for consequences, otherwise you will have a guilty conscience and your self-esteem suffer.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I fear I have strained your indulgence and by an error of judgment, possibly bred of self-conceit, tried to hold your attention too long.

The address to which you have listened with generous patience is all a patch-work. If there is anything in it which by its inherent truth or aptness has received the assent of your minds, I may safely assume that that something is not the product of my own but of someone else's brain, because I have borrowed, consciously or unconsciously, in extensive measure.

It appertains to honesty: it is a part of ethics that any obligation incurred should be openly owned. Here and there I have tried to discharge this obligation. But if I have, in other instances, omitted my acknowledgments to living or dead authors, I take the opportunity even if I cannot specify names, to own my debt and to express gratitude for every bit of the borrowed material which has gone to the construction of this address.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I thank you for the compliment you have paid me by your presence and to you, Mr. Vice-Chancellor, my debt is immense for the honour you doubtless intended to do a recluse by dragging me into the lime-light.

I pray that such occasions in future India may be signalled by attracting the attention of the wide intellectual and cultural world of the Fellowship of Nations.

The Delhi University Convocation

The following is the text of the address delivered by Sir Maurice Gwyer, K.C.B., K.C.S.L., D.C.L., LL.D., Vice-Chancellor, on the December 15, 1944.

The most important educational event of the year has been the publication of the report of the Central Advisory Board for education on Post-War Educational Reconstruction, commonly known as the Sargent Report after the

Educational Advisor to the Government of India who is popularly believed to have inspired it and who we are glad to know is a member of the Executive Council of this University. The proposals in the Report relating to Universities, if adopted and put into effect, will profoundly influence the future of University education in India, and in my opinion wholly for good. They include proposals for the establishment of a University Grants Committee, on the lines of a very successful body with a similar name in Great Britain, whose function is to be the distribution of Government grants to Universities in such a way as to co-ordinate their educational efforts and to prevent overlapping and wasteful competition between them. Fears have been expressed that the establishment of such a Committee might interfere with the autonomy of the Universities. In my view this is based on a misconception of the idea underlying the proposal; and since I have some knowledge of the University Grants Committee in Great Britain, I can say with confidence that no apprehensions of this kind need be entertained. There is also this to be said. The older Universities in England and Scotland are the fortunate possessors of substantial endowments, which up to every recent times enabled them to finance their activities without any outside aid, so that their autonomy was complete. In a country like India, where few, if any, Universities could continue at all without a subvention from public funds, it is less easy to assert an unqualified claim to the tax-payer's money to be expended as the Universities alone may think fit; and hence the great importance of making certain that Governments hold sound views on the educational policy. I think that Governments throughout India might have realised educational standards more than they have done, if they have insisted that every educational institution in receipt of Government assistance must qualify for that assistance by complying with certain minimum conditions. Autonomy is purchased at too high a price, if for example it implies freedom to neglect the interests of University teachers; and I fear that in far too many cases Governments have stood by and watched without visible emotion teachers being compelled to accept conditions of service which are a scandal and a disgrace. These things must stop, if there is to be any progress in education; and the interests of teachers, which in the fullest sense means also the true interests of the Universities, must be the first care of every Government which is distributing educational grants.

In this particular respect we have happily no cause for complaint and good progress has been made in Delhi during the last two years. Much, however, still remains to be done. The teachers are perhaps not yet fully conscious of the new freedom which is theirs; but I hope that the day will come when it will be the teachers of the University, inspired by motives wholly free from self-seeking and self-interest, who will be the principal factor in guiding the policy both of the University and of the Colleges. It is probable that no educational institution in India can dispense with the lay element in its affairs, and that lay element, when composed of wise and disinterested men with a genuine interest in education, can be a real source of strength. Their practical knowledge will often be greater than that to which the academic world can lay claim; and their advice must necessarily be of value in matters affecting the relations between the institution and the world outside. But in its internal administration they can and should play only a minor part; and academic matters should be beyond their jurisdiction. It may be that the course of events in the past has sometimes deprived the academic element of the opportunities which it should have enjoyed of exercising responsibility within its own sphere. The notion of private and proprietary interest dies hard; but no institution is likely to flourish where men of affairs try to assume functions which properly belong to others. On the other hand, if the teachers claim, as I think they are entitled to do, an unrestricted freedom in their own sphere, they must deserve it. In the teaching world, as elsewhere, the price of freedom is eternal vigilance; and the profession will best achieve the status which it ought to have by combining with its educational ideas a spirit of manly independence.

I believe that this University, like other Universities in India, stands upon the threshold of great developments. It will, I hope, be our constant endeavour to fit ourselves for such further tasks as Providence and the wisdom of men in public life may see fit to impose upon us. I think that we may look forward with confidence, for the foundations of the building are sound. I hope that the University may be an ornament to this city and a credit to India; and that those whom it seeks to educate may serve their generation well and be diligent and faithful citizens, knowing their duty to God and to their neighbours, as good citizens should. I hope that they will play their part in the new India which will be born after the war, as champions of true freedom, merciful and peace-loving men and women.

but not lacking in courage to defend what is right and to redress what is wrong. It is from men and women of this kind that India will choose her leaders in the times to come, and I hope that this University may become the fruitful mother of many of them.

To those who have received their degrees today and have thus crowned their University career the University wishes Godspeed and happy and prosperous days hereafter. I hope that they will not be unmindful of the debt which they owe her and that they will regard it an obligation of honour to repay something of it later on. For it is thus that a University tradition, that most valuable profession of a University, is preserved and handed on to generations yet unborn.

The Punjab University Convocation

The following is the text of the Address delivered by The Hon'ble Sir Manohar Lal, Kt., M.A., D.Litt., Barrister-at-Law, Finance Minister, Punjab at the Annual Convocation held on the *December 21st 1944* :—

The Great War of 1914—18 made profound changes in the world ; vast and irrepressible economic forces operated in unprecedented directions on a scale hitherto unknown ; the political structure of large parts of the world underwent change beyond recognition. While the foundations of democracy held firm in a few countries, elsewhere time-long absolute monarchies crumbled rapidly giving rise to authoritarian dictatorships or fascist rule—everywhere the individual had to submit to the growing demands of the State. Imagination staggers at the havoc and destruction caused by the present war. What the world will be like on the morrow of its conclusion, how its rebuilding will be undertaken and achieved is beyond man's sure reckoning. Ideals are under sharp interrogation, but in spite of apparent wish to bring a New Order where truth and justice would reign, there is no definition of the steps to lead up to its realization. And, indeed, as the end of the War is fairly in sight, the voice of the conflict is once more heard, and national jealousy rears its ugly head. The question rests mainly on the position of Germany, and the fate of Empires—mighty issues to grapple with by chastened but weakened peoples, naturally intent everyone on seeing her own life quicken and her own house put into repair. Does a war, while it may reveal weakness in certain existing systems and lay bare how the seeds of trouble thrive and the forces of evil gather strength, create in man the character necessary for God's battles—the struggle for true peace and contentment hereafter. A noble cause has been steadfastly pursued and the shining war record of the Allies is rich not only in the glory of successful arms, but in the unshaken resolve to strike for the right. The dream of victory is fulfilled but as a great Englishman, endowed with calm reflection, has proclaimed, the prize is that we are left the impoverished leaders of a distracted and half ruined world, with immense responsibilities and precarious powers, and Professor Gilbert Murray, for it is to him that I refer, is reminded of the state of those Arthurian Knights who, in the quest of the Holy Grail, dared to sit on the Siege Perilous and straightforth saw around them the vision of a welcoming city full of triumph and splendour, which as they sought to enter it, turned to dust, leaving only a parched land and a sound of wailing in the air. Must complete victory remain a dream, increasingly remote from realization as time passes ? Hitler's wild boast : "I will see once more in youngmen's eyes the instincts of a beast of prey, I will rear a generation at whose prospects the world will tremble"—that evil design is shattered for ever. Such wicked thoughts shall never find utterance again. But war breeds war, and war is incompatible with civilization—for it is the instrument of destruction, both material and moral. Shall there be courage in the world, determination and foresight to stand firmly in the ways of lasting peace ? Victory is coming to-morrow, nay is already with us ; the day of right thinking and of faithful and firm endeavour has come. Whence shall our healing flow, and how will the vain cares that vex our life cease ? We need a clear vision and a strong resolve, wisdom to see and the will to act.

Victory is no end in itself, it must form a glorious new beginning. May I press into service the words of a living poet skillfully conning the meaning of time :

What we call the beginning is often the end
 And to make an end is to make a beginning
 The end is where to start from.

We are truly at the threshold of man's plans and the dispositions of Providence,
 THE INDIAN MIND.

At such a time it is no wonder that Indian minds should turn with peculiar fervour and intensity to problems of India's destiny. That is not my appointed purpose as it has recently been of others who seemed to survey the World Scene with confident knowledge, and to bring that knowledge courageously to bear upon the Indian question. They have spoken with uncommon emphasis, some in the strains of a prophet whose vision cannot be denied, others pronouncing as mighty judges whose verdicts are open to no challenge. Into their confident footsteps I may not step, I do not know whether from the present academic platform I would even be entitled to enlarge upon such a theme. But perhaps I may venture upon one or two thoughts gathered from the teachings of ancient sages. Independence is unquestionably an ideal that must be steadfastly pursued, as a national goal it cannot be put aside even for a moment, for in that possession lies life, otherwise there is death and darkness. But while ideals are to be fought for, even more they require preparing for. The course of time, in spite of the rapid changes in man's ideas and outlook that the Great War and the present War have wrought, has not quickened in the measure which our impatience so often leads us to affirm. Time does not quite fly, it moves slowly when we think of the weary preparations that all great tasks, all worth-while efforts, involve. Certain things are good, but they can nonetheless be only hard-woon. Can there be much doubt that distant gods who watch over our doings to-day might well reason that our endeavours, however well-intentioned to attain our goal, are misdirected, and our preparations for the prize we wish to seize ill-contrived? Do these gods, with all their benignity, not often remark at their high tables that here with us in India there is a sad tendency, instead of addressing ourselves to our immediate tasks and thereby acquiring strength, to think and act as if all things will be added unto our stores if only independence would come. Independence may furnish facilities for advance in certain of our strivings, but in the main it is a goal to be sought after and worked for, it is not a mere means without which we have to sit with folded hands in idle waiting for the day that we imagine must inevitably arrive at once. I trust I have not stressed the point over much, for to speak otherwise would have been the easier and the pleasanter course. But as I have spoken of the need for true preparation, perhaps you would permit me to refer to that master thinker who more than two thousand years ago laid precisely the true foundations of the study of man in organized society. Aristotle emphasized man's innermost character as a 'political animal', and clearly marked off religion from politics. That was unquestionably Aristotle's greatest contribution to the history of thought. History, particularly during the Middle Ages, furnishes a record of how departure from this compelling and sane principle threw the world into the turmoils of dissension. It took centuries in Europe to dispel the gloom and dismay of the Dark Ages induced by States confusing their properly appointed function with another sphere of man's nature claiming imperiously his allegiance even more. Perhaps in this learned gathering, I may recall in support the words of the Latin Poet: "Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum." Lucretius is not writing a precise treatise like Aristotle but is unerringly delivering a warning. I leave it to you to consider whether we have not a lesson to learn from these wise men of old in the difficult art of preparing ourselves for our desired destiny. The highest for us is not attainable, competent and gifted thinkers tell us, without complete freedom in our own house, without a truly national government. No one need quarrel with this, no one does or can dispute its essential validity, but that makes our duty to prepare for this supreme gift all the more instant and paramount. Here there is no scope for impatience, none for deflection.

POST-WAR INDIA

The world has suffered immeasurable destruction during the present War. It lies all around us prostrate in the agony of death, and ruin and collapse are still moving fearfully apace, for even with the undoubted certainty of victory for the Allied arms, the intensity of conflict has not abated. We in India have enjoyed a comparatively sheltered position, Japan's threat of invasion lasted but a short while. But the impact of war has been nevertheless keenly felt, and the economic life of the people has suffered a tremendous shock. Prices have risen here several fold, in the

Punjab the index has nearly touched 400, as compared with 100 in September, 1939. In England the figure stands at only 167. This is a stupendous fact, the implications of which bear upon every aspect of our economic life. Since all prices, including those for services, do not move in equal measure, it furnishes at least a part of the explanation for present day impoverishment and scarcity of food for the whole areas and whole classes of people. Indian attention naturally fastens to-day on India's undoubted poverty. How are we to escape this poverty, and its inevitable consequences? The remedy was pointed out in an unerring manner by the Famine Commission of 1882 more than sixty years ago. We must not rest our economy exclusively on agriculture, we must develop industries, for unbalanced economy not only imposes serious limitations on the possibility of growth, it means without doubt for an old country like India with its teeming population, poverty and starvation. Much thought has since been expended on plans for our deliverance from this perilous state, and several important steps taken to remedy the deep-seated fundamental evil; but industry has grown but slowly, and the unbalanced character of our economy still persists in all its dire vigour. The result of it is that while elsewhere the challenge to master poverty has been successfully overcome: 'Science and invention have so increased our power to produce wealth that poverty in the modern world is becoming an anachronism', declared a large body of leading thinkers in England some years ago, emphasising in this connection the need for a comprehensive and thorough-going policy of industrial reorganization, in India as Prof. A. V. Hill put it in a nutshell the other day the factor of safety is very low and appalling disaster will quickly follow unless radical remedies are immediately adopted and industry properly put in its rightful place.

Yet in India thought itself seems to waver in the distressing complications of actual circumstances and the day's immediate need. Lord Wavell said the other day: "Agriculture must take a high place—perhaps the highest place of all—in our plans for the development of India after the War. Unless we succeed substantially the standard of living in our villages, not only for the small farmer, but for all who make their living on the land, India cannot become a wealthier or a healthier or a better educated country." And many have taken the counsel literally to the detriment of the essential need for a comprehensive and thorough-going policy of industrial organization if we are going to survive the impact of a determined and advancing world. Lord Wavell could have meant no challenge to the well-established doctrine for a balanced economy and the imperious need in India of industrial development—he was bringing into pointed relief what must be if our overwhelmingly large rural population is left inadequately fed and generally uncared for and ill-provided; perhaps he was thinking also that India like most other countries must largely produce her own food, at any rate, as far as one can see at present, and agriculture, therefore, must always be a primary interest with us. But real danger lurks here of erecting a false conflict, I refer to it because I have seen signs of it not only in the hurried arguments of short-sighted and interested political-platforms, but also in some other circles where calm reflection should prevail. There is growing up a tendency to decry the champions of industrialization who are held up to ridicule as giving a wrong twist to our real economics. An abiding lesson of the Great War is that a mainly agricultural country conducts her trade with the outside world at a growing disadvantage. With the advance of years, States, mainly agricultural, are faced with certain disaster; they may, in exceptional circumstances, enjoy only a strictly limited measure of temporary well-being. But let there be no mistake about the import of the fast approaching fate that would confront an unhappy India maintaining world's largest population on her own agriculture and struggling to buy manufactured goods from abroad on terms increasingly unfavourable. He who teaches otherwise is no friend of India. We are drifting towards perils that are of a certainty, we must strain every nerve to reconstruct our economic life. If we are not determined and alert to-day, the world is not going to stay for us in her swift and clear-sighted march forward and our doom may be irretrievably sealed. Experience and teaching alike point to one course of salvation. Plan to-day or perish, for man's vision holds no prospect of another tomorrow for us. And remember that with poverty search for political freedom is idle, a thing of mere vanity and emptiness.

THE UNIVERSITY

Your University has grown with remarkably rapidity in size and numbers during the last forty years, to-day it is well-nigh the biggest in India. Such expansion must raise problems of the highest moment. Do numbers exhibit an equal measure

of progress and achievement? Others more competent to remark have dwelt on the theme; I must resist the temptation to embark on it, for it must be clear to those who are charged with the duty of watching over its destiny that we are at a bursting point, and machinery that was competent for its purposes two generations ago must already have proved to be inadequate. The question must be squarely faced: Is the organization of higher education in the province on a proper and satisfactory footing to-day? for, if it is not, if there is undoubted scope for improvement nay for fundamental change, and we are in our conservatism or otherwise merely drifting, the youth of the province will have a heavy indictment to frame against us. We shall not have done our duty by our beloved Punjab. We have in our charge the most precious gift that God offers to the world, the youth of the people and its intelligence. Attend to it properly, cultivate it duly—strenuous tasks for the most alert and the most sincere, there lies the road to national greatness; falter in your course, engaged in mere tinkering and petty repair, and you forfeit man's richest treasure. Our learned robes and complacent doctrines will not save us from unanswerable challenge at the bar of history. Society has undergone much radical transformation during the past two generations, even governments have cast their previous forms under pressure of changing circumstances, every sphere of activity has altered its methods and procedure, we alone remain unmoved. Do you pretend to have discovered the final form in which the organization of higher education should rest or have we just dropped into a blind and unthinking alley? Are we making our rightful contribution to the community's welfare? Can we do so choked in the tares and weeds of idle form and unprofitable langour? The world is astir to-day, reconstruction and planning are the prevailing ideas that inspire all man's action. Let us also share in the quickening and raise the song of harvest home that we may be pure and wholesome grain acceptable in the eye of future generations.

Of our youngmen I often hear disparagement. I wish to bear my witness, and I speak with intimate knowledge and experience, that the average graduate of to-day carries a large measure of attainment than his brother of yesterday or of a generation ago, and the more gifted accomplish work of increasing distinction, the best would take their place among scholars and path-breakers anywhere in the world. We have proved material of the highest excellence, and learning here is attended with the virtue of enlightened courage and the desire to act fearlessly. But society has failed to provide the right direction for the ability and character of our youth. They flounder in the sad morasses of unemployment where they fall easy victims to despair and all its attendant gloom and frustration. As life's tempest rage around us, if your youngmen are not able to contend with the actual needs of troubled humanity, our task of repairing the immense disasters that encompass us must remain unperformed.

The question is often raised: Is the world threatened with a new dark age? Certain it is that many lamps have gone out, and many lights grown dim. Hitler has gone so far as to say that knowledge is ruin to a youngmen. New Philistines stalk every path and encumber our vision. The riddle of life is to be read anew, and many knots are to be united afresh. We must raise men of vision and strength, of force and determination, if we wish to take our rightful place in the march of human progress. The will in public life has to be encountered, and forces around have to be dealt with. An earnest thinker, a genuine friend of India, advises in the words of Voltaire that the best one can do is to cultivate one's garden. The same set of values, it has been asserted, cannot be applied to public life as to private life. Moral standards change, the world is often powerful for us; our characters and our actions are strangely co-mingled. We have to seek enlightenment and firmness, we may then see the dawn appear, we may then rise like giants refreshed in joy's new rising morn. And in the battle for peace, in the struggle for advance, in the achievement of fullness of life, rigid ways must go. As the French poet, Gautier, said addressing Titian across the spread of centuries: 'Let me effect, thou great old man, by changing my lute with thy palette, a transposition of art.' This is the youth's great privilege, may you be able to pursue the great adventure, ever striving after nay ever attaining the glorious goal.

To your ownself be true. That is the surest path to unflinching success, to that achievement in which you contribute of your best, for the ways of insincerity, howsoever speciously disguised even in the slightest measure, lie strewn with sad wreckage in the life's great enterprise. And I venture to think that we cannot be true to ourselves unless, in the words of Iqbal, in our devotion to our motherland, we consider every particle of this dear land of our divine, nay a divinity in itself. The call of duty to-day is undeniably manifest; let us all, specially as we pass out,

equipped with knowledge and light, of this temple of learning to enter upon life's larger struggles, resolve to consecrate our utmost, our every thought and energy to the service of India. India has need of it as never before in her history. We can deny it to her only at the peril of irretrievable extinction, if we offer it to her, we may win for her life everlasting glory and fadeless splendour. The moment to decide is to-day, or the choice goes by for ever.

The Bombay University Convocation

The following is the text of the address delivered by Mr. B. J. Wadia, Esq., M.A., LL.B., Bar-at-Law, Vice-chancellor, at the annual convocation held on the 15th. August 1944 :—

All over the world the War has mobilized man's will to prepare new plans of development and expansion for the post-war period. New theories and new ideas of education are being freely discussed, and the time has come for us, with a wider horizon, to take larger views of our educational aims and activities. It will always be our ambition in the years of future development to keep before us high standards of excellence, and equally to keep a high conception of the Truth as an end to be pursued for its own sake. The more democratic we become, the more important it is that we maintain high standards in literature, in art and in science. With these standards before them our students must seek to discover and unravel the Truth by experiment, by reason, and even by the imagination, in order to widen the bounds of human knowledge from year to year. The path of knowledge is beset with difficulties, which can be overcome only by endurance and self-denial. Though the second oldest of the Universities in India, our University is still young in years. It has not yet been greatly moved by the stir of the centuries, but in an age which measures most attainments by their market value it has gone its way with quiet perseverance, attracting many scholars bent on learning for its own sake, and yet prepared to face the hard realities of life. It is our pride that this University has always been cosmopolitan, and knows no barriers of birth, or class, or fortune. Its door are open to all. Our University is not only cosmopolitan in its composition, but also catholic in its range. There are no limits to our range of study and scholarship, for we have not sought to restrict the pursuit of Truth within the narrow confines of a single field. We aim not only at the creation and equipment of experts and specialists, but also humanizing and broadening the mental outlook of the students generally. We wish to be judged not merely by our efforts to equip our students to compete successfully in the crafts and professions, but also by the influence which they will exercise on the imagination and the character, not only of themselves, but of their fellow-citizenship also, with a view of enriching the corporate life of the community. It is not the purpose of higher education to teach our youth only to make a living, but also how to live a full life.

No plan for the future development of education in the country can be complete without a full reconsideration of the scope and aims of University education. It is not the schools and colleges alone that are concerned, but the whole problem of the fitness of students is involved, and also the consideration of the aims and object of Universities and all they represent. A University is not a place for professional education. Its object is not to produce skilful lawyers, or physicians, or engineers; but capable and cultured human beings. We have facilities for the study of the professions, but that is not our primary object. What professional men should carry from a University is not mere professional knowledge, but the general culture which provides the background and throws light on the technicalities of a special pursuit. We believe in the relatively greater importance of Research over Teaching in the dual aim of the Universities, and urge the need of a worthier output of original work from our graduates. There is no doubt that our Indian Universities have struck their roots deep into the soil, and are greatly affected by their environment, social, intellectual and political. At times there is an arduous struggle between the student and the environment, especially when it is overshadowed by communal feelings which often involve considerable bitterness. We have tried our best to see that communal bitterness does not distort our higher education and its aims, but I am not sure that we have always succeeded. That great factor, the sense of man's equality and freedom which affected the development of ancient Greece and the Roman Republic, is still absent from India. The country

will, however, look for its future leaders principally to the men and women who pass through our doors; but true leadership will be difficult of attainment unless we give something more than lip-service to the great ideal of—country first and community afterwards.

It is difficult to address an assembly of this nature without feeling that one cannot always avoid all the common places of education usually dealt with in Convocation addresses. There are some problems which are none the less important because they are commonplace. It is an old charge that we are yearly turning out more educated men than can get work suited to their abilities, and that therefore there must be something wrong with our educational system or with the world they enter after the school and college days are over. There is probably a great deal wrong with both; but we can possibly have too many educated men in a country like India? Do we not in these days think far too much in terms of what a man can do, not enough in terms of what he is or should be? The so-called "failures" amongst our educated men are not an argument against education, for they might well be worse without it. No impartial observer, however, will deny that our system of education has been found wanting in many ways and that there is urgent need for reform. For the moment the "humanities" have been relegated to the background, but it is refreshing to be reminded now and again that spirit and matter are mutually attractive, and that what has inspired man through the ages is something intangible which is not to be found midst the din of machines and in the activities of the factories and the workshops.

There are at present signs of intense activity on the whole educational front, and it is evident that we are in for a prolonged struggle about the education of the post-war world. Ideas of education take diverse forms, but though all of them run a common aim, that of a system in which the mind and spirit of our youth should be nurtured into a fine personality and useful citizenship. We are today confronting a world in which cultural values are momentarily in dissolution, but we feel certain that sooner or later they will be restored to their proper places. Every one is agreed that the quality and quantity of our education must be improved after the war, and that we must aim at quality rather than quantity. There is, however, a great divergence of opinion as to where the improvement is to be effected, and nowhere is the divergence greater than among educationists themselves. It is for the Universities to see that such divergence does not confuse our perception of the higher value, so that a man's self may not seem greater than the race, and the present benefit more important than the permanent good. A sense of these values is the surest safeguard against the influence of catchwords and phrases; the great things of the human spirit still shine like stars pointing the way to the triumph or the tragedy of life. The democratic tradition which the greater part of the world has inherited is rooted in certain beliefs about human nature and about the moral end which underlie a proper system of education. We must go back to the fundamental principles of moral training and responsibility, and give such training a larger place in our courses of study than we have been doing. The battle on the moral front has not yet been won. And it will not be won, so long as there is the tendency to plan the new world only in terms of material well-being and to think always of economic, and never of moral and spiritual values.

No one can in our time deny the value and importance of scientific knowledge and study, and the ever-increasing numbers of students who wish to join the science classes in our colleges and the Department of Technology testify to this value and importance. It is sad to think that so many of them fail to secure admission. We want more science colleges and better equipment in our existing laboratories. This is the age of the machine, and it is only those scientifically developed countries with highly organized industries that will survive the present struggle. But even with regard to the methods of scientific study educationists are not agreed. One thing is clear. Students of science need a broad and deep background to their training as much as others, and it is true to say that the want of a proper balance between the study of science and a study of the "humanities" largely accounts for the unbalanced state of our modern civilization. This is not the occasion to discuss details of the different courses of study which will have to be recast. Speaking generally, there is a consensus of opinion that the education of the future ought to have a double aim, the aim of developing the student's individuality, and the aim of developing in him a strong sense of national obligation. What is specially required is not the teaching of party views nor of narrow communal predilections, but the teaching of great and united purposes which aim at the production of the good and liberal minded citizen.
