

THE INDIAN
ANNUAL REGISTER

Jan.—June 1947

VOL. I

**Printed by D. N. Singha at the
Singha Printing Works
30, Badur Bagan Street
and
published by N. N. Mitra
16/1, Komedan Bagan Lane, Calcutta. (India)**

Issued
from 1919]

THE INDIAN

[30th. 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 I] Jan.—June 1947 [Volume I

Editor :—Nripendra Nath Mitra

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION PAYABLE IN ADVANCE Rs. 15 ONLY.
VOLUMES: CLOTH BOUND Rs. 8/8 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 ST., CALCUTTA. (INDIA)

THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER

16/1, KOMEDAN BAGAN LANE, CALCUTTA

CALENDER FOR 1947

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

THE INDIAN ANNUAL REGISTER

JANUARY—JUNE 1947

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ADMINISTRATION OF INDIA 1947	1
Personnel of the India Office	2
" The Government of India	2
" The Government of Bengal	3
" The Government of Punjab	3
" The Government of Sind	4
" The Government of Orissa	4
" The Government of Assam	5
" The Government of Madras	5
" The Government of Bombay	6
" The Government of United Provinces	6
" The Government of Bihar	7
" The Government of Central Provinces	7
" The Government of N. W. Fr. Provinces	8
" The Federal Court of India	8
" The Indian States (with salutes)	8
" The Indian States (without salutes)	18
CHRONICLE OF EVENTS	25
January 1947	25
February 1947	32
March 1947	41
April 1947	52
May 1947	62
June 1947	70
NOTES ON INDIAN HISTORY	81
The Rigveda	82
Unitary Indian Empire	83
Chandragupta and Asoka	84
Gupta Dynasty	84
Mediaeval India	85
The Muhammedan Rule	86
The British Rule	86
Japanese Invasion and its effects	90
"Quit India" Movement (1942)	91
Bengal Famine (1943—'44)	92
1943, 1944 and 1945	92
Cabinet Delegation's Plans	93
Muslim League's "Direct Action" and its Aftermath	94

Announcement of Feb. 20, 1947—Statement of June 3, 1947	95
Two States in India	95
INDIA IN HOME POLITY	97
Britain's last acts as ruler of India	97
The use of words "Succession Government or Governments"	
Significant	98
February 20, 1947 statement "encouragement" of Muslim separatism	100
The long story of Muslim League intransigence	100
Cabinet Delegation's plan contained seeds of Pakistan	101
Genesis of the "Section" and "Group" idea	103
Can be traced to the Morley-Minto days	104
Motive behind the Cripps Mission—germs of Separate State	105
Similarity & Difference between the Cripps Plan and the Attlee Plan	106
Why did Britain withdraw authority from India—British view	107
Bally round I. N. A., Indian National Army and the revolt in the Navy—other contributing factors	108
Britain's Foreign Minister suggests another reason—"Power Vacuum" in Asia	109
U. S. A.'s interest in India's political future	109
Mr. Marshall's Statement ignores South Asian complications	111
Divided India rendered weak in the International field	112(a)
Reasons for British decision to divide India	112(b)
The manner of Britain's quitting India	112(d)
Delhi Secretariat full of "cells" of Muslim League saboteurs	112(e)
Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel tells the story of Anglo-Muslim mischief	112(f)
The British version of their last acts as Rulers of India	112(g)
Prospect of power to Provincial Governments gave a hint to League leadership	112(i)
Attempt by Muslim League to dislodge Ministries in the Punjab, N. W. Frontier Province and Assam	112(j)
Purpose of Muslim League attack on Assam's Autonomy	112(l)
The Fizzling out of Civil Liberties campaign by Muslim League	112(i)
Indian States' "lapse of Paramountcy"—its consequences	112(m)
Mr. Jinnah's interpretation of the States' Memorandum	112(n)
Majority of States join Constituent Assembly	112(o)
Main lines of partition plan accepted by Congress and Muslim League	112(q)
Partition of the Punjab, Bengal and Assam	112(q)
Mr. Jinnah's outcry and Babu Rajendra Prasad's cruel reply	112(r)
Exchange population—logical culmination of "Pakistan"	112(s)
Gandhiji engaged during this in building up a bridge of reconciliation	112(t)
Gandhij's insistence on "honesty" and immediate withdrawal	112(u)

A thousand-mile corridor through "Hindustan" demanded	112(v)
Indo-British Relation	112(w)
THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS	113
WORKING COMMITTEE—DELHI—JANUARY 4, 5 & 7, 1947	113
Independence Pledge for 26th. January, 1947 ...	113
PROCEEDINGS OF THE A. I. C. C.—DELHI—JANUARY	
5 & 6, 1947	114
The A. I. C. C. accept Grouping Plan	114
CONGRESS PRESIDENT'S STATEMENTS	116
On Police Firing on Calcutta Students	116
PROCEEDINGS OF THE WORKING COMMITTEE—DELHI—	
MARCH 6, 7 & 8, 1947	117
Resolution on (1) Prime Minister Attlee's Declaration	
of Feb. 20, 1947	117
(2) Invitation to Muslim League to meet	
Congress Representatives	118
(3) Punjab	118
(4) Constructive Programme	119
(5) Congress Seva Dal	119
(6) Ministerial Crisis in Madras	120
PROCEEDINGS OF THE WORKING COMMITTEE—DELHI	
MAY 1, 2 AND 4, 1947	120
Abolition of Zamindari	120
Hindusthan Mazdoor Sevak Sangh	121
PROCEEDINGS OF THE WORKING COMMITTEE—DELHI—	
MAY 31 to JUNE 5, 1947	121
PROCEEDINGS OF THE WORKING COMMITTEE—DELHI	
—JUNE 12, 13 and 16, 1947.	122
PROCEEDINGS OF THE ALL INDIA CONGRESS COMMITTEE	
—DELHI—JUNE 14 and 15, 1947	122
Resolutions on (1) Statement of June 3, 1947 ...	122
(2) The Indian States	123
Congress President's Address	124
DETAILS OF THE A. I. C. C. PROCEEDINGS	126
Mahatma Gandhi's call to A. I. C. C.—New Delhi—	
14th June, 1947	126
Acharya Kripalani's Address	127
British Decision to Transfer Power	128
"Only way to Freedom"	128
No Coercion of unwilling Areas	129
Maulana Azad's Support	129
Amendments Moved	130
Referendum in Frontier and Bengal	131
Sind Leaders' Opposition	131
"Will Amount to abject Surrender"	131
Minority Problem made more acute	132
New Elections Urged	132
Socialist Leaders' Criticism	132

SECOND DAY—NEW DELHI—15TH. JUNE, 1947	...	183
Pandit Nehru's Speech	183
"Drift Towards Anarchy"	183
Coercion not possible	183
No "Surrender" by Congress	184
Minorities in Pakistan	184
Acceptance of Dominion Status	185
Need for Strong Government	185
Sardar Patel's Support	185
'No Room for Groups within Congress'	186
"Surrender to Mr. Jinnah"	187
Resolution Carried	187
Debate on the Resolution on Indian States	187
"Inherent Paramountcy"—Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru	188
"No Foreign Contacts"	188
Security Considerations	189
Independence Claim Untenable	189
Cannot Remain Outside Union	140
CONGRESS PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT ON		
(1) late PROFESSOR ABDUL BARI	...	140
(2) National Week	141
(3) Minorities in Pakistan	141
PREMIER ATTLEE'S ANNOUNCEMENT OF FEBRUARY 20, 1947		142
BRITISH GOVERNMENT'S STATEMENT OF JUNE 3, 1947		143
THE ALL INDIA MUSLIM LEAGUE		147
WORKING COMMITTEE—KARACHI—31st. JAN. to 1st.		
FEB., 1947	147
League withdraws acceptance of Cabinet Plan	147
Text of Resolution	147
Congress and H. M. G.'s Statement of Dec. 6	148
A. I. C. O. Resolution Criticised	148
Question of Reference to Federal Court	149
Proceedings of Constituent Assembly Objected to	149
H. M. G. asked to abandon Plan	150
Constituent Assembly should be Dissolved	151
SECOND DAY—KARACHI—1st. FEBRUARY, 1947	151
Resolutions on		
(1) Civil Resistance in the Punjab	151
(2) Congress Ministries & Muslims	152
(3) Eviction Policy in Assam	153
(4) Imposition of Fine on Tribes	153
(4) Bihar Disturbances	154
(5) League's Demand	154
WHITE PAPER ON INDIA		155
HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATE—LONDON—20TH. FEBRUARY		
1947	155
Britain to quit India by the June 1948	155
Pethick Lawrence Defends H. M. G.'s Decision—		
HOUSE OF LORDS—LONDON—25TH. FEBRUARY, 1947	158

SECOND DAY—HOUSE OF LORDS—LONDON—26TH FEB., 1947	158
"British Cannot Prolong stay in India"—Cripps Defends decision to withdraw	159
HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATE—LONDON—5th. MARCH, 1947	159
Appetite for Self-Government	160
Cripps' Offer Recalled	160
Minority Veto	162
Formation of Interim Government	162
British Forces in India Reduced	163
Sir John Anderson's Criticism	167
SECOND DAY—HOUSE OF COMMONS—LONDON—6th. MARCH, 1947	171
Mr. Churchill's Speech	171
Mr. Alexander's Reply to Mr. Churchill	176
Premier's Reply to Debate	179
THE ALL INDIA HINDU MAHASABHA			
WORKING COMMITTEE—NEW DELHI—8TH TO 10TH FEB., 1947	182
Scheduled Castes' Demand	182
SECOND DAY—NEW DELHI—9TH. FEBRUARY, 1947	182
Hindu Sabha's Appeal to Princes	182
Work of Assembly must go on	183
Draft Constitution Proposed	183
THIRD DAY—NEW DELHI—10TH. FEBRUARY, 1947	183
"Pakistanisation of West Bengal	381
THE ALL INDIA TRADE UNION CONGRESS			184
JUBILEE SESSION—CALCUTTA—16TH. FEBRUARY, 1947	184
Sj. Mrinal Kanti Bose's Appeal	184
Soviet Delegate's Appeal for Unity	185
THE INDIAN NATIONAL TRADE UNION CONGRESS			186
NEW ORGANISATION FOR LABOUR—NEW DELHI—3RD. MAY, 1947	186
Central Board's Resolution	187
Acharya Kripalani Inaugurates	188
Committee to draw up Constitution	188
THE SOCIALIST PARTY CONFERENCE			186
CONVENTION OF A. I. CONGRESS SOCIALIST PARTY—CAWNPORE—28TH. FEBRUARY, 1947	189
Modification of Constitution	189
OPEN SESSION—CAWNPORE—1ST. MARCH, 1947	189
Chairman's Address	189
Presidential Address	189
H. M. G.'s Statement	190
THE INDIAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE & INDUSTRY			191
20TH. ANNUAL SESSION—NEW DELHI—3RD. MARCH, 1947	191
Pandit Nehru's Assurance to Indian Business Men	191
Sri Rajagopalachari's Address	194

SECOND DAY—NEW DELHI—4TH. MARCH, 1947 ...	195
Resolution on (1) Working of State Controls ...	195
(2) Sterling Balances ...	195
(3) Budget Proposal Criticised ...	195
(4) Civil Aviation ...	196
(5) Powers of Indian Union Centre ...	196
THE ALL INDIA FORWARD BLOC COUNCIL ...	197
BAURIA (HOWRAH)—16TH. TO 18TH, MARCH, 1947 ...	197
Call for Fresh Struggle under Netaji's Slogan ...	197
Text of Resolution ...	197
Programme of Work ...	199
THE ALL INDIA MAJLIS-E-AHRAR ...	199
WORKING COMMITTEE—LAHORE—24TH MARCH, 1947 ...	199
Ahrars' change of Attitude to Congress ...	199
THE ALL INDIA DEPRESSED CLASSES LEAGUE ...	200
TENTH SESSION—PATNA—7TH. APRIL, 1947 ...	200
Alignment with Muslim League means Practical "Harakari" ...	200
Indian States and Harijans ...	201
THE ALL INDIA MANUFACTURERS' ORGANISATION ...	201
ANNUAL SESSION—NEW DELHI—4TH. APRIL, 1947 ...	201
Pandit Nehru's Call to Manufacturers ...	201
THE INDIAN LABOUR CONFERENCE ...	204
EIGHTH SESSION—NEW DELHI—21ST. APRIL, 1947 ...	204
Government's Five-year Welfare Plan ...	204
Need for Increased Production ...	205
THE ALL INDIA NEWSPAPERS EDITORS' CONFERENCE ...	205
ANNUAL SESSION—MADRAS—18TH TO 20TH APRIL, 1947 ...	205
Presidential Address ...	205
RESOLUTIONS—MADRAS—20TH. APRIL, 1947 ...	210
Communal Peace ...	210
Freedom of the Press ...	210
Conference of Asian Press Suggested ...	210
THE ALL INDIA STATES' PEOPLE'S CONFERENCE ...	211
ANNUAL SESSION—GWALIOR—18TH TO 20TH APRIL, 1947 ...	211
Pandit Nehru's Address ...	211
Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya's Address ...	212
RESOLUTIONS—2ND. DAY—GWALIOR—19TH. APRIL, 1947 ...	214
British Declaration welcomed ...	214
Demand for Responsible Government ...	215
Paramountcy ...	215
Choice of States' Delegates ...	216
RESOLUTIONS—3RD. DAY—GWALIOR—20TH APRIL, 1947 ...	217
Reforms in States ...	217
Reforms in Travancore ...	218
Grouping of States ...	218
Criticism of Reforms in Bhopal ...	218

LEAGUE AGITATION IN PUNJAB & FRONTIER	220
MUSLIM NATIONAL GUARDS DECLARED UNLAWFUL—	
LAHORE—24TH. JAN. 1947	220
British Troops standing by as precautionary step ...	220
Demonstrations and arrests Continue	221
League Leaders defy Ban	222
Ban on League Guards withdrawn	222
Clashes in Amritsar and Jullunder	223
League Agitation in Punjab called off	223
Punjab Ministry Resigns	223
Disturbances in Lahore	224
Section 93 Proclaimed in the Punjab	224
Improvement in situation in Lahore	226
Arson and Looting in Rawalpindi	226
Quiet in Riot-affected Areas	227
Multan and Amritsar still Disturbed	229
Military fire on crowd in Peshawar	231
Punjab Government's Estimate for Riot casualties ...	231
Pandit Nehru's Impressions of Punjab Tour	233
Casualties in Punjab Disturbances	233
Fires in Dera Ismail Khan villages	234
Khan Abdul Ghaflar Khan suspects "Big Plot"	234
Dismissal of Frontier Governor urged by Congress ...	235
Mr. Jinnah accuses Ministry of "Ruthless Policy" ...	236
THE PARTITION OF BENGAL	236
HINDU LEADERS' DEMAND—NEW DELHI—4TH. APRIL	
1947	238
BENGAL CONGRESS EXECUTIVE'S CALL—CALCUTTA—	
4TH. APRIL, 1947	238
BENGAL HINDU CONVENTION—TARAKESWAR—4TH.	
APRIL, 1947	239
Presidential Speech	239
Council of Action Proposed—5th. April, 1947 ...	240
MEMORANDUM TO VICEROY—NEW DELHI—11TH. APRIL	
1947	240
DR. S. P. MOOKERJEE'S DEMAND—NEW DELHI—22ND.	
APRIL, 1947	242
DR. MOOKERJEE'S APPEAL TO SECRETARY OF STATE—	
CALCUTTA—7TH. MAY, 1947	243
THE PARTITION OF THE PUNJAB	243
SIKH LEADERS' DEMAND—LAHORE—5TH. APRIL, 1947 ...	243
SIKH LEADERS MEET VICEROY—NEW DELHI—18TH.	
APRIL, 1947	244
CONGRESS—SIKH DEMAND—NEW DELHI—22ND. APRIL,	
1947	244
MINORITY LEADERS' DEMAND—NEW DELHI—2ND. MAY,	
1947	245
Zonal Scheme Unacceptable	245

MR. JINNAH OPPOSES PARTITION MOVE--NEW DELHI--		
30TH. APRIL, 1947	...	245
Exchange of Population	...	246
Demand for Division of Forces	...	247
DR. BAJENDRA PRASAD SPEAKS OUT--NEW DELHI--30TH		
APRIL, 1947	...	247
The Minority Problem	...	247
TRANSFER OF POWER TO INDIAN HANDS		248
VICEROY INVITES LEADERS	...	248
MOUNTBATTEN TO VISIT LONDON	...	248
Departure from New Delhi	...	248
Viceroy Communicates British Plan	...	249
Decision Communicated to Viceroy	...	249
H. M. G.'s JUNE 3RD. STATEMENT	...	249
(For text See p. 143)		
The Viceroy's Broadcast	...	249
Pandit Nehru's Broadcast	...	251
Mr. Jinnah's Broadcast	...	253
Sardar Baldev Singh's Broadcast	...	254
Master Tara Singh's Statement	...	255
Mahasabha Resolution on H. M. G.'s Plan	...	256
Muslim League Council accepts June 3 plan	...	257
League Resolution Forwarded to Viceroy	...	258
Socialist Party's Criticism	...	259
Congress Acceptance of June 3 Plan	...	260
(For Resolution & Proceedings see p. 126)		
Communist Party's Criticism	...	260
Sikh Joint Conference Resolution	...	261
STATES' PEOPLE'S STANDING COMMITTEE RESOLUTION	...	261
Election of States' Representatives	...	262
The British Plan	...	263
Appeal to Patiala Ruler	...	263
Kashmir Govt's Policy	...	265
Punitive Tax in Srinagar	...	265
Appeal to Bhopal Ruler	...	264
Situation in Mysore	...	265
BENGAL LEGISLATORS DECIDE PARTITION	...	266
Morning Session	...	266
Partition Motion Carried	...	266
Muslim Majority Section	...	267
Constituent Assembly Issue	...	267
Muslims to Join Pakistan Constituent Assembly	...	268
PUNJAB LEGISLATORS DECIDE PARTITION	...	268
Western Section Meeting	...	268
Joint Session	...	269
Verdict of Eastern Section	...	269
SIND THE FIRST PAKISTAN PROVINCE	...	269
THE INTER ASIAN RELATIONS CONFERENCE		271
PLENARY SESSION--NEW DELHI--23RD MARCH TO 2ND.		
APRIL, 1947	...	271

Welcome Address	...	271
Pandit Nehru's Speech	...	271
Mrs. Sarojini Naidu on Asia's Resurgence	...	275
Delegates' Speeches	...	275
Aung San's Message	...	276
Ceylon Delegates' Hope	...	276
Chinese Delegate's Message	...	277
Egyptian Delegate's Message	...	277
SECOND DAY—NEW DELHI—24TH. MARCH, 1947	...	277
Egyptian Delegate's Message	...	277
Chinese Yuan's Message	...	277
Georgia's Greetings	...	277
Indonesian Delegate's Message	...	278
Kazakistan Delegate's Message	...	278
Malayan Delegate's Message	...	278
Nepal Delegate's Address	...	279
Palestine Jewish Delegate's Message	...	279
Other Delegations' Messages	...	280
A Breeze	...	280
Pandit Nehru's Concluding Remarks	...	281
THIRD DAY—NEW DELHI—25TH. MARCH, 1947	...	282
Meetings of Groups	...	282
FOURTH DAY—NEW DELHI—26TH. MARCH, 1947	...	282
Migration and Racial Problem	...	282
FIFTH DAY—NEW DELHI—27TH. MARCH, 1947	...	284
Absence of Japanese Delegates	...	284
Cultural Affairs	...	284
SIXTH DAY—NEW DELHI—29TH. MARCH, 1947	...	285
Transition from Colonial to National Economy	...	285
Reconstruction of Agriculture	...	286
Industrial Development	...	287
SEVENTH DAY—NEW DELHI—1ST. APRIL, 1947	...	289
Gandhiji's Appeal to Asian Delegates	...	288
Dr. Sultan Sharif's Address	...	290
Report on Freedom Movements Adopted	...	290
Group Reports Adopted	...	291
EIGHTH DAY—NEW DELHI—2ND. APRIL, 1947	...	292
Filipino Delegate's Greetings	...	292
Dr. Sharif's Speech	...	292
Gandhiji's Parting words to Delegates	...	293
Next Session in China	...	293
Resolution on Asian Organisation	...	294
Pt. Nehru's Call to Asians	...	295
Mrs. Sarojini Naidu's Appeal	...	297
Nehru Elected President of Council	...	297
Report on Women's Movements	...	298
Muslim League Attitude to Conference—19th. March 1947	...	298
Sponsors' Reply to Leaguers' Charge	...	298

THE INDIAN CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY

800

2ND. SESSION—NEW DELHI—20TH. JAN. TO 25TH. JAN. 1947

Dr. Prasad Replies to British Critics	800
Debate on Nehru's Resolution	801

SECOND DAY—NEW DELHI—21ST. JANUARY, 1947

Steering Committee Personnel	804
Aims & Objectives Resolution (Contd.)	804
Dr. Jayakar Withdraws Amendment	806

THIRD DAY—NEW DELHI—22ND. JANUARY, 1947

Resolution on Aims Carried	807
Negotiations with Bhutan and Sikkim	811
Motion on Budget	811

FOURTH DAY—NEW DELHI—24TH. JANUARY, 1947

Advisory Committee on Minorities	811
----------------------------------	-----

FIFTH DAY—NEW DELHI—25TH. JANUARY, 1947

Scope of Union Centre	814
-----------------------	-----

THIRD SESSION—NEW DELHI—28TH. APRIL, 1947

Dr. Rajendra Prasad's Address	815
Adoption of States' Committee's Report	817
States' Representatives' Speeches	818
Pandit Nehru reviews Negotiations	820
Powers of Indian Union	822

SECOND DAY—NEW DELHI—29TH. APRIL, 1947

Report on Fundamental Rights	824
------------------------------	-----

THIRD DAY—NEW DELHI—30TH. APRIL, 1947

Constitution for Union Centre	830
Order of Business Committee Report	830
Abolition of Titles	831
Citizens' Rights	832
Future of Tribal Areas	832
Report of Order of Business Committee	833
League's Attitude	833

FOURTH DAY—NEW DELHI—1ST. MAY, 1947

Freedom of Religion	834
Abolition of Forced Labour	834
Inter-State Freedom of Commerce	835
Religious Conversion of Minors	836
Cultural Rights of Minors	837

FIFTH DAY—NEW DELHI—2ND. MAY, 1947

Language of the Constitution	838
Discussion on Fundamental Rights	838
Question of compensation	838
Future of Zamindars	839
Citizenship Clause	839

Administration of India 1947

British India consists of the 11 Provinces of Assam, Bengal, Bihar, Bombay, Central Provinces, Madras, North West Frontier, Orissa, Punjab, Sind and the United Provinces, plus the Chief Commissionerships of British Beluchistan, Delhi, Ajmer-Merwara, Coorg, the Andamans and Nicobar Islands, Panth Piploda, and does not include any Indian States.

The name India describes the central peninsula of Southern Asia, south of the Himalayas, reaching eastward to Siam, French Indo-China and China. It is bounded on the north by Afghanistan, Nepal, Bhutan and Tibet; on the south by the Bay of Bengal, the Indian Ocean and the Arabian Sea; on the west by the Indian Ocean, Arabian Sea, Persia and Afghanistan. Its territory is as large as that of Europe minus Russia. Burma was separated from India politically. (April 1, 1937.)

The climate ranges from the extremely hot in the southeast to cooler elevations of the north-west mountains, the whole being tropical in general character. The highest point in the world is Mt. Everest, 29,141 ft. in the Himalayas, between India and China.

Approximately 20% of the area is forested, among the timber products being sandalwood, teak, ironwood, deodar, stainwood, date palm, Coconut, sago, banyan and scacia.

The country is essentially agricultural. 70% of the people living therefrom. The most important crop is tea and engages the daily employment of nearly a million persons. Other principal agricultural products are: rice, coffee, wheat, sugar cane, cotton, jute, linseed, mustard, sesamum, castor seed, groundnut and rubber. Corn, barley, tobacco and indigo are also grown.

India has an usually wide range of minerals and was famous for its riches from time immemorial. The country has yielded much gold, silver, diamonds and rubies to the western world. The most important minerals today are coal, petroleum, gold, lead, manganese, salt, silver, tin, mica, copper, tungsten, iron and zinc.

The chief industry, after agriculture, is the weaving of cotton clothes, followed by silk rearing and weaving shawl and carpet weaving, wood-carving and metal-working.

In British India there are 211,192 "recognised" educational institutions with 13,911,172 scholars and 19,354 "unrecognised" schools with 597,443 scholars. There are 20 universities.

There are more than 45 races speaking 200 languages, 2,400 castes and tribes and 700 Indian States. Each cult, caste and tribe adheres to its religious beliefs and social rules. The religious population is as follows—Hindus, 239,195,140; Muslims, 77,677,545; Buddhists, 12,788,806; Tribal, 8,280,347; Christians, 6,296,763; Sikhs, 4,335,771; Jains, 1,252,105; Zoroastrians, 109,752; Jews, 24,141.

Units of the British Regular Army, the Indian Army, Auxiliary and Territorial Forces, the Indian Army Reserve, the Royal Indian Navy, the Indian States Forces, the Royal Air Force and the Indian Air force form the defence. Members of the British Regular Army in Indian service are paid by India. The Auxiliary Force is composed of persons of British extraction and subject to call for local service. The Indian Territorial Force comprises provincial and urban battalions and a University Training Corps, all subject to general service. The Indian Army Reserve comprises reservists of all arms. The Indian States maintain the Indian States Forces and are trained by British officers. The strength of the Indian Army was estimated at 1,000,000. The Royal Indian Navy consists of five escort vessels, a survey boat, patrol ship and trawler.

In London, the governmental affairs of India are handled by the Secretary of State for India. At New Delhi, the capital of India, there is a British Governor-General and under the Government of India Act (1935), two legislative chambers, the Council of State and the House of Assembly.

The Government of India Act establishes a federation embracing British India and the Indian States with a measure of autonomy for some of the provinces. These provinces are: Bengal, Bombay, Madras, Assam, Bihar, Orissa, Punjab, Sind, Central Provinces, United Provinces, and North-west Province. Delhi has separate administration. Each Province has a Governor appointed by the King, a Cabinet and Legislature of two chambers except in Orissa, Punjab, Sind, Central Provinces, and N. W. Fr. Province there is only one chamber.

Reigning Sovereign—His Majesty George the VI

(Ascended the Throne: 11th. December 1936)

India Office

Secretary of State for India—The Right Hon. Lord Pethick Lawrence.

High Commissioner of India—Sir Samuel Runganadhao.

Government of India

(Area—18,01,679 sq. miles with a population of 352,837,778 of people—nearly one-fifth of human race. British Provinces area—1,318,346 sq. miles and population: 289,491,241.

Viceroy & Governor-General

H. E. Field Marshal the Rt. Hon. Viscount Wavell of Syria and Winchester. P. C. G. C. R., G.M.S.I. G.M.I.R., C. M. G.

His Excellency General Sir Claude John Eyre Auchinleck, G.S.I.E., C.B., C.S.I. D.S.O., O.B.E., A.D.C., Commander-in-chief in India.

Interim Government

A communique issued from the Viceroy's House on Aug. 24, 1946 stated:

His Majesty the King has accepted the resignations of the present members of the Governor-General's Executive Council. (See Vol. I 1945). His Majesty has been pleased to appoint the following:—

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.
Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel.
Dr. Rajendra Prasad.
Mr. M. Asaf Ali.
Mr. C. Rajagopalachari.
Mr. Sarat Chandra Bose.
Dr. John Matthai.
Sardar Baldev Singh.
Sir Shafaat Ahmed Khan.
Mr. Jagjivan Ram.
Syed Ali Zahir.
Mr. Cooverji Hormusji Bhabha.
Two more Muslim members will be appointed later.

The Interim Government took office on September 2, 1946.

At 11 A.M. on September 2, 1946 seven Members of the new Interim Government were sworn in by H. E. the Viceroy at the Viceroy's House, New Delhi. They were Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Mr. Asaf Ali, Mr. Sarat Chandra Bose, Mr. Jagjivan Ram, and Syed Ali Zahir. They took the oath of allegiance, the oath of office and the oath of secrecy, after which there was a brief meeting of the Members of the new Interim Government.

The five Members-designate absent were Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, Dr. John

Matthai, Sir Shafaat Ahmed Khan, Sardar Baldev Singh and Mr. C. H. Bhabha.

Distribution of Portfolios.

A Press note issued from the Viceroy's House on September 1, 1946 stated:—

The Portfolios of the new Interim Government have been distributed by H. E. the Governor-General as follows:—

External Affairs and Commonwealth Relations: Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, (Vice-President).

Defence: Sardar Baldev Singh.

Home, including information and Broadcasting: Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel.

Finance: Dr. John Matthai.

Communications (War Transport and Railways): Mr. M. Asafali.

Agriculture and Food: Dr. Rajendra Prasad.

Labour: Mr. Jagjivan Ram

Health, Education and Arts: Sir Shafaat Ahmed Khan.

Legislative and Posts and Air: Syed Ali Zahir.

Industries and Supplies: Mr. C. Rajagopalachari.

Works, Mines and Power: Mr. Sarat Chandra Bose.

Commerce: Mr. C. H. Bhabha.

Muslim League Joins Interim Government

Four out of the five representatives of the Muslim League, who were appointed members of the Interim Government, were sworn in by His Excellency the Viceroy at the Viceroy's House, New Delhi on October 26, 1946. They were Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan, Mr. I. I. Chundrigar, Mr. Abdur Rab Nishtar, and Mr. Gaznafar Ali Khan, Mr. Jogendra Nath Maudal who was in Bengal took charge of his office telegraphically.

After the swearing-in ceremony there was a brief meeting of the Cabinet.

Announcing the allotment of portfolios to the new members of the Interim Government, a Press Communique issued from the Viceroy's House on October 25, 1946 stated: The portfolios to be held by the representatives of the Muslim League, who have recently been appointed Members of the Interim Government, have been allotted by His Excellency the Governor-General as follows:

Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan: Finance.

Mr. I. I. Chundrigar: Commerce.

Mr. Abdur Rab Nishtar: Communications (Posts and Air).

Mr. Gaznafar Ali Khan—Health.

Mr. Jogendra Nath Mandal: Legislative.

Consequent changes among the other portfolios are as follows:—

Dr. John Matthai: Industries and Supplies.

Mr. Rajagopalachari: Education and Arts.

Mr. Bhabha: Works, Mines and Power.

The other portfolios remain as before i. e.:—

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru: External Affairs and Commonwealth Relations.

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel: Home and Information and Broadcasting.

Dr. Rajendra Prasad: Food and Agriculture.

Mr. Asaf Ali: Transport and Railways.

Sardar Baldev Singh: Defence.

Mr. Jaggivan Ram: Labour.

An earlier Communiqué issued on October 15, announcing the Muslim League's decision to join the Interim Government and the appointment of the five League nominees, stated *inter alia* that in order to make it possible to reform the Cabinet the following members had tendered their resignations:—

Mr. Sarat Chandra Bose.

Sir Safiat Ahmed Khan.

Syed Ali Zaheer.

Government of Bengal

Area:—82,955 sq. miles; Population—70,00,000. (Provisional to the nearest thousand).

Governor

Sir Frederick Burrows, G.O.B. Assumed office February 18, 1946.

Ministry (Its composition, Political complexion etc.,)

Muslim League, formed April 23, 1946:—

(1) Mr. H. S. Suhrawardy, Chief Minister; Portfolio, Home.

(2) Mr. Mohammad Ali, Portfolios: Finance, Health and Local Self-Government.

(3) Mr. Syed Muezzemuddin Hossain; Portfolio: Education.

(4) Mr. Ahmed Hossain; Portfolios: Agriculture, Forest and Fisheries.

(5) Mr. Abdul Gafran; Portfolio: Civil Supplies.

(6) Mr. A. F. M. Abdur Rahman; Portfolios: Co-operation, Credit & Relief.

(7) Mr. Samsuddin Ahmed, Portfolios, Commerce, Labour and Industries.

(8) Mr. Tarak Nath Mukherjee, Portfolio: Irrigation and Waterways.

(9) Mr. Nagendra Narayan Ray, (Scheduled Caste), Portfolios: Judicial and Legislative.

(10) Mr. Fazlur Rahman, Portfolios: Land and Land Revenue and Jails Branch of the House Department.

(11) Mr. Dwarkanath Barori, Portfolios: Works and Buildings.

Parliamentary Secretary

1. (Chief Whip) Zahur Ahmed Ohudhury, M.L.A., Chief Minister's Department (Constitution and Elections, Common Service, General Administrations and Organisation and Methods). (2) (Whip) Abdul Karim, M.L.A. (Muslim League). (3) Abdul Khaleque M.L.A. Education and Lands and Land Revenue Departments (Muslim League). (4) Hamiduddin Ahmed, M.L.A., Home and Commerce, Labour and Industries Departments (Muslim League). (5) Mafuzuddin Ahmed, M.L.A., Chief Minister's Department (Development and Publicity branches) and whip (Muslim League). (6) K. Nasarullah, M. L. A., Home Department (Jails, Evacuees and Defence) and Whip (Muslim League). (7) Syed Abdus Salim, M.L.A., Chief Minister's Department (Katabiishment Branch and Whip (Muslim League). (8) Masjuddin Ahmed, M. L. A., Co-operation, Credit and Relief, and Irrigation and Waterways Departments (Muslim League). (9) Maulana Abul Aziz, M.L.A. Madrassa Education (Muslim League). (10) Ebrahim Khan, M. L. A. Agriculture, Forest and Fisheries Departments. (Muslim League). (11) Eskandar Ali Khan M.L.A. Civil Supplies Department and Whip (Muslim League). (12) Mohd. Abdur Rashid, M.L.A., Finance and Health and Local Self-Government departments and Whip (Muslim League).

Legislative Assembly (Lower House)
Total Seats 250.

Legislative Council (Upper House)
Total Seats 63.

Calcutta population—40,00,000.
Summer Capital and its population

Darjeeling—25,900.
Receipts—Rs. 31,78,91,000.

Expenditure—Rs. 31,75,65,000.

Government of the Punjab

(Area—136,330 Sq. miles; Population—28,478,819).

Governor

H. E. Sir Evan Meredith Jenkins, K.C.S.I. K.C.I.E., (Assumed charge April 8, 1946.)

Ministry (Its composition, political, complexion etc.

Coalition formed on March 11, 1946,

(1) Lt. Col. Sir Khizar Hayat Khan Tiwana, Premier (Muslim Unionist).

(2) Sardar Swarna Singh (Akali), Minister of Development. Succeeded Sardar Baldev Singh, who since been appointed Member of the Interim Government at the Centre.

(3) Nawab Sir Muzaffar Ali Khan Qazilbash, Minister of Revenue (Unionist)

(4) L. Bhim Sen Sachar, Finance Minister (Congress).

(5) Mian Mohammad Ebrahim Barque, Minister for Education (Unionist).

(6) Ch. Lehari Singh, Minister for Public Works (Congress).

Parliamentary Secretaries

(1) Mian Muhammad Rafiq (Irrigation) Unionist.

(2) Mian Bagh Ali (Revenue) Unionist.

(3) Chaudhuri Sundar Singh (Public Works) Congress.

(4) Sardar Gurbachan Singh (Development) Akali.

(5) Chaudhuri Abdul Ghafoor Qamar (General) Unionist.

(6) Sardar Sajjan Singh (Finance) Congress.

(7) Rao Sahib Rao Mohar Singh (Premier) Unionist.

(8) Mr. C. E. Gibbon (Premier) Anglo-Indian.

(9) Sardar Shiv Saran Singh Gyani (Revenue) Akali.

(10) Chaudhuri Harbhsaj Ram (Revenue) Independent.

(11) Mr. Sant Ram (Finance) Congress.

(12) Mr. Fazal Ilahi (Education) Independent.

(13) Sardar Narottam Singh (Development) Akali.

(14) Chaudhuri Mehar Chand (Public Works) Congress.

(15) Chaudhuri Netu Ram (Additional) Congress.

Numerical Strength of Parties

The total number of seats in the Legislative Assembly is 175, including the Hon'able Speaker. They are divided into parties as follows as on 11-12-46 :—

Prty Analysis (Legislative Assembly); Muslim League 77; Congress 48; Panthik 21; Unionist 16; Independent 5; (7 Seats are vacant.)

Capital and its population—Lahore—671,659.

Summer capital and its population—Simla—18,349.

Receipts and Expenditure. Revenue Estimate :—Rs. 21,29,73,000 (1946-47)
Expenditure :—Rs. 20,82,52,000 (1946-47).

Government of Sind

(Area—46,378 Sq. miles; Population—4,535,008).

Governor

Sir Francis Mudie, K.O.S.I., K.O.L.E., O.B.E. I.O.S., (Jan. 15, 1946.)

Council of Ministers

Muslim League formed February 8, 1946 and reformed January 3, 1947, after the General Elections in December 1946.

(1) Mr. Ghulam Hussain Hidayatullah, Premier, Portfolio: Finance.

(2) Mr. M. A. Khuhro; Portfolios: P. W. D. and Post-War Development.

(3) Pir Ilahi Bakhsh Nawaz Ali, Portfolios: Education, Local Self-Government and Public Health.

(4) Firzada Abdus Sattar, Portfolios: Revenue, Excise and Forests.

(5) Mir Ghulam Ali Khan Talpur, Portfolios: Food, Civil Supplies, Agriculture and Industries.

(6) Mir Bunde Ali Khan Talpur, Portfolio: Home.

Parliamentary Secretaries

(1) Mr. Muhammad Azam Khan.

(2) Kazi Fazullah.

(3) Kazi Muhammad Akbar.

(4) Mr. Ahmed Khan.

(5) Mr. Rahim Bux.

(6) Mrs. J. G. Aliana.

Numerical Strength of Parties

Party Analysis (Legislative Assembly)

Total seats 60. (As on Jan 31, 1947.)

Congress 20; Muslim League 35;

Muslim Jamiat 2; Europeans 3.

Capital and its Population :—Karachi

—866,655.

Budget. Revenue :—Rs. 8,03,29,000.

Expenditure :—Rs. 8,00,13,000.

Government of Orissa

(Area—89,000 Sq. miles; Population—87,28,544.

Governor

H. E. Sir Chandulal Trivedi, K.C.S.I. C.I.E. I.C.S., (April 1946).

Council of Ministers

Congress: formed April, 25, 1946.

(1) Sri Hare Krishna Mahatab, Prime Minister, Portfolios: Home, Finance, Publicity, Planning and Reconstructions.

(2) Sri Nabakrishna Choudhury, Portfolios: Revenue, Supply and Transport.

(3) Pandit Lingaraj Miera, M. A., Portfolios: Education, Forest and Health.

(4) Sri Nityananda Kanungo, B.A. B.L., Portfolios: Law, Local Self-Government and Development.

(5) Sri Radhakrishna Biswas Roy, Portfolios: Public Works, Commerce and Labour.

Numerical Strength of Parties
Party Analysis (Legislative Assembly).
 Total Seats 60. (As on 5-8-1946)
 Congress 47; Muslim League 4;
 Communist 1; Independents 4; Nominated
 by Government 4.

Capital and its population: Outack—
 79,107. Summer Capital: Puri—12,916.
Receipts and Expenditure:—Receipts—
 Rs. 3,57,51,000. **Expenditure—Rs. 3,92,26,000**

Government of Assam

(Area—87,384 Sq. miles; Population—
 10,980,888)

Governor

Sir Andrew Gournlay Olow, K.C.S.I.
 C.I.E., I.C.S. (May 4, 1942)

Council of Ministers

Congress: formed February 11, 1946:—

(1) Srijiut Gopinath Bardoloi, M.A.
 B.L., Prime Minister, Portfolios: Educa-
 tion and Publicity.

(2) Basanta Kumar Das, B.L., Port-
 folios: Home, Judicial, Legislative and
 General Departments.

(3) Srijiut Bishnuram Medhi, M.S.O.
 B.L., Portfolios: Finance and Revenue.

(4) Maulavi Abdul Matlib Mezumdar,
 M.A., B.L., (Jamiat-ul-Ulema): Portfolios:
 Local Self-Government, Agriculture and
 Veterinary.

(5) Baidynath Mookherjee, B.A.
 Portfolios: Supply, Reconstructions
 Mechanically-propelled Vehicles and
 Jails.

(6) The Rev. J. J. M. Nicholas Roy,
 B.A. Portfolio: Public Works.

(7) Srijiut Ramnath Das, B.L. Port-
 folios: Medical Public Health and Labour

(8) Mr. Brimbar Deuri, Portfolio:
 Forests.

(9) Maulavi Abdur Rashid, Portfolios:
 Industries, Co-operation, Registration
 and Muslim Education.

Parliamentary Secretary

Mr. Purananda Ohtia.

Numerical Strength of Parties

Party Analysis (Legislative Assembly.)
 Total Seats 108 as on 8-8-46.

Congress 60; Jamiat-ul-ulema 3;
 Muslim League 31; Independent 14,
 Legislative Council:—Total Seats 22
 (of which 4 are nominated.)
 (As on 8-8-1946)

Congress 4; Muslim League 2;
 Independents 16.

Capital and its Population—Shillong
 —38,192. No Summer Capital.

Receipts and Expenditure:—Receipts
 Re. 5,15,59,000; **Expenditure:—Rs.**
 5,05,32,000.

Government of Madras

(Area 1,24,363 Sq. miles. Population—
 4,98,40,664).

Governor

Lieut-General Sir Archibald Edward
 Nye, G.C.I.E., K.C.B., K.B.E., M.C., Assumed
 charge May 6, 1946.

Advisory Council

Congress: formed April 30, 1946.

(1) Mr. T. Prakasham, Premier, Port-
 folios: Public, Home, Food, Police,
 Finance, Planning.

(2) Mr. V. V. Giri. Portfolios: In-
 dustries, Labour, Electricity, Co-operation
 and Emigration.

(3) Mrs. Rukmini Lakshminpathi,
 Portfolios: Public Health and Medicine.

(4) Mr. K. Bhaahyam, Portfolios:
 Law, Courts, Registration and Prison
 Legislation.

(5) Mr. K. Kott Reddi. Portfolios:
 Hindu Religious Endowments, Charitable
 Institutions, Excise and Debt Relief.

(6) Mr. Daniel Thomas, Portfolio:
 Local Administration.

(7) Mr. K. R. Karanth, Portfolios:
 Land Revenue and Commercial Taxes.

(8) Mr. M. Vaktavatsalam, Portfolios
 Public Works (General), Irrigation and
 Highways.

(9) Mr. T. S. Avinashilingam Obet-
 tair, Portfolio: Education.

(10) Mr. V. Kurmayya, Portfolios:
 Public Information, Broadcasting and
 Harijan uplift.

(11) Mr. P. S. Kumaraswami Raja,
 Portfolios: Agriculture, Commerce and
 Trade, Statistics, Marketing, Museum,
 Communication, Post and Telegraphs,
 Banking, Insurance, Rural Indebtedness
 and Veterinary.

(12) Mr. E. Veeraswami, Portfolios:
 Forests and Cinchona, Fisheries and
 Village Industries.

(13) Mr. R. Raghava Menon, Port-
 folios: Transport and House Control
 Motor Transport, Additional Minister for
 food.

Parliamentary Secretaries

(1) T. Viswanatham, M.A. B.L.

(2) V. Raghavayya, B.A., B.L.

(3) N. Sankara Reddi,

(4) B. S. Murthy, B.A.

(5) B. Venkatchalam Pillai, B.A., B.L.

(6) R. Subha Iyar, B.A., B.L.

(7) L. C. Pais, B.A., B.L.

(8) L. S. Karayalar, B.A., B.L.

(9) K. Lingaraju.

(10) G. Rajamannar Ohtty.

(11) V. M. Ramswamy, B.A., B.L.

(12) B. Parameswarar, B.A.

(13) R. Venkata Reddi, B.A., B.L.

(14) M. P. Damodaran, B.A.

Legislative Assembly (Lower House)

Total Seats 215.

Legislative Council (Upper House)

Total Seats 55.

Party Analysis (Legislative Assembly) :
(As on 6-8-1946)

Congress 165; Muslim League 29; Europeans 7; Anglo Indians 2, Independents 9; Nationalists 1; Communists 2.

Party Analysis (Legislative Council)

Congress 32; Muslim League 7; Europeans 1; Justics 2; National Democrats 1; Independents 2; Independent Nationalists 1; Nominated 9.

The total estimate revenue receipts (including 894 lakhs proposed for transfer to the Revenue account from the Revenue Reserve Fund) and the expenditure on Revenue account for 1946-47 for the Madras province with reference to the revised budget 1946-47 as presented to the Legislature, are Rs. 57,42,92,600 and Rs. 57,42,77,300 respectively.

Government of Bombay

(Area—76,448 sq. miles; Population 20,849,840).

Governor

Sir John Colville, G.C.I.E., T.D.
(24 March 1943).

Ministry (its composition, political complexion etc.)

Congress : formed April 23, 1946 :—

(1) B. G. Kher, B.A. LL.B. Prime Minister, Portfolios : Political service and Education.

(2) Morarji R. Desai, B.A. Portfolios : Home and Revenue.

(3) Dr. M. D. D. Gilder B.A. M.D. F.R.C.S. Portfolios : Health and Public Works.

(4) L. M. Patil, B.A., LL.B. Portfolios : Excise and Reconstruction.

(5) Dinkarrao N. Desai, M.A., LL.B. Portfolios : Law and Civil Supplies.

(6) Vaikunth L. Mehta, B.A., Portfolios Finance, Co-operation and Village Industries.

(7) Gulzarilal Nanda, M.A. LL.B. Portfolio : Labour.

(8) M. P. Patil, B.A., LL.B. Portfolios Forest and Agriculture.

(9) G. D. Vartak, B.A. Portfolio : Local Self-Government.

(10) G. D. Tapase, B.A., LL.B.; Portfolios : Industries, Fisheries and Backward Classes.

Parliamentary Secretaries

(1) Mr. S. E. Kantbi.

(2) Mr. K. F. Patil.

(3) Mr. S. P. Gaoker.

(4) Miss Indumathi Seth.

(5) Mr. Yashvantrao Chawan.

(6) Mr. D. K. Kunte.

(7) D. N. Wandrekar.

(8) Mr. P. K. Savant.

Legislative Assembly (Lower House)

Total Seats 175.

Legislative Council (Upper House)
Total seats not less than 29 and not more than 30.

Party Analysis (Legislative Assembly)
(As on 23-8-1946) :

Congress 127; Muslim League 31; Progressive Communists 1; Hindu Mahasabha 1; (plus 2 seats vacant.)

Party Analysis (Legislative Council)
Congress 16; Muslim League 4; Liberals 1; Hindu Mahasabha 1, (of which three are filled by nomination).

Capital and its population—Bombay City—1,439,883.

Summer Capital and its population—Poona—13,51,233.

Receipts—Ra. 30,94,87,000.

Expenditure—Ra. 30,89,75,000.

Govt. of the United Provinces

(Area—1,12,191 sq. miles; Population—6,63,46,456).

Governor

H. E. Sir Francis Verner Wylie, KCSI, CIE, L.C.S., (December 6, 1939).

Ministry (its composition, political complexion etc.) Congress : formed April 1, 1946 :—

(1) Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, B.A. LL.B. Premier, Portfolios : Home Affairs and Food.

(2) Rafi Ahmed Kidwai; Portfolios : Jails and Police.

(3) Dr Kailash Nath Katju, M.A. LL.D., Portfolios : Justice, Industries and Labour.

(4) Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit; Portfolios : Local Self-Government and Health.

(5) Hafiz Muhammad Ibrahim, B.A. LL.B. Portfolios : Communications.

(6) Shri Sampurand, B. Sc. Portfolios Education and Finance.

(7) Shri Hakim Singh, B.A. LL.B.; (appointed August 7, 1946). Portfolios : Revenue and forests.

(8) Nisar Ahmed Sherwani (appointed August 7, 1946), Portfolios : Agriculture and Animal Husbandry.

(9) Shri Girdhari Lal (appointed August 7, 1946); Portfolios : Excise, Registration and Stamps.

Parliamentary Secretaries.

(1) Chandra Bhan Gupta, M.L.A.

(2) Lal Bahadur Shastri, M.L.A.

(3) Charan Singh, M.A. B.S.C. M.L.A.

(4) Govind Sahai, M.L.A.

(5) Jagan Prasad Rawat, B.B.C. LL.B.
M.L.A.

(6) Keshav Deo Malaviya, M.L.A.

(7) Waheed Ahmed, M.L.O.

(8) Atma Ram Govind Kher,

B.A. LL.B. M.L.A.

(9) Latafat Hussain, M.L.A.

- (10) Udaibir Singh, M.L.A.
 (11) Maulavi Mahfuz-ur-Rahaman,
 M.L.A.
 (12) Raghukul Tilak, M.A. L.L.B., M.L.A.
 (13) Thakur Har Govind Singh,
 B.S.C. M.L.C.

Legislative Assembly (Lower House)
 Total seats 228

Legislative Council (Upper House)

Total Seats 60 (52 elected and 8 nominated).

Party Analysis (Legislative Assembly) :
 Congress 151; Nationalist Muslim 7;
 Muslim League 58; Zaminders 6; Independents 5; Ahrar 1; Europeans 3, Vacant 2.

Party Analysis (Legislative Council) :
 Congress 26, Muslim League 10;
 Independents 12, Unattached to any party 11; Vacant 1.

Capital and its population—

Allahabad—2,60,630.

Summer Capital and its population—
 Naini Tal—21,313.

Receipts and expenditure—*Receipts*—
 Rs. 29,15,02,0.0 *Expenditure*—
 Rs. 29,44,37,800.

Government of Bihar

(Area—69,948 Sq. miles; Population—37,985,581).

Governor

H. E. Sir Hugh Dow, K.C.S.I., C.L.E.
 L.C.S. (Assumed charge May, 10, 1946.)

Ministry (its composition, Political complexion etc.)

Congress formed April 2, 1946 :—

1. Shri Krishna Singh, Portfolios :
 Appointments, Political, Judicial and Jails
 2. Anugrah Narayan Singh, Portfolios :
 Finance, Labour, Supply and Price Control.

3. Dr. Syed Mahmud; Portfolios :
 Development (minus cottage industries) and Transport.

4. Jaglal Chaudhuri, Portfolios :
 Excise and Public Health.

5. Ramcharitra Singh, Portfolios :
 Irrigation, Public Health (Engineering),
 Electrification and Legislative.

6. Badri Nath Vsrma, Portfolios :
 Education and Information.

7. Krishna Ballabh Sahai, Portfolios :
 Revenue and Forest.

8. Pt. Binodananda Jha, Portfolios :
 Local Self-Government and Medical.

9. Qaisum Ansari, (Nationalist Muslim) Portfolios : P. W., D., Roads and Building and Cottage Industries.

Parliamentary Secretaries

1. Shivanandan Prasad Mandal, M.L.A.
2. Nirapada Mukherji, M.L.A.
3. Bir Chandra Patel, M.L.A.
4. Sukhlal Singh, M.L.A.

5. Shah Muhammad Umair, M.L.C.
6. Abdul Ahad Mohd Noor. M.L.A.
7. Devendra Nath Samanta, M.L.C.
8. Bhola Paswan, M.L.C.
9. Boniface Lakra, M.L.C.

Legislative Assembly (Lower House)
 Total Seats 152 (including the speaker).

Legislative Council (Upper House).

Total Seats 30.

Party Analysis (Legislative Assembly) :
 (As on 12-10-1946)

Congress (including 5 Nationalist Muslims and excluding the speaker) 102;
 Muslim League 34; Unattached 15; No Party (the speaker) 1.

Party Analysis (Legislative Council) :
 Congress 15; Muslim League 4; Coalition 10; No party (the President) 1.

Capital and its population—Patna—196,435.

Summer Capital and its population—
 Ranchi—92,562.

Receipts and Expenditure :—*Receipts*—
 —Rs. 13,62,39,000. *Expenditure*—Rs.
 13,60,10,000.

Government of Central Prov.

(Area—98,575 Sq. Miles; Population—1,68,13,532 (excluding States.)

Governor

H. E. Sir Federick Chalmers Bourne
 K.C.S.I., C.L.E., I.C.S. (October 2, 1940).

Ministry (its composition, Political complexion etc.,

Congress : formed April 27, 1946.

1. Pandit Ravi Shankar Shukla,
 Prime Minister; Portfolios : Home Affairs.

2. Pandit Dwarka Prasad Mishra;
 Portfolios : Development and Local Self-Government.

3. Durga Shankar Kripa Shankar
 Mehta, Portfolio : Finance.

4. Sambhaji Vinayak Gokhale; Portfolios : Education.

5. Ramrao Krishnarao Patel; Portfolios :
 Food and Revenue.

6. Dr. Syed Minhajul Hassan; Portfolio :
 Medical and Public Health.

7. Dr. Waman Sheodas Barlingey;
 Portfolio : Public Works.

8. Rameshwar Agnihotri; Portfolio :
 Agriculture (Scheduled Caste).

9. Baba Anandrao Deshmukh; Portfolio :
 Excise.

Parliamentary Secretaries

1. Mrs. Vimalabai Deshpande.
2. Mr. H. J. Khandekar.
3. Dr. R. A. Belsare.
4. Mr. K. N. Kbandare.
5. Mr. G. S. Agnihotri.
6. Mr. Kanyilal Dubey.
7. Mr. Premchankar Bhagat.

8. Mr. Ramgopal Tewari.

9. Dr. Bhegal.

Legislative Assembly (Lower House)

Total Seats 112. (As on 13-8-1946)

Party Analysis

Congress 99; Muslim League 13; Independents 5; (Excluding the speaker).

Capital and its population—Nagpur—301,957.

Summer capital and its population—Panchmari, 6,696.

Receipts and expenditure :—Receipts—Rs. 9,48,14,000. Expenditure—Rs. 9,48,57,000.

Govt. of N. W. Fr. Province

(Area—30,38,067 sq Miles; Population—6,415,666.)

Governor

H. E. Sir George Cunningham K.C.S.I., K.C.I.E., O.B.E. L.O.S., (March 2, 1937.)

Ministry (Its composition, political complexion etc.)

Congress; formed March 9, 1946 :—

1. Dr. Khan Shihb, Premier, Portfolios: Law and Order; P. W. D. Electricity, Civil Defence, Motor Transport and Resettlement of Demobilized Personnel.

2. Qazi Attaullah Khan, Portfolios: Revenue, Civil Supplies, Legislative Judicial, Forests, Jails, Hospitals and Public Health.

3. Lala Meher Chand Khanas, Portfolios: Finance, Information, National Savings Scheme, Elections, Industries, and Companies, Co-operative Societies, Agriculture, Veterinary and Marketing, Stationery and Printing.

4. Khan Mohammed Yahya Jan, Portfolios: Education, Local Self-Government, Archaeology, Geological Surveys, Census and Gazetteers.

Parliamentary Secretaries

1. Mian Jaffar Shah. (Chief Parliamentary Secretary).

2. Sardar Ishar Singh.

3. Khan Abdul Qaiyum Khan Swati.

4. Mehta Madan Lal.

5. Syed Qaim Shah.

Legislative Assembly (Lower House)

Total Seats 50. (As on 7-8-1946).

Party Analysis

Congress 30; Congress Nationalists 2; Muslim League 17; Akalis 1.

Population of the Capital—Peshawar City 173,430. Peshawar Cantonment—42,453. Summer Capital—Nathigalli.

Revenue receipts—Rs. 2,63,99,000

Revenue expenditure—Rs. 2,68,77,000

Federal Court of India

Chief Justice of India—The Hon. Sir Patrick Spens, O.B.E. (Apptd. in 1943).

Judges

The Hon. Mr. Justice Srinivasa Varadachariar, Kt., (Appt. in 1939).

The Hon. Mr. Justice Sir Mhd. Zafarulla Khan, K.C.S.I., (Apptd. in 1941).

Indian States (with Salutes)

(Area—712,508 sq. miles; Population—31,310,845).

Assam State

Manipur—H. H. Maharaja Sir Chura Chand Singh, K.C.S.I., O.B.E. Maharaja of—

Date of Birth—15th April, 1885

Date of succession—18th September, 1891

Area in Sq. miles—8618 (Approximately)

Population of State—4,45,606

Revenue—Nearly Rs. 9,59,620

Salute in guns—11

Baluchistan State

Kalat—His Highness Beglar Begi Mir Sir Mahmud Khan, G.O.I.E. Wali of—

Date of Birth—1864

Date of succession—1893

Area of State in square miles—73,278

Population of State—328,281

Revenue—Rs. 17,76,000

Salute in Guns—19

Baroda State

Baroda—His Highness Farzandi-i-Khas-i-Daulat-i-Inglisbia Maharaja Sir Pratapsingh Gaekwar, G.O.I.E. Sena Khas

Khel Shamsher Bahudur, Maharaja of—

Date of Birth—29th June, 1908

Date of succession—7th Feb., 1939

Area of State in sq. miles—8,164

Population of State—28,55,010

Revenue—Rs. 245-23 lacs

Salute in guns—21

Bengal States

Cooch Behar—H. H. Maharaja Jagadipendra Narayan Bhup Bahadur, Maharaja of—

Date of Birth—15th December, 1915

Date of succession—20th Dec. 1922

Area of State in sq. miles—131,835

Population of State—6,39,698

Revenue—About Rs. 38½ lacs

Salute in guns—13

Tripura—H. H. Maharaja Manikya Bir Bikram Kishore Deb Barman Bahadur, K.C.S.I., Maharaja of—

Date of Birth—19th August, 1908

Date of succession—13th August, 1928

Area of State in sq. miles—4,116

Population of State—382,450

Revenue—Rs. 33,42,104 (including the revenue of the zamindaries in British India)

Salute in guns—13

Bihar & Orissa

Kalabandi—H. H. Maharaja Pratapkeshori Deo, Maharaja of—

Date of birth—5th October '19
Date of succession—19th September '39
Area in sq. miles—3,745
Population—5,99,751
Revenue—6,43,000
Salute in guns—9

Mayurbhanj—Maharaja Sir Pratap Chandra
Bhanj Deo, K. C. I. E. Maharaja of—
Date of birth—18th February, '01
Date of succession—28rd April '28
Area in sq. miles—4,243
Population—9,89,857
Revenue—Rs. 34 lacs
Salute in guns—9

Patna—H. H. Maharaja Rajendra Narayan
Singh Deo, Maharaja of—
Date of birth—31st March '12
Date of succession—16th January '24
Area in sq. miles—2,511
Population—16,32,220
Revenue—Rs. 11,02,251
Salute in guns—9

Sonpur—H. H. Maharaja Sing Deo,
K. C. I. E. Maharaja of—
Date of birth—28th June 1874
Date of succession—8th August '02
Area in square miles—906
Population—226,751
Revenue—Rs. 3,74,000 nearly
Salute in guns—9

Bombay Presy. States

Belasinor—H. H. Babi Shri Jamiat
Khanji Munavvar Khanji Nawab
Saheb Bahadur, Nawab of—
Date of birth—10th November, 1894
Date of succession—31st December, '15
Area in square miles—189
Population—52,525
Revenue—Rs. 3,50,000
Indian State Forces:—Cavalry—60
Infantry—177, Guns—10
Salute in guns—9

Bansda—H. H. Maharawal Shri Indra-
sinbji Pratapsinhji, Raja of—
Date of birth—16th February 1888
Date of succession—21st Sept. '11
Area in square miles—215
Population—40,125
Revenue—Rs. 7,98,000 nearly
Salute in guns—9

Baria—Lt. Col. His Highness Maharaj
Shree Sir Ranjitsinhji, K. C. S. I. Ruler of—
Date of birth—10th July 1895
Date of succession—20th Feb. '03
Area in sq. miles—813
Population—1,89,206
Indian States Forces—Cavalry (Irregular)
Strength 17, 1 Company Ranjic
Infantry 153; 1 Platoon Militia,
Strength 50
Salute in guns—9

Bhor—H. H. Meharban Srimant Ragu-
nathrao Shankarrao, Pant Sachib of—
Date of birth—20th September 1878
Date of succession—17th. July, '22
Area in square miles—925
Population—130,420
Revenue—Rs. 600,000 nearly
Salute in guns—9

Cambay—H. H. Nawab Mirza Hussain
Yawar Khan Saheb Bdr., Nawab of—
Date of birth—16th May '11
Date of succession—21st January '15
Area in sq. miles—392
Population—87,761
Revenue—Rs. 10,00,000 nearly
Indian States Forces—19 infantry: 165
Police Forces; 15 Body guards.
Salute in guns—11

Chhota Udepur (Mohan)—H. H.
Maharawal Shri Natwarsinhji Fateh-
sinbji, Raja of—
Date of birth—16th November '06
Date of succession—29th August '23
Area in sq. miles—88,084
Population—1,62,145
Revenue—Rs. 13,03,248
Salute in guns—9

Danta—H. H. Maharana Shri Bhavani-
Singhi Hamirsinhji, Maharana of—
Date of birth—12th September 1899
Date of succession—20th November '25
Area in sq. miles—347
Population—18,541
Revenue—Rs. 1,75,000 nearly
Salute in guns—9

Dharampur—H. H. Maharana Shri
Vijayadevji Mohandevji, Raja of—
Date of birth—3rd December 1884
Date of succession—26th March '21
Area in sq. miles—704
Population—1,12,031
Revenue—Rs. 8,50,000
Salute in guns—9

Idar—H. H. Maharajadhiraja Shri
Himmat Singhji Sahib Bahadur,
Date of birth—2nd September 1899
Date of succession—14th April '31
Area in sq. miles—1,669
Population—3,07,798
Revenue—Rs. 24,66,000 nearly
Salute in guns—15

Janjira—H. H. Nawab Sidi Muhammad
Khan Sidi Ahmad Khan, Nawab of—
Date of birth—7th March '14
Date of succession—2nd May '22
Area in sq. miles—379
Population—1,10,388
Revenue—Rs. 11,00,000
Salute in guns—11

Jawhar—Shrimant Yeswantrao Maharaj,
Raja of—
Date of birth—11th December '17

Date of succession—11th December '27
 Area in sq. miles—308
 Population—66,291
 Revenue—Rs. 5,20,000
 Salute in guns—9

Khairpur—H. H. Mir Faiz Mahomed
 Khan Talpur, Mir of—
 Date of birth—4th January '13
 Date of succession—December '35
 Area in sq. miles—6,050
 Population—227,168
 Revenue—Rs. 25'84 (lacs)
 Indian State Forces—Khairpur "Faiz"
 Light infantry, 215; Khairpur Camel
 Transport Corps, 72
 Salute in guns—15

Kolhapur—Col. H. H. Shri Sir Rajaram
 Chhatrapati Maharaj, C.S.I., G.O.I.E.,
 Maharaja of—
 Date of birth—30th. July 1897
 Date of succession—6th May '23
 Area in sq. miles—3,217.1
 Population—9,57,157
 Revenue—Rs. 125,36,527
 Salute in guns—19

Lunawada—Lieut. H. H. Maharana Shri
 Virbhadrasinghji Sahab of—
 Date of birth—8th June '10
 Date of succession—2nd October '20
 Area in sq. miles—388
 Population—95,163
 Revenue—About Rs. 5,50,000
 Dynastic Salute—9 guns

Mudhol—H. H. Srimant Raja Bhairvsinh
 (minor), Raja of—
 Date of birth—15th. October '29
 Date of succession—9th November '37
 Area in sq. miles—399
 Population—62,832
 Revenue—Rs. 4,85,000 nearly
 Indian State Forces—Mudhol Sajjan Singh
 Infantry—116
 Salute in guns—9

Rajpipla—Captain H. H. Maharana Shri
 Sir Vijaya Singhji Chhatrasinhji, K.C.S.I.
 Date of birth—30 January 1890
 Date of succession—26th September '15
 Area in sq. miles—1,517.50
 Population—2,48,068
 Revenue—Rs. 24,32,000
 Indian State Forces—Rajpipla Infantry
 152; Rajpipla Bodyguard 25
 Salute in guns—13

Sachin—His Highness Nawab Sidi
 Muhammad Haider Muhammad Yakut
 Khan, Mubzarizud Daula, Nusrat Jung
 Bahadur, Nawab of—
 Date of birth—11th September '09
 Date of succession—19th November '30
 Area in sq. miles—57.80
 Revenue—Rs. 4,00,000
 Indian State Forces—Sachin Infantry 80

Salute in guns—9

Sangli—Captain H. H. Raja Srimant
 Sir Chintamanrao Dhundirao alias
 Appasheb Patwardhan, K.C.I.E., Raja of—
 Date of birth—14th Feb. 1890
 Date of succession—15th June 1903
 Area in sq. miles—1,136
 Population—2,93,498
 Revenue—Rs. 16,80,224
 Salute in guns—9

Sant—Maharana Shri Jorawasinhji
 Pratapsinhji, Raja of—
 Date of birth—24th March 1881
 Date of succession—31st. August 1896
 Area in sq. miles—394
 Population—83,531
 Revenue—Rs. 485,826
 Salute in guns—9

Savantvadi—(Minor) H. H. Raja Bahadur
 Shrimant Shivram Savant Bhonele
 Date of birth—13th August '27
 Date of succession—15th July '37
 Area in sq. miles—930
 Population—2,52,170
 Revenue—Rs. 6,13,478
 Salute in guns—9

Central India States

Ajaigarh—H. H. Maharaja Sawai Bhupal
 Singh Bahadur, Maharaja of—
 Date of accession—7th June '13
 Date of birth—13th November 1866
 Area in sq. miles—802
 Population—84,790
 Revenue—Rs. 500,000 nearly
 Salute in guns—11

Alirajpur—H. H. Maharaja Pratap Singh
 K.C.I.E., Maharaja of—
 Date of birth—12th Sept 1881
 Date of accession—14th February 1891
 Area in sq. miles—836
 Population—1,120,754
 Revenue of the State—Rs. 5,85,000
 Salute in guns—11

Baoni—H. H. Azam-ul-Umara Iftikhar-
 ud-Daulah Imad-ul-Mulk Sahib-i-Jah
 Mihin Sardar Nawab Mohammad
 Mushtaq-ul-Hasan Khan Sardar Jung
 Date of birth—7th February 1886
 Date of succession—28th October 11
 Area in sq. miles—121
 Population—25,256
 Revenue—Rs. 2,25,000
 Salute in guns—11

Baraundha (Pathar Kachar)—Raja Ga
 Parshad Singh. Raja of—
 Date of birth—1865
 Date of succession—9th July '09
 Area in sq. miles—218
 Population—15,912
 Revenue—Rs. 45,000 nearly
 Salute in guns—9

Barwani—His Highness Rana Devisinghji
Date of birth—19th July '22
Date of succession—21st April '30
Area in sq. miles—1,178
Population—1,76,632
Revenue—Rs. 11,04,510
Salute in guns—11

Bhopal—Lt. Col. H. H. Itikhar-ul-Mulk
Sikandar Saikat Nawab Haji Muham-
mad Hamidulla Khan Bahadur,
G.O.I.E., G.C.S.I., C.V.O., Nawab of—
Date of birth—9th September 1894
Date of succession—17th May '26
Area in sq. miles—7,000
Population—700,000
Revenue—Rs. 62,00,000 nearly
Indian State Forces—Bhopal (Victoria)
Lancers—141; Bhopal Sultania
Infantry—772; Bhopal Gohar-i-Taj
Own Company—164
Salute in guns—19

Bijawar—H. H. Maharaja Govind Singh
(Minor) Maharaja of—
Date of birth—17th June '34
Date of succession—11th Nov. '41
Area in sq. miles—973
Population—1,20,928
Revenue—Rs. 8,55,271
Salute in guns—11

Charkhari—H. H. Maharajadhiraja
Sipadhar-ul-Mulk Armaridan Singhji
Deo Bahadur, Maharaja of—
Date of birth—29th December '03
Date of succession—6th October '20
Area in sq. miles—880
Population—123,405
Revenue—Rs. 8,26,000 nearly
Salute in guns—11

Chhatargarh—H. H. Maharaja Bhawani
Singh Bahadur, Maharaja of—
Date of birth—16th August, '04
Date of succession—5th April, '32
Area in sq. miles—1,130
Population—1,61,267
Gross Revenue Nearly—Rs. 12,00,000
Indian State Forces—412
Salute in guns—11

Datia—Major H. B. Maharaja Lokendra
Sir Govind Singh Bahadur, K.C.S.I.
Date of birth—21st June 1886
Date of succession—5th August '07
Area in sq. miles—911
Population—148,659
Revenue—Rs. 19,00,000 nearly
Indian State Forces—Datia 1st Govind
Infantry—200; Datia Govind Infantry
(B Company)—117
Salute in guns—15

Dewas (Senior)—His Highness Maharaja
Sir Vikramsinhha Rao Puar, K.C.S.I.,
B.A. Maharaja of—
Date of birth—4th April '10

Date of succession—21st December '37
Area in sq. miles—449.50
Population—89,479
Revenue—Rs. 7,00,000
Salute in guns—15

Dewas (Junior Branch)—H. H. Maharaja
Sadashivrao Khase Sahab Puar,
Maharaja of—
Date of birth—13th August 1887
Date of succession—4th February '34
Area in sq. miles—419
Population—70,513
Revenue—Rs. 6,83,000
Salute in guns—15

Dhar—Lieut. H. H. Maharaja Anand Rao
Puar Sahab Bahadur, Maharaja of—
Date of birth—24th November, '20
Date of succession—1st August '26
Date of Investiture—16th March, '40
Area in sq. miles—1,799.34
Population—2,53,210
Revenue—Rs. 3,000,000
Indian State Forces—Dhar Light Horse
66; Dhar Infantry (Laxmi Guard) 263
Salute in guns—15

Indore—H. H. Maharajadhiraja Raj
Rajeshwar Sawai Shri Yeshwant Rao
Holkar Bahadur, G.O.I.E., Maharaja of
Date of birth—6th September '08
Date of succession—26th February '26
Area in sq. miles—9,902
Population—over 15,00,000
Revenue—Rs. 1,21,81,100
Indian State Forces—Indore Holkar
Escort—141, Indore 1st Battalion,
Maharaja Holkar's Infantry Companies,
"A" & "B"—380
Indore Holkar Transport Corps—266
Salute in guns—19

Jaora—Lt. Col. H. H. Fakhrud-Daulah
Nawab Sir Mohammed Itikhar Ali
Khan Bahadur, Saulat-i-Jang, G.B.E.,
K.C.I.E., Nawab of—
Date of birth—17th January 1883
Date of succession—6th March 1895
Area in sq. miles—601
Population—1,16,738
Revenue—Rs. 16,00,000
Salute in guns—13

Jhabua—H. H. Raja Uday Sing, Raja of
Date of birth—6th May 1875
Date of succession—26th April 1895
Area in sq. miles—1,336
Population—123,932
Revenue—Rs. 3,50,000 nearly
Salute in guns—11

Khlichipur—Raja Rao Bahadur Sir
Durjansing, K.C.I.E., Raja of—
Date of birth—26th August 1897
Date of succession—19th January '08
Area in sq. miles—273
Population—45,625

Revenue—Rs. 2,24,000

Salute in guns—9

Maihar—H. H. Raja Brijnath Singhi

Deo Bahadur, K.O.I.E. Raja of—

Date of birth—22nd February 1896

Date of succession—16th Dec. '11

Area in sq. miles—407

Population—68,991

Revenue—Rs. 5,00,000

Salute in guns—9

Nagod—(Unchebra)—H.H. Raja Mahendra

Singhies Deo Bahadur, Raja of—

Date of birth—5th February '16

Date of succession—26th Feb. '26

Area in sq. miles—501.4

Population—87,911

Revenue—Rs. 3,00,000

Salute in guns—9

Narsinggarh—H. H. Raja Sir Vikram

Singhji Sahib Bdr. K.C.I.E. Raja of—

Date of birth—21st Sept. '09

Date of succession—23rd April '24

Area in sq. miles—734

Population—1,24,281

Revenue—Rs. 7,09,291 (nearly)

Salute in guns—11

Orchha—H. H. Saramad-i-Rajaha-Bundel-

khand Shri Sawai Sir Vir Singh Dev

Bahadur, K.C.S.I. Maharaja of—

Date of birth—14th April 1899

Date of succession—4th March '03

Area in sq. miles—2,060

Population—314,661

Revenue—Rs. 13,00,000 (nearly)

Salute in guns—15

Panna—H. H. Maharaja Mahendra Sir

Yadvendra Singh Bahadur, K.C.S.I.,

K.O.I.E., Maharaja of—

Date of birth—31st January 1894

Date of succession—20th June '02

Area in sq. miles—2,596

Population—2,12,130

Revenue—Rs. 9,50,000

Salute in guns—11

Rajgarh—H. H. Raja Rawat Bikramaditya

Singh Bahadur (minor), Raja of—

Date of birth—18th December '36

Date of succession—Do Do

Area in sq. miles—862

Population—1,48,609

Revenue—Rs. 8,63,200

Salute in guns—11

Ratlam—Major-General H. H. Maharaja

Sir Sajjan Singh, G. C. I. E., K. C. S. I.,

K. C. V. O.

Date of birth—13th January 1880

Date of succession—29th Jan. 1893

Area in sq. miles—693

Revenue—Rs. 10 lacs

Indian State Forces—Shree Lokendra

Rifles—Authorised Strength—161

Salute in guns—13 permanent, local 15

Rewa—H. H. Maharaja Dhiraj Sir Gulab

Singh Bahadur, G. C. I. E., K. C. S. I.,

Maharaja of—

Date of birth—12th March '03

Date of succession—31st October '18

Area in sq. miles—18,000

Population—18,90,306.

Revenue—Rs. 60,00,000

Salute in guns—17

Sailana—H. H. Raja Sahib Sir Dilcep

Singhji Bahadur, K. C. I. E. Raja of—

Date of birth—18th March 1891

Date of succession—14th July '19

Area in sq. miles—297

Population—40,228

Revenue—Rs. 3,00,000

Indian State Forces—1. Cavalry 30:

2. Infantry 44; 3. Police 130

Salute in guns—11

Samthar—H. H. Maharaja Sir Bir Singh

Deo Bahadur K. C. I. E., Raja of—

Date of birth—26th August 1864

Date of succession—17th June 1896

Area in sq. miles—180

Population—33,216

Revenue—3,50,000 (nearly)

Salute in guns—11

Sitamau—H. H. Raja Sir Ram Singh,

K. C. I. E., Raja of—

Date of birth—2nd January 1830

Area in sq. miles—201

Population—26,549

Revenue—Rs. 2,55,076

Salute in guns—11

Gwalior State

Gwalior—H. H. Maharaja Mukhtar-ul-

Mulk, Azim-ul-Iqtidar, Rafi-ush-Shan,

Wala Shikoh, Motasham-i-Dauran,

Umdat-ul-Umra,* Maharajadhiraja

Alijah, Hisamus-Salta-nat George

Jayaji Rao Scindia, Bahadur, Srinath

Manuri-i-Zaman, Fidwi-t-Hazrat-i-

Melik-Muazzam-i-Rafi-ud-Darjat-i-

Inglistan, Maharaja of—

Date of birth—26th June '16

Date of succession—5th June '25

Area in sq. miles—26,367

Population—3,623,070

Revenue—Rs. 241.81 lacs nearly

India State Forces—

Gwalior 1st Jayaji Lancers—526

" 2nd Alijah —526

" 3rd Maharaja Madho Rao

Scindia's Own Lancers—526

" 1st Maharani Sakhya Ray's

Own Battalion—768

2nd Maharaja Jayaji Rao's

Own Battalion—765

3rd Maharaja Scindia's Own

Battalion—772

" 4th Maharaja Bahadur Battalion

—772

7th Scindia's Battalion (Training)—488
 Mountain Battery—260
 Scindia's House Artillery—138
 Sappers Artillery—178
 Pony Transport Corps—476
 Salute in guns—21

Hyderabad State

Hyderabad—Lt. General H. E. H. Asaf Jah Muzaffar-ul-Mulk wai Mamalik, Nizam-ul-Mulk Nizam-ud-Daula, Nawab Sir Mir Usman Ali Khan Bahadur Fatah Jang, Faithful Ally of the British Government, G. O. S. I., G. B. E., Nizam of—
 Date of birth—6th April 1886
 Date of succession—29th August '11
 Area in sq. miles—100,465
 Population—17,877,986
 Revenue—Rs. 894,93 lacs
 Indian State Forces—Hyderabad 1st Imperial Service Lancers, 644
 Hyderabad 2nd Imperial Service Lancers, 544
 Salute in guns—21

Jammu & Kashmir

Jammu & Kashmir—Lieut. General H. H. Raj Rajeshwar Maharajadhiraj Maharaja Shri Harisinghji Bahadur, Indar Mahinder, Spar-i-Saltan-i-Englishtia, G.O.S.I., G.O.L.E., K.C.V.O., LL.D., Maharaja of—
 Date of birth—September 1895
 Date of succession—September '25
 Area in sq. miles—84,471
 Population—40,21,616
 Revenue—Rs. 257.92 lacs
 Indian State Forces—
 1. 1st Line Troops (Fighting Service) Jammu and Kashmir Body Guard Cavalry—658
 2. 1st Jammu & Kashmir Mountain Battery 314
 3. 2nd Jammu and Kashmir Mountain Battery 262
 4. 1st " " " Infantry 679
 5. 2nd " " " Rifles 690
 6. 3rd " " " " 679
 7. 4th Jammu & Kashmir Mountain Infantry 690
 8. 5th " " " Light " 679
 9. 6th " " " " " 772
 10. 7th " " " " " 690
 11. 8th " " " " " 679
 12. 9th " " " " " 679
 1st Line (Troops Administrative Service)
 13. J. & K. A. T. O. 365
 14. Jammu & Kashmir Infantry Training Battalion 1969
 15. Jammu & Kashmir Army Training School 26
 16. Auxiliary Service

17. Jammu & Kashmir Military Transport 229
 18. Jammu & Kashmir State Band 68
 19. " Fort Dept. 117
 20. Military Veterinary Corps 21
 21. Military Medical Corps 40
 Salute in guns—21

Madras States

Banganapalle—H. H. Nawab Saijid Fazle Ali Khan Bahadur, Nawab of—
 Date of birth—9th November '01
 Date of succession—22nd January '22
 Area in sq. miles—275
 Population—44,631
 Revenue—Rs. 3,53,758
 Salute in guns—9

Cochin—H. H. Sir Kerala Varma, Maharaja of—
 Date of birth—29th Vrischigon 1039 M.E.
 Date of succession—13th April '41
 Area in sq. miles—1480
 Population—1,422,875
 Revenue—Rs. 1,21,46,238
 Indian State Forces—34 Officers and 370 men
 Salute in guns—17

Pudukkottai—H. H. Sri Brihadamba Das Raja Rajagopal Tondaiman Bahadur,
 Date of birth—23rd June '22
 Date of succession—24th October '28
 Area in sq. miles—1,179
 Population—4,83,348
 Revenue—Rs. 20,74,000 nearly
 Salute in guns—11

Travancore—H. H. Sir Padmanabha Dasa Vanchi Pala Rama Varma Kulasehara Kiritapiti Manney Sultan Maharaja Raja Ramraja Bahadur Shamsar Jang, G. O. I. E. Maharaja of—
 Date of birth—1st November '12
 Date of succession—1st September '24
 Area sq. miles—7,661.75
 Population—6,070,018
 Revenue—Rs. 280.73 lakhs
 Salute in guns—19; Local 21

Mysore—H. H. Maharaja Sri Chamaraja Wadiar Bahadur, Maharaja of—
 Date of birth—18th July '19
 Date of succession—8th September '40
 Area in sq. miles—29,598
 Population—73.29 lakhs including Civil & Military Station, Bangalore
 Revenue—Rs. 4,65,66,000 nearly
 Indian State Forces—Mysore Lancers 495; Horses 188; Bodyguard 125; 1st Infantry 772; 2nd Infantry 1180; Palace Guard 500
 Salute in guns—21

Punjab States

Bahawalpur—Major His Highness Rukn-ud-Daula. Nusrat-i-Jang, Shaif-ud-

Daula, Wa-Muinud-Daula Nawab Al-Haj Sir Sadiq Muhammed Khan V Abbasi Bahadur, G. C. I. E., K. C. S. I., K. C. V. O. Nawab Ruler of—
 Date of birth—30th September '04
 Date of succession—4th March '04
 Area in sq. miles—22,000
 Population—Over one million
 Revenue Rs.—1,40,000
Indian State Forces—Bahawalpur 1st Sadiq Infantry; Bahawalpur 2nd Haroon Infantry; H. H. the Nawab's own Bodyguard Lancers
 Salute in guns—17

Bilaspur—(Kahlur)—H. H. Raja Anand Chand, Raja of—
 Date of birth—26th January '18
 Date of succession—11th November '27
 Area in sq. miles—448
 Population—1,10,000
 Revenue—8,00,000 nearly
 Salute in guns—11

Chamba—H. H. Raja Lakshman Singh, the Ruler of Chamba State (Minor)
 Date of birth—8th December '24
 Date of succession—7th Dec. '35
 Area in sq. miles—8,127
 Population—18,89,38
 Revenue—Rs. 9,00,000
 Salute in guns—11
 Council of Administration appointed by Government to carry on Minority Administration, President—Lt. Col. H. S. Strong, C. I. E., Vice-President & Chief Secretary—Dawan Bahadur Lala Madho Ram, Member—Rai Bahadur Lala Ghaushyam Dass.

Faridkot—Lt. H. H. Farzand-i-Sadat Nishan-i-Hazrat-i-Kaisar-i-Hind Barar Bana Raja Har Indar Singh Bahadur
 Date of birth—29th January '15
 Date of succession—23rd December '18
 Area in sq. miles—848
 Population—164,346
 Revenue—Rs. 17,00,000
Indian State Forces—Faridkot Sappers-Headquarters 8, (Field Company) Sappers & Miners 129, Bodyguard Lancers 27, Infantry 112, Band 35
 Salute in guns 11

Jind—Colonel H. H. Farzand-i-Dilband Rasikh ul-Itikad Daulat-i-Inglisbia Raja Rajgan Maharaja Sir Banbir Singh, Rajendra Bahadur, G.C.I.E. G.C.S.I., Maharaja of—
 Date of birth—11th October 1879
 Date of succession—7th March 1887
 Area in sq miles—1,259
 Population—308,183
 Revenue—Rs. 28,00,000 nearly
 Salute in guns—13

Kapurthala—Colonel His Highness Farzand-i-Dilband Rasikh-ul-Itikad

Daulat-i-Inglisbia Raja-i-Rajgan Maharaja Sir Jagatjit Singh Bahadur, G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., G.B.E., Maharaja of—
 Date of birth—24th November 1872
 Date of succession—5th September 1877
 Area in sq. miles—652
 Population—3,78,380
 Revenue—Rs. 34,00,000 roughly
 Salute in guns—13

Loharu—Capt. H. H. Nawab Mirza Aminud-Din Ahmed, Fakhar-ud-Daula Khen Bahadur, Nawab of—
 Date of birth—23rd March 11
 Date of succession—30th Oct. '22
 Area in sq. miles—222
 Population—27,892
 Revenue—Rs. 1,33,000 nearly
 Salute in guns—9

Malerkotla—Lt. Colonel H. H. Nawab Sir Ahmed Ali Khan Bahadur, K.C.S.I. K.C.I.E., Nawab of—
 Date of birth—10 September 1881
 Date of succession—23rd August '08
 Area in sq. miles—168
 Population—80,322
 Revenue—Rs. 15,61,000
Indian State Forces—Sappers-Headquarters 16; Lancers (Bodyguard) 40; Infantry 226; Field Company Sappers & Miners 295
 Salute in guns—11

Mandi—Major H. H. Raja Sir Joginder Sen Bahadur, K.C.S.I., Raja of—
 Date of birth—20th August '04
 Date of succession—20th April '13
 Area in sq. miles—1,200
 Population—2,07,465
 Revenue—Rs. 12,50,000
 Salute in guns—11

Nabha—H. H. Farzand-i-Arjmand, Aquidat-Paiwand-i-Daulat-i-Inglisbia, Barar Bana Sarmat Raja-i-Rajgan, Maharaja Pratap Singha Malvendra Bahadur, Maharaja of—
 Date of birth—21st September '19
 Date of succession—February '28
 Area in sq. miles—928
 Population—263,334
 Revenue—Rs. 24,05,000
 Salute in guns—13

Patiala—Dr. H. H. Farzand-i-Khas Daulat-i-Englisbia Mansur-ul-Zaman Amir-ul-Umra Maharajadhiraj Raj Rajeswar Shri Maharaja-i-Rajgan Shri Yadavindra Singhji L.L.D., Mahendra Bahadur, Maharaja of—
 Date of birth—7th January '13
 Date of succession—23rd March '38
 Area in sq. miles—5,932
 Population—1,625,520
 Revenue—Rs. 1,57,00,000
Indian State Forces—

	Combatants :	Non-combatants
1.	1st. Rajindar Lancers	475 178
2.	2nd. Patiala Lancers	212 85
3.	War Strength 2nd P. Lrs.	30 60
4.	P. H. A.	90 28
5.	1st. B. S. Infantry	732 68
6.	2nd Yadavendra „	665 61
7.	3rd P. S.	662 51
8.	4th Patiala „	682 51
9.	Training Battalion	635 45
10.	Patiala Transport Corps	99 33
11.	S. M. Vety. Hospital	5 9
12.	Army Trg. School	39 10
13.	Patiala Wireless Section	48 6
14.	Deputy Company	227 10

4609 638

Salute in guns—17

Sirmur—(Nahan)—H. H. Lt. Maharaja Rajendra Prakash Bdr. Maharaja of—
 Date of birth—10th January '13
 Date of succession—Nov. '33
 Area in sq. miles—1,141
 Population—1,48,568
 Revenue—Rs. 10,00,000 nearly
 Indian State Force—Sappers—Head-quarters 5; Band 23; No. 1 Company 142, No. 2 Company 155; State Body-guard Lancers 31
 Salute in guns—11

Suket—H.H. Raja Lakshman Sen, Raja of
 Date of birth—1894
 Date of succession—13th Oct. '19
 Area in sq. miles—420
 Population—54,328
 Revenue—Rs. 2,67,000
 Salute in guns—11

Bashahr—H. H. Raja Padam Singh
 Date of birth—1873
 Date of succession—5th August '14
 Area in sq. miles—3,820
 Population—86,377
 Revenue—Rs. 3,34,600 nearly
 Salute in guns—9

Rajputana States

Alwar—H. H. Shri Sewai Maharaj Tej Singhji Bahadur, Maharaja of—
 Date of birth—19th March '11
 Date of succession—22nd July '37
 Area in sq. miles—3,217
 Population—7,49,751
 Revenue—About Rs. 40,00,000
 Indian State Forces—1. Jay Paltan Infantry 865; 2. Pratap Paltan Infantry 331; 3. Alwar Mangal Lancers 158;
 Salute in guns—15

Banswara—H. H. Rai-i-Rayan Maharawal Sahib Sri Sir Pirthi Singhji Bahadur, K.C.I.E. Maharaja of—
 Date of birth—15th July 1888
 Date of succession—8th January '14
 Area in sq. miles—1,946

Population—299,913

Revenue—Rs. 8,17,726

Salute in guns—15

Bharatpur—Lt. Col. H. H. Maharaja Sri Brajindra Sawai Sir Kriehna Singh Bahadur, Bahadur Jang, K.C.S.I.

Date of birth—4th October 1899

Date of succession—27th August 1900

Area in sq. miles—1,982

Population—4,96,437

Revenue—Rs. 34,25,000 nearly

Indian State Forces—Jeswant Household Infantry—772; 2nd Ram Singh's Own Infantry—353; 3rd Baretha Infantry—353

Salute in guns—17

Bikaner—General H. H. Maharajadhiraj Rajeswar Narendra Shiromoni Maharaja Sri Ganca Singhji Bahadur, G.G.S.I., G.O.L.E., G.C.V.O., G.B.E., K.C.B., A.C.D., LL.D., Maharaja of—

Date of birth—13th Oct. 1880

Date of succession—31st Aug. 1887

Area in sq. miles—23,317

Population—12,93,000

Revenue—Rs. 1,58,11,000

Indian State Forces

Ganga Risala (Camel Corps) 532

Sadul Light Infantry

Dungar Lancers

(including H. H.'s Body Guard) 342

Bijay Battery 245

Camel Battery 20

Artillery Training Centre 158

2nd Battalion Bikaner State Infantry 697

3rd Battalion Bikaner State Infantry 362

Training Battalion 413

Motor Machine Gun Sections 100

Salute in guns—Personal 19, Permanent 17

Bundi—His Highness Hadendra Siromoni Deo Sir Buland Raj Maharajadhiraj Saheb Bahadur G.C.I.E.

Date of birth—8th March 1893

Date of succession—8th August '27

Area in sq. miles—2,220

Population—2,49,374

Revenue—Rs. 16,50,000

Salute in guns—17

Dholpur—Lt. Col. H. H. Raja-ud-Daula

Sipahdar-ul-Mulk Maharajadhiraja

Sri Sawai Maharaja-Rana Sir Udaibhan

Singh Lokindar Bahadur Diler Jang

Jai Deo, K.C.S.I., K.C.V.O., Maharaj-

Raja of—

Date of birth—25th February 1893

Date of succession—29th March '11

Area in sq. miles—1,200

Population—2,30,188

Revenue—Rs. 17,53,000 nearly

Indian State Forces—Dholpur Narsingh

Infantry 164; Dholpur Sappers and

Miners 76

Salute in guns—15

Dungarpur—H. H. Rai-i-Rayan Mohi-mahendra Maharajadhiraj Maharawal Sri Sir Lakshman Singbji Bahadur, K.C.S.I., Maharawal of—
Date of birth—7th March '08
Date of succession—15th Nov. '18
Area in sq. miles—1,460
Population—2,74,282
Revenue Nearly—Rs. 24,00,000
Salute in guns—15

Jaipur—H. H. Saramud-i-Rajaha-i Hindustan Rai Rajindra Sri Maharajadhiraja Sir Sawai Man Singh Bahadur, G.O.I.E., Maharaja of—
Date of birth—21st August '11
Date of succession—7th September '22
Area in sq. miles—16,662
Population—26,31,775
Revenue—Rs. 1,35,00,000 nearly
Indian State Forces—Jaipur Infantry—772
Jaipur Lancers—526; Trpt. Corps 570
Salute in guns—17

Jaisalmer—H. H. Maharajadhiraj Raj Rajeshwar Param Bhattarak Sri Maharawalji Sir Jawahir Singbji Bahadur Yadukul Ohandrabhal Rukan-ud-Daula Muzzafer Jang Bijaiman K.C.S.I., Ruler of—
Date of birth—18th Nov. 1862
Date of succession—26th June '14
Area in sq. miles—16,062
Population—93,246
Salute in guns—15

Jhalawar—H. H. Dharmadivakar Prajavalat Patit-pawan Maharaj Rana Shri Raj Rajendra Singh Ji Dev Bahadur, K.C.S.I., Maharaj Rana of—
Date of birth—15th July 1900
Date of succession—13th April '29
Area in sq. miles—818
Population—1,22,375
Salute in guns—13

Jodhpur—Air Commodore His Highness Raj Rajeswar Saramad-i-Rajai-Hind Sahib Bahadur, G.O.S.I., G.O.I.E., K.C.V.O. A.D.G., L.L.D. Maharaja of—
Date of birth—8th July '03
Ascended the throne—3rd October, '18
Area—36,071 sq. miles
Population—21,34,818
Revenue—Rs. 157,71,521
Indian State Forces—
Jodhpur Sardar Rissala—508, Jodhpur Training Squadron—147; Jodhpur Sardar infantry, including Training Coy. (163) and State Military Band (39)—864; 2nd Jodhpur Infantry—669; Jodhpur Mule Troops—80; Fort Guard—94.
Salute in guns—17

Karauli—H. H. Maharaja Sir Bhompal Deo Bahadur Yadukul Chandra Bhal, K.C.S.I., Maharaja of—

Date of birth—18th, June 1866
Date of succession—21st August '27
Area in sq. miles—1,242
Population—152,418
Estimated Gross Revenue—Rs. 6,28,000
Salute in guns—17

Kishengarh—H. H. Umdar Rajhea Baland Makan Maharajadhiraja Maharaja Sumair Singbji Sahib Bahadur, (Minor) Maharaja of—
Date of birth—27th January '29
Date of succession—24th April '39
Area in sq. miles—858
Population—1,04,165
Revenue—Rs. 7,50,000
Salute in guns—15

Kotah—Colonel H. H. Maharao Sir Umed Singh Bahadur, G.O.S.I., G.O.I.E., G.S.E., Maharao of—
Date of birth—16th September 1872
Date of succession—11th June 1889
Area in sq. miles—5,684
Population—6,85,804
Revenue—Rs. 53,63 lacs
Salute in guns—19

Pratabgarh—H. H. Maharawat Sir Ram-Singbji Bahadur, K.C.I.E., Maharawat of—
Date of birth—1908
Date of succession—'29
Area in sq. miles—989
Population—91,967
Revenue—Rs. 5,82,000 nearly
Salute in guns—15

Shahpura—H. H. Rajadhiraj Umaid Singhji, Raja of—
Date of birth—7th March 1878
Date of succession—24th June '32
Area in sq. miles—405
Population—61,173
Revenue—Rs. 3,36,762
Salute in guns—9

Sirohi—H. H. Maharajadhiraj Maharao Sir Sarup Ram Singh Bahadur G.O.I.E., K.O.S.I., Maharao of—
Date of birth—27th Sept. 1888
Date of succession—29th April '20
Area in sq. miles—1,994
Population—2,33,870
Revenue—Rs. 11,48,771
Salute in guns—15

Tonk—H. H. Said-ud-daula Wazir-ul-Mulk—Nawab Hafiz Sir Mohammad Sadat Ali Khan Bahadur Sowlat-i-Jung, G.O.I.E., Nawab of—
Date of birth—13th February, 1876
Date of succession—23rd June '30
Area in sq. miles—2,558
Population—3,58,687
Revenue—Rs. 19,30,000 nearly
Salute in guns—17

Udaipur—(Mewar)—Lt. Col. H. H. Maha-

rajadhiraja Maharaja Shri Sir Bhopal Singhji Bahadur, G.C.S.I., Maharaja of—
Date of birth—22nd February 1884
Date of succession—24th May '30
Area in sq. miles—12,763
Population—1,925,000
Revenue—Rs. 8,00,000 nearly
Salute in guns—19

Sikkim State

Sikkim—H. H. Maharaja Sir Tashi Namgyal, K.C.I.E. Maharaja of—
Date of birth—1893
Date of succession—5th Dec. '14
Area in sq. miles—2,818
Population—81,721
Revenue—Rs. 4,33,000
Salute in guns—15

United Provinces States

Benares—H.H. Maharaja Vibhuti Narayan Singh Bahadur (minor) Maharaja of—
Date of birth—5th November '27
Date of succession—5th April '39
Area in sq. miles—875
Population—451,327
Revenue—Rs. 30,42,921
Salute in guns—13 (Local 15)

Rampur—Captain H. H. Alijib Farzandi-Dailpazir-i-Daula-i-Ingliabia Mukhlis-ud-Daula Navir-ul-Mulk Amir-ul-Umra, Nawab Sir Saiyid Mohammad Raza Ali Khan Bahadur Mustaid Jung, K. C. S. I., Nawab of—
Date of birth—17th Nov. '06
Date of succession—20th June '30
Area in sq. miles—892.54
Population—464,919
Revenue—Rs. 51,00,000 nearly
Salute in guns—15

Tehri (Garhwal)—Lt. Colonel H. H. Maharaja Narendra Shah, K.C.S.I., of—
Date of birth—3rd Aug. 1898
Date of succession—25th April '13
Area in sq. miles—4,502
Population—3,18,483 nearly
Revenue—Rs. 18,30,000 nearly
Indian State Forces—Tehri H. Q. Infantry and Band—100
Tehri Pioneers Narendra—101
" Sappers and miners—129
Salute in guns—11

Western India States

Bhavnagar—Lt. H. H. Sir Krishna Kumarsinghji Bhavsinghji K.C.S.I. Maharaja of—
Date of birth—19th May '12
Date of succession—18th July '19
Area in sq. miles—2,951
Population—5,00,274
Revenue—Rs. 109,68,620
Indian State Forces—Bhavnagar Lancers—270; Bhavnagar Infantry—219
Salute in guns—13

Cuteb—H. H. Maharajahirej Mirza Maharao Shri Sir Khengraji Sawai Bahadur G.C.S.I.E., G.C.I.E. Maharao of—
Date of birth—23rd Aug. 1866
Date of succession—1st Jan. 1876
Area in sq. miles—8,249.5
Population—500,800
Revenue—Rs. 31,00,000 nearly
Salute in guns—17 Perm., 19 Local

Dhrangadhra—Major H. H. Maharaja Shri Ghanashyamsinghji Ajitsinghji, G.C.I.E., K.C.S.I., Maharaja of—
Date of birth—31st May 1889
Date of succession—February, '11
Area in sq. miles—1,187
Population—Rs. 25,00,000 nearly
Salute in guns—13

Dhrol—H. H. Thakor Saheb Shri Chandrasinghji Saheb, Thakor Saheb of—
Date of birth—28th Aug. '12
Date of succession—20th Oct. '39
Area in sq. miles—282.7
Population—27,639
Revenue—Rs. 289,281
Salute in guns—9

Gondal—H. H. Maharaja Shri Bhagavatsinghji Sagramji G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., Maharaja of—
Date of birth—21th Oct. 1865
Date of succession—14th Dec. 1869
Area in sq. miles—1,024
Population—2,05,846
Revenue—Rs. 50,00,000
Salute in guns—11

Junagadh—Captain H. H. Nawab Sir Mahabatkhanji, Rasulkhanji K.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., Nawab of—
Date of birth—2nd Aug. 1900
Date of succession—2nd Jan. '11
Area in sq. miles—3,336.9
Population—545,152
Revenue—Rs. 10,000,000

Indian States Forces—Junagadh Lancers 173; Junagadh Mahabatkhanji Infantry 201
Salute in guns—15

Limbdi—Thakor Saheb Shri L. Chhatra-Saiji Digvijaysingji, Thakor Saheb of—
Date of birth—19th Feb. '14
Date of succession—6th Jan '41
Area in sq. miles—343.96
(exclusive of about 207 sq. miles in the collectorate of Ahmedabad).
Population—64,000 nearly
Revenue—Rs. 7,00,000 nearly
Salute in guns—9

Morvi—H. H. Maharaja Shri Lakhdhirji Weghji, G.B.E., K.C.S.I., Maharaja of—
Date of birth—26th Dec. 1876
Date of Succession—11th Jan. '24
Area in sq. miles—822
Population—112,023

Revenue—Rs. 50 lacs nearly
Salute in guns—11

Nawanagar—Lt. Col. H. H. Maharaja
Jam Shri Sir Digvijaysinji Ranajitsinji
Jadeja, G.O.I.E., K.O.S.I., O.D.O., Maha-
raja Jam Sahib of—

Date of birth—1st Sept. 1895
Date of succession—2nd April '38
Area in sq. miles—3,791
Population—5,04,006
Revenue—Rs. 94,00,000 nearly
Salute in guns—15

Palampur—Lt. Col. H. H. Nawab Shri
Taley Muhammed Khan Bahadur,
G.O.I.E., K.C.V.O., Nawab Sahib of—

Date of birth—7th July 1883
Date of succession—28th Sept. '18
Area in sq. miles—1,774.64
Population—3,15,855
Revenue—Rs. 11,64,987
Salute in guns—13

Patiala—H. H. Thakor Sahib Shri Baha-
dursinji Mansinhji K.C.I.E., K.C.S.I.,
Thakor Sahib of—

Date of birth—3rd April '00
Date of succession—22th Aug. '05
Area in sq. miles—288
Population—62,150
Revenue—Rs. 9,00,000
Salute in guns—9

Porbandar—Captain H. H. Maharaja Shri
Sir Natawarsinhji, Bhabsinghji K.C.S.I.,
Maharaja Rana Sahib of—

Date of birth—30th June '01
Date of succession—10th Dec. '08
Area in sq. miles—642.25
Population of State—1,46,616
Revenue—Rs. 28,00,000 nearly
Salute in guns—13

Radhanpur—H. H. Nawab Sahib Murteza-
Khan Jorawarkhan Babi Bahadur
Nawab of—

Date of birth—10th Oct. 1899
Date of succession—7th April '37
Area of State in sq. miles—1,150
Population of State—70,530
Revenue—Rs. 8,00,000 to 10,00,000
Salute in guns—11

Rajkot—H. H. Thakor Sahib Shri Pradu
mansinji, Thakor Sahib of—

Date of birth—24th Feb. '13
Date of succession—17th August '40
Area in sq. miles—2824
Population of State—1,03,033
Revenue—Rs. 13,40,872 nearly
Salute in guns—9

Wadhwan—H. H. Thakor Sahib Shri
Sarandrasinhji, Thakor Sahib of—

Date of birth—4th January '22
Date of succession—27th July '34
Area—242'6 sq. miles excluding the area
in the British India District of
Ahmedabad.

Population—50,934

Revenue—Rs. 6 lacs

Salute—Permanent 9 guns

Wankaner—Captain H. H. Maharana
Shri Sir Amarshiji, K.C.S.I., K.O.I.E.,
Maharana Sahib of—

Date of Birth—4th January 1881
Date of succession—12th June 1881
Area in sq. miles—417
Population—55,024
Revenue—Rs. 7,87,000
Salute in guns—11

Indian States (without Salute)

Baluchistan States

Las Bela—Mir Gulam Muhammed
Khan, Jam Sahib of—

Date of birth—December 1895
Date of succession—March '21
Area in sq. miles—7132
Population—50,696
Revenue—Rs. 3,78,000 nearly

Bihar & Orissa States

Athgarh—Raja Sreekarana Radhanath
Babarta Patnalk, Raja of—

Date of birth—28th Nov. '09
Date of succession—22nd June '18
Area in sq. miles—168
Population—55,508
Revenue—Rs. 1,76,000

Athmallik—Raja Kishor Chandra Deo

Date of birth—10th November '04
Date of succession—3rd November '18
Area in sq. miles—730
Population—59,749
Revenue—Rs. 1,81,000 nearly

Bamra—Raja Bhaugana Tribhuban Deb
Raja of—

Date of succession—1st January '20
Date of birth—25th February '14
Area in sq. miles—1988
Population—1,34,721
Revenue—Rs. 5,81,000

Baramba—Raja Sree Narayan Chandra
Birbar Mangraj Mahapatra, Raja of—

Date of birth—10th January '14
Date of succession—20th August '22
Area in sq. miles—142
Population—52,924
Revenue—Rs. 1,03,000 nearly

Baud—Raja Narayan Prasad Deo of—

Date of birth—14th March '04
Date of succession—10th March '18
Area in sq. miles—1,264
Population—124,411
Revenue—Rs.—2,72,000 nearly

Bonal—Raja Indra Deo, Raja of—

Date of birth—6th January 1884
Date of succession—19th February '02
Area in sq. miles—1,296
Population—68,178
Revenue—Rs. 2,36,000 nearly

Daspalla—Raja Kishore Chandra Deo
Date of birth—16th April '08
Date of succession—11th December '13
Area in sq. miles—568
Population—53,893
Revenue—Rs. 1,41,993

Dhenkanal—Raja Sankar Pratap Mahendra Bahadur Raja of—
Date of succession—16th Oct. '18
Date of birth—6th November '04
Area in sq. miles—1,463
Population—2,33,691
Revenue—Rs. 5,13,000 nearly

Gangpur—Raja Bhawani Shankar Sekhar,
Date of birth—14th May 1898
Date of succession—10th June '17
Area in sq. miles—2,492
Population—3,09,271
Revenue—Rs. 6,76,000 nearly

Hindol—Raja Bahadur Naba Kishor Chandra Singh Mardraj Jagadeb, M.E.S.S., F.R.S.A., Raja of—
Date of birth—June 1891
Date of succession—10th February '06
Area sq. miles—812
Population—49,896
Revenue—Rs. 1,45,000

Keonjhar—Raja Shri Balabhadra Narayan Bhanj Deo, Ruler of—
Date of birth—26th December '05
Date of succession—12th August '26
Area in sq. miles—3,217
Population—529,786
Revenue—Rs. 15,56,786

Khandapara—Raja Harihar Singh Mardraj Bhramarbar Ray, Raja of—
Date of birth—26th August '14
Date of succession—26th December '22
Area in sq. miles—244
Population—84,289

Kharsawan—Raja Sriram Chandra Singh
Date of birth—4th July 1892
Date of succession—6th February '02
Area in sq. miles—157
Population—44,805
Revenue—1,18,000 nearly

Narsinghpur—Raja Ananta Narayan Mausinghar Harichandra Mahapatra
Date of birth—9th September '08
Date of succession—5th July '21
Area in sq. miles—207
Population—48,448
Revenue—Rs. 129,000

Nayagarh—Raja Krishna Chandra Singha Mandhata Raja of—
Date of birth—15th August '11
Date of succession—7th Dec. '18
Area in sq. miles—552
Population—1,61,409
Revenue—Rs. 392,210

Nilgiri—Raja Kishore Chandra Mardraj Harichandra, Raja of—

Date of birth—2nd Feb. '04
Date of succession—6th July '13
Area in sq. miles—284
Population—73,109
Revenue—Rs. 2,14,589

Pal Lahara—Raja Muni Pal, Raja of—
Date of birth—26th November '03
Date of succession—18th April '18
Area in sq. miles—452
Population—23,229
Revenue—Rs. 75,000 nearly

Ranpur—Raja Birbar Krishna Chandra Mahapatra, Raja of—
Date of birth—About 1887
Date of succession—12th July 1899
Area in sq. miles—203
Population—41,282
Revenue—Rs. 65,000

Seraikella—Raja Aditya Pratap Singh Deo, Ruler of—
Date of birth—30th July 1887
Date of succession—9th Dec. '31
Area in sq. miles—449
Population—166,374
Revenue—Rs. 418,000 nearly

Taleber—Raja Kishore Chandra Birbar Harichandan, Raja of—
Date of birth—9th June 1880
Date of succession—18th December 1891
Area in sq. miles—399
Population—86,482
Revenue—Rs. 8,97,668 gross

Maratha States—(Bombay Presy.)

Akalkot—Meherban Shrimant Vijayasingh Fatehsingh, Raja Bhonsle, Raja of—
Date of birth—13th Dec. '15
Date of succession—4th April '23
Area in sq. miles—498
Population—92,605
Revenue—Rs. 7,58,000 nearly

Aundh—Meherban Bhavanrao alias Bala Sahib, Pant Pratinidhi of—
Date of birth—24th Oct. 1868
Date of succession—4th November '09
Area in sq. miles—501
Population—88,762
Revenue—Rs. 9,38,378

Phaltan—Major Raja Shrimant Malojirao Mudhojirao alias Nana Sahab Naik Nimbalkar Raja of—
Date of birth—11th September 1896
Date of succession—17th October '16
Area in sq. miles—397
Population—58,761
Revenue—Rs. 8,56,000 nearly

Jath—Lt. Raja Shrimant Vijayasingh Rao Ramrao Dada Raja of—
Date of birth—21st July '09
Date of succession—14th August '28
Area in sq. miles—981
Population—91,099
Revenue—Rs. 4,25,000

Jamkhandi—Meherban Shankerrao Parashuremrao alias Appasaheb Patwardhan, Raja Sahab of—
Date of birth—5th Nov. '06
Date of succession—25th Feb. '24
Area in sq. miles—524
Population—1,14,282
Revenue—Rs. 10,06,715

Kurundwad—(Senior) Meherban Chintamanrao Bhalechandrarao alias Balasabeb Patwardhan, Chief of—
Date of birth—13th Feb. '21
Date of succession—10th September '27
Area in sq. miles—182.5
Population—88,760
Revenue—Rs. 3,76,000 nearly

Kurundwad—(Jr.)—Meherban Madhavrao Ganpatrao alias Bhausabeb Patwardhan, Chief of—
Date of birth—6th Dec. 1875
Date of succession—29th July, 1899
Area in sq. miles—174
Population—34,288
Revenue—Rs. 2,88,000 nearly

Miraj—(Sr.)—Narayanrao Gangadharrao alias Tatyasaheb Patwardhan, Chief of—
Date of birth—6th September 1898
Date of succession—11th Dec. '39
Area in sq. miles—342
Population—93,888
Revenue—Rs. 4,41,000 nearly

Miraj—(Jr.)—Meherban Sir Madhavrao Harihar alias Baba Sahab Patwardhan K.C.I.E., Raja of—
Date of birth—4th March 1899
Date of succession—16th Dec. 1899
Area in sq. miles—196
Population—40,688
Revenue—Rs. 3,68,515 nearly

Ramdurg—Meherban Ramrao Venkatrao alias Rao Sahab Bhave Chief of—
Date of birth—16th Sept. 1896
Date of succession 30th April '07
Area in sq. miles—169
Population—33,997
Revenue—Rs. 2,69,000 nearly

Savanur—Captain Meherban Abdul Majid Khan, Jang Bahadur Nawab of—
Date of birth—7th Oct. 1890
Date of succession—30th January 1893
Area in sq. miles—70
Population—16,830
Revenue—Rs. 1,69,000 nearly

Mahi-Kantha States

Ghodasar—Thakur Shri Fatehsinghji Ratansingji Dabhi, Thakor Sahab of—
Date of birth—7th Aug. '09
Date of succession—31st May '03
Area in sq. miles—16
Revenue—Rs. 51,000

Hol—Thakor Shibsinghji, Thakor of—
Date of birth—31st December '01
Date of succession—18th Oct. '27
Area in sq. miles—19
Population—3,349
Revenue—Rs. 41,000

Katosan—Thakor Takhatsinghji Karansinghji Thakor of—
Date of birth—9th Dec. 1870
Date of succession—January '01
Area in sq. miles—10
Population—4,818
Revenue—Rs. 51,000

Khadal—Sardar Shri Fatehsinghji Rajsinghji, Thakor Shri of—
Date of birth—1899
Date of succession—7th February '12
Area in sq. miles—8
Population—2,852
Revenue—Rs. 35,000 nearly

Malpur—Raoji Shri Gumbhirsinghji Himatsinghji—
Date of birth—27th Oct. '14
Date of succession—23rd June '23
Area in sq. miles—97
Population—16,562 *
Revenue—Rs. 1,10,000 approx.

Pethapur—Thakor Fatehsinghji Gambhirsinghji, Thakor of—
Date of birth—3rd Oct. 1895
Date of succession—1896
Area in sq. miles—11
Population—3,931
Revenue—Rs. 34,000 (nearly)

Varsoda—Thakor Joravarasinghji of—
Date of birth—17th April '14
Date of succession—18th July '19
Area in sq. miles—11
Population—8,424
Revenue—Rs. 33,000 nearly

Vijayangar—Rao Shri Hamirsinghji
Date of birth—3rd January '04
Date of succession—27th June '16
Area in sq. miles—135
Population—12,000 (approx)
Revenue—Rs. 1,00,000 nearly

Rewa Kantha States

Bhadarwa—Shrimant Thakur Sahab Shree Narvarasinghi Ranjitsinghji, Thakor of—
Date of birth—19th November '08
Date of succession—26th April '35
Area in sq. miles—27 (excluding several Wanta villages under Baroda State)
Population—13,520
Revenue—Rs. 1,14,000 nearly

Jambugodha—Meherban Rana Shri Raojitsinghji Gambhirsinghji, Thakore Sahab of—Parmar Rajput. He enjoys full Civil and Criminal powers.
Date of birth—4th January 1882
Date of Succession—27th September '17

Area in sq. miles—143
 Population - 11,365
 Revenue—Rs. 142,000

Kadana—Rana Sri Chatrasaji, Thakor of
 Date of birth—23th January 1879
 Date of succession—12th April 1889
 Area in square miles—130
 Population—15,370
 Revenue—Rs. 1,32,000 nearly

Nasvadi—Thakor Ranjitsinhji, Thakor of—
 Date of birth—24th March '05
 Date of succession—13th Sept. '27
 Area in sq. miles—1950
 Population—4,197
 Revenue—Rs. 33,000 nearly

Palasni—Thakor Indorsinhji Thakor of—
 Date of birth—16th Aug. 1885
 Date of succession—30th May '07
 Area in sq. miles—12
 Population—1,766
 Revenue—Rs. 22,000 nearly

Sihora—Thakor Mansinhjee Karansinhjee
 Date of birth—14th November '07
 Date of succession—13th June '28
 Area in square miles—16 (approx)
 Population—5300
 Revenue—Rs. 36,000 nearly

Uchad—Thakor Mohomadmia Jitawaba,
 Date of birth—15th October 1895
 Date of succession—21th June '15
 Area in sq. miles—850
 Population—2330
 Revenue—Rs. 41,000 nearly

Umetha—Thakor Ramsinhji Raisinhji
 Date of birth—19th August 1894
 Date of succession—1st July '2
 Area in sq. miles—24
 Population—5,375
 Revenue—Rs. 73,000 nearly

Central India States

Alipura—Rao Harpal Singh, Rao of—
 Date of birth—12th Aug. 1892.
 Date of succession—26th March '22
 Area in sq. miles—73
 Population—14,580
 Revenue—Rs. 70,000 nearly

Bakhtagarh—Thakur Rai Singh, Thakur of
 Date of birth—3rd October 1869
 Date of succession—30th May '12
 Area in sq. miles—66
 Population—10,414
 Revenue—Rs. 74,000 nearly

Garauli—Dewan Bahadur Chaudrabhan
 Singh, Chief of—
 Date of birth—2nd April 1883
 Date of succession—20th Dec., 1898
 Area in sq. miles—21
 Population—4,985
 Revenue—Rs. 36,000 nearly

Jobat—Rana Bhimsingh, Rana of—

Date of birth—10th November '15
 Date of succession—30th May '17
 Date of getting Ruling Power—14th
 March '36
 Area in sq. miles—191.20
 Population—20,945
 Revenue—Rs. 81,550

Kachhi-Baroda—Maharaj Benimadho
 Singh
 Date of birth—3rd October '04
 Date of succession—12th June '06
 Area in sq. miles—34'63
 Population—5,000
 Revenue—Rs. 71,000

Kathiawara—Rana Thakur Sahib
 Onkarsinhji, Rana of—
 Date of birth—5th December 1891
 Date of succession—8th June, '03
 Area in miles—70
 Population of State—6096
 Revenue—Rs. 44,880

Kothi—Raja Bahadur Sitaram Pratap
 Bahadur Singh, Raja of—
 Date of birth—26th July 1892
 Date of succession—8th August '14
 Area in sq. miles—169
 Population—20,087
 Revenue—Rs. 70,000 nearly

Kurwai—Nawab Sarwal Ali Khan of—
 Date of birth—1st December '01
 Date of succession—2nd October '06
 Area in sq. miles—142
 Population—19,851
 Revenue—Rs. 2,64,000 nearly

Mota Barkhera—Bhumia Nain Singh of—
 Date of birth—7th November '07
 Date of succession—4th June '12
 Area in sq. miles—39
 Population—4,732
 Revenue—Rs. 53,000 nearly

Multhan—Dharmalankar, Dharm-bhushan
 Dharm-Divaker, Shreeman Maharaj
 Bharat Sinhji Sahib, Chief of—
 Date of birth—1893
 Date of succession—26th August '01
 Area in sq. miles—100
 Population—11,804
 Revenue—Over Rs. 1,00,000

Nimkhera—Bhumia Ganga Singh Bhumia
 Date of birth—'31
 Date of succession—27th March '22
 Area in sq. miles—90
 Population—5,358
 Revenue—Rs. 62,000 nearly

Paldeo—Chaubey Shiva Prasad, Jagirdar of
 Date of birth—1st March '08
 Date of succession—2nd Oct. '23
 Area in sq. miles—53'14
 Population—9,088
 Revenue—Rs. 50,000

Piploda—Rawat Mangal Singh, Rawat of

Date of birth—7th September 1893
 Date of succession—5th Nov. '19
 Area in sq. miles—35
 Population—8,766
 Revenue—Rs. 1,14,000

Sarila—Raja Mahipal Singh, Raja of—
 Date of succession—11th Sep. 1898
 Area in sq. miles—85'28
 Population—6,081
 Revenue—Rs. 1,00,000

Sarwan—Thakur Mahendra Singh
 Date of birth—6th November '09
 Date of succession—23rd April '21
 Area in sq. miles—71
 Population—7,199
 Revenue of the State—Rs. 60,000 nearly

Sahawal—Raja Bhagwat Raj Bahadur
 Singh, C.I.E., Raja of—
 Date of birth—7th August 1878
 Date of succession—23rd Nov. 1899
 Area in sq. miles—813
 Population—38,078
 Revenue—Rs. 1,04,000 nearly

Tori Fatehpur—Dewan Raghuraj Singh,
 Jagirdar of—
 Date of birth—21th Jan. 1895
 Date of succession—7th April '41
 Area in sq. miles—86
 Population—6,269
 Revenue—Rs. 81,000 nearly

Central Province States

Bastar—Maharaja Pravir Chandra Deo
 Date of birth—25th June '29
 Date of succession—28th Feb. '38
 Area in sq. miles—18,725
 Population—6,84,915
 Revenue—Rs. 13,22,699

Chnuikhadan—Mahant Bhudhar Kishore
 Das of—
 Date of birth—April 1891
 Date of succession—30th Sept. '08
 Area in sq. miles—154
 Population—26,141
 Revenue—Rs. 1,22,000

Jashpur—Raja Bijay Bhushan Singh Deo
 Date of birth—11th Jan. '26
 Date of succession—8th Feb. '26
 Area in sq. miles—1,928
 Population—2,23,632
 Revenue—Rs. 3,62,342

Kanker—Maharajadhiraj Bhanupratap
 Deo, Chief of—
 Date of birth—17th September '22
 Date of succession—8th Jan. '25
 Area in sq. miles—1,429
 Population—122,925
 Revenue—Rs. 3,88,000

Kawardha—Raja Thakur Dharamraj Singh,
 Chief of—
 Date of birth—18th August '10

Date of succession—4th Feb. '20
 Area in sq. miles—805
 Population—72,820
 Revenue—Rs. 2,93,175

Khairagarh—Raja Birendra Bahadur
 Singh, Raja of—
 Date of birth—9th November '14
 Date of succession—22nd October '18
 Area in sq. miles—931
 Population—157,400
 Revenue—Rs. 6,80,000 nearly

Korea—Raja Ramanuj Pratap Singh Deo,
 Raja of—
 Date of birth—8th December '81
 Date of succession—November '09
 Area in sq. miles—1,647
 Population—90,500
 Revenue—Rs. 7,00,199

Makrai—Raja Drigpal Shah Hathiya Rai
 Date of birth—24th September '18
 Date of succession—30th October '18
 Area in sq. miles—155
 Population—12,809
 Revenue—Rs. 2,01,000 nearly

Nandgaon—Mahant Sarveshwar Dass, of—
 Date of birth—30th March '06
 Date of succession—24th June '13
 Area in sq. miles—271
 Population—1,47,919
 Revenue—Rs. 7,91,000

Raigarh—Raja Chakradhar Singh, Raja of
 Date of birth—19th August '05
 Date of succession—23rd August '24
 Area in sq. miles—1,486
 Population—2,41,634
 Revenue—Rs. 6,46,000 nearly

Sakti—Raja Liladhar Singh, Raja of—
 Date of birth—3rd Feb. 1892
 Date of succession—4th July '14
 Area in sq. miles—183
 Population—41,595
 Revenue—Rs. 1,20,000 nearly

Sarangarh—Raja Bahadur Jawahir Singh
 Date of birth—3rd Dec. 1898
 Date of succession—5th Aug. 1890
 Area in sq. miles—540
 Population—117,781
 Revenue—Rs. 3,14,000 nearly

Surguja—Maharaja Ramanuj Saran Singh
 Deo, C.B.E. Maharaja of—
 Date of birth—4th Nov. 1895
 Date of succession—31st Dec. '17
 Area in sq. miles—6,055
 Population—5,51,307
 Revenue—Rs. 7,56,500 nearly

Udaipur—Raja Chandra Chur Prasad
 Singh Deo, Raja of—
 Date of birth—5th June '23
 Date of succession—8th Dec. '27
 Area in sq. miles—1,052
 Population—71,124

Revenue—Rs. 3,22,000

Madras States

Sandur—Raja Srimant Yeshwantha Rao Anna Saheb, Rao Sahib, Hindu Rao Ghorapade, Mamukhatmadar Sonapati, Raja of—

Date of birth—15th November '08
Date of succession—5th May '28
Area in sq. miles—167
Population—11,684
Revenue—Rs. 2,03,000

Punjab States

Dajana—Jalal-ud-Daula Nawab Mohammad Iqtidar Ali Khan Bahadur, Mustaqil-i-Jan, Nawab of—

Date of birth—20th Nov. '12
Date of succession—21st July '25
Area in sq. miles—100
Population—25,833
Revenue—Rs. 1,65,000 nearly

Kalsia—Raja Ravi Sher Singh Sahib Bahadur, Raja Sahib of—

Date of Birth—30th October '02
Date of succession—25th July '08
Date of Investiture with full ruling power. } 6th April '22

Area in sq. miles—192
Population—59,848
Revenue—Rs. 3,50,000 nearly

Pataudi—Nawab Muhammad Iftikar Ali Khan Bahadur, Nawab of—

Date of birth—17th March '10
Date of succession—30th Nov. '17
Date of investiture—10th Dec. '31
Area in sq. miles—160
Population—24,500
Revenue—Rs. 3,10,000

Simla Hill States

Bhagal—Raja Surendra Singh, Raja of—

Date of birth—14th March '09
Date of succession—14th Oct. '22
Area in sq. miles—114
Revenue—Rs. 1,00,000 nearly

Baghat—Raja Durga Singh, Raja of—

Date of birth—15th Sept. '10
Date of succession—30th Dec. 1941
Area in sq. miles—86
Population—93,595
Revenue—Rs. 1,10,000

Bhaji—Rana Birpal, Rana of—

Date of birth—19th April '06
Area in sq. miles—96
Population—14,268
Revenue—Rs. 99,000

Jubbal—Rana Sir Bhagat Chandra Bahadur, K.C.S.I., Ruler of—

Date of birth—12th Oct. 1888
Date of succession—29th April '10
Area in sq. miles—288
Population—28,500
Revenue—Rs. 8,50,000 nearly

Keonthal—Raja Himandar Sen, Raja of—

Date of birth—21st January '06
Date of succession—2nd Feb. '16
Area in sq. miles—116
Population—23,599
Revenue—Rs. 1,30,000 nearly

Kumbarasain—Raja Vidyadhar Singh

Date of birth—1895
Date of succession—24th August '14
Area in sq. miles—97
Population—12,227
Revenue—Rs. 75,000

Nalagarh—Raja Jagindra Singh, Raja of—

Date of birth—1870
Date of succession—18th Sept. '11
Area in sq. miles—256
Population—52,737
Revenue—Rs. 2,71,000 nearly

Tiroch—Thakur Sarat Singh, of—

Date of birth—4th July 1887
Date of succession—14th July '03
Area in sq. miles—75
Population—4,219
Revenue—Rs. 1,30,000 nearly

Western India States

Bajana—Malek Shri Kamalkhan Jivankhan, Chief of—

Date of birth—6th December '07
Date of succession—2nd Feb. '20
Area in sq. miles—183.12
Population—14,017
Revenue—Rs. 1,82,424 average

Bantwa Manavadar—Babi Ghulam Moyuddin Khanji Fatehdinkhanji, Chief of—

Date of birth—22nd December '11
Date of succession—October '18
Area in sq. miles—221.8
Population—14,934
Revenue—Rs. 8,46,000 nearly

Chuda—Thakore Shri Bahadursinghji, Jarovarsinji, Thakore of—

Date of birth—23rd April '09
Date of succession—20th January '21
Area in sq. miles—782
Population—11,393
Revenue—Rs. 2,11,000 nearly

Jardan—Darbar Shree Ala Kachar, Chief of—

Date of birth—4th November '06
Date of succession—11th June '19
Area in sq. miles—296
Population—36,823
Revenue—Rs. 6,00,000 nearly

Kotda-Sangani—Thakore Shree Pradyumansinghji,

Date of birth—5th December '20
Date of succession—23rd Feb. '30
Date of Installation—10th Dec. '40
Area in sq. miles—90
Population—12,165
Revenue—Rs. 1,50,000 nearly

Lakhtar—Thakur Sahab Shri Indra-Siabji Valavasinji, Thakore Sahab of—
 Date of birth—15th April '07
 Date of succession—2nd July '40
 Area in sq. miles—247.488
 Population—21,123
 Revenue—Rs. 4.49,000

Lathi—Thakore Sahab Shri Pralhadraojji, Thakore of—
 Date of birth—31st March '12
 Date of succession—14th October '18
 Area in sq. miles—41.8
 Population—10,312
 Revenue—Rs. 2,80,300

Malia—Thakore Shri Shri Ratsinji Modji of—
 Date of birth—14th February 1898
 Date of succession—20th Oct. '07
 Area in sq. miles—103
 Population—12,060
 Revenue—Rs. 3,02,000

Muli—Thakur Shri Harichandrasinji, of—
 Date of Birth—10th July 1869
 Date of succession—3rd December '05
 Area in sq. miles—133.2
 Population—18,890
 Revenue—Rs. 1,57,000

Patdi—Desai Shree Raghubirsinji, of—
 Date of birth—8th Jan. '26
 Date of succession—25th Oct. '28
 Area in sq. miles—39.4
 Population—2,508
 Revenue—Rs. 1,14,000

Sayla—Thakur Sahab Shri Madarsinji, Vakhatsinji Thakor Sahab, of—

Date of birth—28th May 1868
 Date of succession—25th Jan. '24
 Area in sq. miles—222.1
 Population—13,351
 Revenue—Rs. 2,54,000

Thana Devi—Darbar Shri Vala Amra Laxman, Chief of—
 Date of birth—28th Nov. 1895
 Date of succession—12th Oct. '22
 Area in sq. miles—94.2
 Population—11,348
 Revenue—Rs. 3,00,000

Tharad—Waghela Bhumsinji Dolatsinji, Thakur of—
 Date of birth—28th Jan. '00
 Date of succession—19th Feb. '21
 Area in sq. miles—1,260
 Population—52,839
 Revenue—Rs. 99,000 nearly

Vadia—Darbar Shree Suragwala Sahab, Chief of—
 Date of birth—15th March '05
 Date of succession—7th Sept. '30
 Area in sq. miles—90
 Population—12,749
 Revenue—Rs. about 2 lacs.

Zainabad—Malek Shri Aziz Mahomed Khanji Zainkhanji, Talukdar of—
 Date of birth—21st June '17
 Date of succession—28th January '23
 Area in sq. miles—30
 Population—8,466
 Revenue—Rs. 1,20,000 nearly

Chronicle of Events

January 1947

Mahatma Gandhi began his walking tour in the Noakhali district. The 34th. session of the Indian Science Congress met in New Delhi under the presidentship of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

The All-India Congress Committee accepted the Working Committee's draft resolution agreeing to H. M. G's interpretation of the Dec. 6 statement.

Mr. Sarat Chandra Bose resigned his membership of the Congress Working Committee.

The Assam Provincial Muslim League decided to launch a civil disobedience movement against the eviction policy of the Assam Government.

Large scale disturbances broke out in Bombay.

The police made a country-wide search of the offices of the Communist Party of India.

A five-year plan to improve the food position in the country was disclosed by Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Food Member at New Delhi.

Talks between Sardar Patel and Mr. Arthur Henderson, Under-Secretary of State for India, on the future of the I. P. S. and I. C. S. services, concluded in New Delhi.

The Indian Constituent Assembly resumed its session.

Police opened fire on student demonstrations in Calcutta on "Viet Nam Day."

The Constituent Assembly adopted Pt. Nehru's resolution on "aims and objectives."

The 51st. death anniversary of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose was celebrated all over the country.

Seven top-ranking Muslim League leaders were arrested in Lahore.

The Punjab Govt. declared the Muslim League National Guards and the Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh as unlawful bodies.

Large scale demonstrations were staged by Muslims in Lahore following arrest of League leaders.

Dr. H. C. Mukherjee was elected Vice-President of the Constituent Assembly.

The "Independence Day" was celebrated all throughout the country.

The Muslim League leaders arrested were released in Lahore.

The Punjab Govt. withdrew the ban on the R. S. S. and Muslim National Guards.

The British Financial Delegation, for a settlement of the Sterling Balances with the India Govt., arrived in New Delhi.

The Standing Committee of the Chamber of Princes adopted a resolution on the question of Indian States' participation in the Constituent Assembly.

The Working Committee of the A. I. Muslim League, in a resolution, recorded the opinion that the Constituent Assembly should be forthwith dissolved.

1st. Presiding over the 13th annual general meeting of the National Institute of Sciences at New Delhi, Mr. D. N. Wadia dwelt on the role of scientists in the building of a free and New India.

- 2nd. Mahatma Gandhi started on his village-to-village tour in Noakhali District. U. Aung San, Vice-Chairman of the Burma Government, arrived in New Delhi. Addressing a meeting at Bombay, S. K. M. Munshi said, "We hold fast to the statement of the British Cabinet, which, to my mind, is a treaty between the nation and the British Government. We have paid a heavy price for it by accepting residuary powers for the provinces and a very restricted centre and we are determined not to let the treaty be trifled with."
- Sir Abdur Rabim, former President of the Central Legislative Assembly, expressed the hope that Congress in accepting the grouping provision of the State Paper would do so without reservations and that both Congress and the League would find themselves able to come to a clear understanding on all outstanding problems, including major communal issues.
- 3rd. In his presidential address at the 34th session of the Indian Science Congress, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru dwelt on the role of scientists in a free India and stressed on a constructive research for the advancement of science in the cause of peace and progress in the world.
- Mr. Ghulam Hussain Hidayatullah was unanimously elected leader of the Siad Muslim League Assembly Party.
- An appeal to the students of the world to unite and build a common platform for world peace was made by S. J. Mrinal Kanti Bose, President of the All-India Trade Union Congress in his inaugural address at the 10th annual conference of the All-India Students' Federation at New Delhi.
- 4th. The Congress Working Committee, which met in New Delhi, discussed the draft of a resolution on H. M. G.'s statement of December 6 to be submitted before the A. I. C. C.
- The importance of starting atomic energy research in India was stressed by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, in laying the foundation-stone of the National Physical Laboratory at New Delhi.
- S. J. L. B. Bhopatkar, President of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha, in a statement said, "The only way to solve the communal problem in India is to build a solid Hindu front against which the tide of Muslim fury and fanaticism will waste itself."
- The Bihar delegation headed by S. J. Krishna Ballabh Sahay, submitted to Mahatma Gandhi a memorandum containing notes prepared by the Bihar Government which reply to and refute certain charges made by the Bengal Premier, Mr. H. S. Suhrawardy, regarding the treatment of refugees in Bihar.
- The Congress President, Acharya Kripalani, in a statement characterised the news from Viet-Nam as "dirquiting." He added that it is a pity that the French who value their own freedom so high should try to deprive other people of theirs.
- Sir B. L. Mitter, Dewan of Baroda, expressed the opinion that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's resolution in the Constituent Assembly declaring India a sovereign Republic is merely a statement of the ideals and aspirations of the Indian people and does not rule out the possibility of some units in the Federation choosing a different constitution.
- 5th. The debate on the draft resolution on H. M. G.'s statement of Dec. 6 commenced at the emergent session of the A. I. C. C.
- S. J. Jai Prakash Narain, Congress Socialist leader, in a press statement at Lahore said, "I do not think that the British are prepared to quit India but they will be forced to do so."
- 6th. The A. I. C. C., by 99 votes to 52, accepted the Working Committee's draft resolution agreeing to H. M. G.'s interpretation in regard to the procedure to be followed in the Sections of the Constituent Assembly. Babu Purushottamdas Tandon's amendment for rejection of the Dec. 6 statement was lost by 54 votes to 102. The Socialists, headed by S. J. Jai Prakash Narain, opposed the resolution and urged the Congress to return to the "revolutionary path."
- S. J. Sarat Chandra Bose resigned his membership of the Congress Working Committee as a protest against the action of that body in recommending to the A. I. C. C. acceptance of the British Government's Statement of December 6.
- Presiding over the Damodar Valley Scheme Conference at New Delhi, Mr. C. H. Bhabha, Member for Works, Mines, and Power, Central Government, appealed to the representatives of the Bengal and Bihar Governments to import a sense of urgency in the execution of the project and to make a bold, unorthodox and revolutionary approach with regard to its organisation and finance.

The view that the resolution passed by the A. I. C. O. amounted to an unconditional acceptance of groups by the Congress, even though it alluded to certain vague assurances in case of compulsion, was expressed by Gianl Kartar Singh, President of the Shiromani Akali Dal and member of the Constituent Assembly, in a press interview at Amritsar.

7th. S. J. Gopinath Bardoloi, Premier of Assam, at a press conference in Bombay, said, "Assam will now act alone in terms of the resolution adopted by the A. I. C. O. We are prepared to sit in sections in the Constituent Assembly, but Assam demands exactly what the Muslim League demands from the Union Centre. If the Muslim League has apprehensions about the Union Centre forcing its brutal majority decisions on the minority, Assam has greater apprehensions about a brutal majority in grouping with Bengal."

Full assurance and hope of closer Indo-Russian contact in the scientific and diplomatic fields as well as collaboration in many fields of beneficent human activity was conveyed by Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, in an interview at New Delhi, to the head of the Russian Delegation to the Indian Science Congress, Prof. V. P. Volgin, Vice-President of the Academy of Science, U. S. S. R.

8th. The Assam Provincial Muslim League decided to a civil disobedience movement against the eviction policy of the Government of Assam.

Baba Kharak Singh, President of the Central Akali Dal and the All-India Sikh League, in a statement, said, "By accepting the statement of December 6 the Congress has not only acquiesced in the principle of vivisection, but it has also betrayed the confidence of the minorities."

S. J. T. R. Venkatarama Sastri, President, Indian Liberal Federation, characterised the decision of the Congress in accepting H. M. G.'s interpretation of December 6 statement as "wise and right."

9th. Presiding over the 15th. meeting of the Central Advisory Board of Education in Bombay, S. J. C. Rajagopalachari, Education Minister stressed the importance of education in planning the future of the country and pointed out to the role teachers should play in fulfilling this object.

Police opened fire several times to quell disturbances which broke out in Bombay to-day.

S. J. Shankar Rao Deo, General Secretary of the A. I. C. O. in a press interview, said that the fundamental principle of Provincial Autonomy "has not been infringed nor the right of self-determination negated by the Delhi resolution of the A. I. C. O. accepting the December 6 statement of H. M. G."

10th. A proposal to establish a National Cultural Trust for India, with a substantial endowment, to stimulate and co-ordinate the cultural activities in the country was accepted by the Central Advisory Board of Education at Bombay.

Planned development of India's mineral resources so as to dovetail into the framework of planned industries was advocated by Mr. C. H. Bhabha, Member for Works, Mines and Power, while addressing the Mineral Policy Committee at Bombay.

More incidents occurred in Bombay to-day. As a result of police firing, 12 persons were killed and 110 others injured.

Under the Chairmanship of Dr. John Mathal, Member for Industries & Supplies, a Conference of Provincial and States' Ministers at Bombay discussed ways and means of combating the acute scarcity of cloth in the country.

11th. An appeal to the Govt. of India and the Universities to give a charter for experiment to all responsible earnest men and women in the field of education so as to bring about an educational reform in the country, was made S. J. C. Rajagopalachari, addressing the concluding session of the Central Advisory Board of Education at Bombay.

An adjournment motion to discuss the "indiscriminate, excessive and brutal firing by the local police on unarmed labourers in Cawnpore on January 6" and the general strike which followed, was moved in the U. P. Legislative Assembly.

12th. Mahatma Gandhi, commenting on the Delhi resolution, said, "The All-India Congress Committee, as its Delhi debate and the resolution adopted show, has gone its farthest limit in order to declare its unfriendly attitude towards the Muslim League, consistent with its cherished principles. I cannot say how the League will react to the Congress gesture. I can only hope it will reciprocate."

Sir Charles Darwin, leader of the British delegation to the Indian Science

Congress, expressed the hope in New Delhi of increasing co-operation between India and Britain not only in science but also in the whole cultural field.

- 13th. The Subjects Committee of the All India Forward Bloc, at its meeting in Arrah, moved two amendments to the resolution asking the Forward Bloc members of the Constituent Assembly and the Provincial and Central Legislatures to resign from these bodies.

The police made a country wide search of the offices of the Communist Party of India and other allied organisations and also made several arrests in connection with an article published in the party's organ 6 months ago, which revealed certain military instructions.

Mr. C. H. Bhabha, Member, Works, Mines and Power, addressing the Mineral Policy Committee, emphasised the need for an All-India legislative framework to provide for central regulation of conditions under which a co-ordinated scheme of mineral development could be worked out.

An appeal to the Interim Government to bring diplomatic pressure on France to recognize and respect the sovereignty of the Republic of Viet Nam was made by S. J. Rabintra Verma, President of the A. I. Students' Congress, in a press statement.

- 14th. Brigadier E. K. G. Sixsmith, Bengal and Assam Area Commander, gave evidence before the Calcutta Riots Enquiry Commission which resumed sitting for the first time in public.

- 15th. Addressing the Food Production Conference at New Delhi, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Food Member, disclosed a five-year plan to expand and intensify agriculture in order to wipe out India's annual deficit of 1½ million tons of foodgrains, which, he said, would increase to 7 million tons by 1951.

Mr. K. P. S. Menon, Indian Political Service, was appointed as the Indian Ambassador in Olna.

Malik Feroz Khan Noon, in an interview at Calcutta said that the A. I. C. C. by its resolution on H. M. G.'s statement of December 6 has deceived none but themselves. "I cannot see," he said, "how the Muslim League can come into the Constituent Assembly in view of this resolution and also in view of the spirit of hostility towards Muslims, which still exists in the minds of the Congress High Command.

- 16th. Mr. Shankar Rao Deo, General Secretary of the Congress, at a public meeting in Poona, denied that the Congress had surrendered to the dictates of H. M. G. or the Muslim League by passing the January 6 resolution accepting the December 6 statement of the British Cabinet.

The talks between Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Home Member, and Mr. Arthur Henderson, Under-Secretary of State for India, on the winding up of the Secretary of State's Services, such as I. P. S. and I. C. S. were concluded in New Delhi.

The Working Committee of the All-India Scheduled Castes' Federation at Bombay discussed a draft memorandum prepared by Dr. Ambedkar to be submitted before the Minorities Sub-Committee of the Constituent Assembly.

- 17th. An emphatic assertion that the Sikhs would withdraw from the Constituent Assembly if the right of communal veto in the Punjab and the North West Group was not conceded to them was made by Giani Kartar Singh and Sardar Ujjal Singh, members of the Constituent Assembly, in a press interview at Lahore.

The Working Committee of the All-India Scheduled Castes' Federation, at its concluding session, adopted a resolution seeking to submit to the U. N. O. the case of "the sufferings of the Scheduled Castes in India against the Hindus for their acts of social, economic and political tyranny."

The Degree of Doctor of Science (Honoris Causa) was conferred on Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, at a special convocation of the Patna University.

An appeal to the Muslim League to enter the Constituent Assembly, and co-operate with the Congress in the task of framing the future constitution of a Free and Independent India, was made by S. J. N. Mandal, Law Member, in a press interview at Bombay.

Proposal for setting up an All-India Agricultural Prices Council, a semi-judicial Price Determination Commission to fix the price level of agricultural produce and a Commodity Corporation to enforce the price level so fixed were

explained by Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Member for Agriculture at the Agricultural Prices Conference which opened in New Delhi.

The Madras Government's decision to revise the salaries of non-gazetted Government services was announced in a Press Note.

Sj. P. C. Joshi, General-Secretary of the Communist Party of India, in a statement, said that the recent raids on the Communist Party Officers in India are "an imperialist feeler to see if patriotic India will swallow the illegalisation of the Communist Party."

18th. Sir Maharaj Singh, a member of the Indian delegation to the U. N. O., said at Madras, "India must not be too optimistic about a change on the part of the Union Government towards Indians in S. Africa, although the annexation of S. W. Africa was unanimously rejected after a joint resolution by India and the U. S. A., has been approved by the U. N. General Assembly."

Sj. Gopinath Bardoloi, Premier of Assam, in a statement at Calcutta, reiterated the Assam Assembly's decision with regard to Sections and Groupings. He said, "We are ready to face any eventualities for our goal. Assam could not boycott the Constituent Assembly, but we are not going to submit to compulsion."

19th. A plea for the abolition of such classifications as Excluded and Partially Excluded Areas in the country was made by Sj. Devendranath Samnath in his presidential address to the 6th Annual All-India Excluded and Partially Excluded Areas and Tribal People's Association Conference at New Delhi.

Two new Ordinances, namely, Bengal Criminal Law Amendment Ordinance, 1947 and Bengal Special Powers (Amendment) Ordinance, 1947 were promulgated by the Bengal Government.

20th. The Constituent Assembly to-day unanimously accepted Sj. Satya Narain Sinha's motion to elect 11 members, other than the President, to be members of the Steering Committee and further resumed the debate on Pt. Nehru's resolution on Objectives.

Dr. Rajendra Prasad made a statement in the Constituent Assembly refuting the views expressed in the British Parliament recently that the Assembly represented only one major community in India or was a body of Hindus and Caste Hindus.

Announcing their conclusions on the report of the inquiry into the R. I. N. Mutinies, in February, 1946, the Central Government declared their intention to take every step to put right the grievances revealed by the report.

Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, Member for External Affairs, in a statement, replied to the charges made by the Republicans' foreign affairs expert, Mr. J. F. Dulles at Washington, that foreign power exercised a strong influence over the Nehru Government. He said, "Our policy is to cultivate friendly and co-operative relations with all countries, and not to align ourselves with any particular foreign grouping. Our policy is going to be an independent one based on the furtherance of peace and freedom everywhere on the lines laid down by the United Nations Charter."

The structure of the Advisory Committee on Minorities, Fundamental Rights and Tribal Areas provided for in the State Paper was discussed at a meeting of the Consultative Committee of the Congress bloc in the Constituent Assembly.

Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the U. N., described as "complete misapprehension" the recent statement of Mr. Dulles, one of the United States delegates to the U. N., that "in India, Soviet Communism exercised a strong influence through the Hindu Interim Government."

21st. In the Constituent Assembly, Dr. M. R. Jayakar, the Liberal leader, withdrew his amendment to Paudit Nehru's resolution on aims and objectives. The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, also announced the names of the members of the Steering Committee.

The police opened fire several times on students' demonstrators in Calcutta in connection with the observance of the "Viet-Nam Day". About 80 persons were injured. A large number of arrests were also made.

22nd. The Indian Constituent Assembly adopted Paudit Nehru's resolution providing as the guiding principle of the country's new constitution that of an independent, sovereign republic with the powers and authority derived from the people.

An emphatic declaration that India had no intention to get tied up with any particular group or bloc of States and desired only to be free and independent

and to co-operate on equal terms with all countries to build up a world structure was made by Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru in the Constituent Assembly.

The police opened fire on student demonstrators in Mymensingh, which came out as a protest against the alleged police firing in Calcutta on "Viet Nam Day."

23rd. The 51st birth anniversary of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose was celebrated all over the country.

Giving his views of Pakistan, Mahatma Gandhi said, "Full religious tolerance will be the fundamental principle of any State declaring freedom from outside control. In such a State, the minorities would be given the same amount of freedom as enjoyed by the majority community."

The police fired several times to quell disturbances in Bombay on the occasion of the celebration of the "Netaji Day."

Acharya Kripalani, the Congress President, in a statement, condemned the brutal police firing on students in Calcutta on the "Viet Nam Day."

The Madras Government promulgated a new Ordinance, viz. the Madras Maintenance of Public Order Ordinance (1) of 1947.

24th. The Constituent Assembly to-day agreed to S. Satya Narain Sinha's motion for the election of a Vice-President and took up Pandit Pant's motion for the election of an Advisory Committee to deal with the rights of minorities, the rights of citizens and questions relating to the tribal and excluded and partially excluded areas.

Seven top-ranking Muslim League leaders of the Punjab were arrested in Lahore in course of police raids on the headquarters of the Muslim League National guards. They were:—Khan Iftikhar Hussain Khan of Mamdot, Mian Iftikharud-Din, Mian Mumtaz Daulatana, Begun Shah Nawaz, Sardar Saikat Hyat Khan, Mr. Feroz Khan Noon and Syed Amir Hussain Shah.

The Punjab Government declared the Muslim League National Guards and the Rashtriya Swyam Sevak Sangh as unlawful bodies under Sec. 16 of the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1908.

Saddar Abdur Rab Nishtar, Communications Member, Central Government, in a statement said that the Punjab Government's action in arresting the League leaders appeared to be an attempt to destroy the League organisation in the province by force.

Presiding over the A. I. Christian Conference at Bombay, Dr. John Matthai, Member for Transport & Railways, appealed to the Indian Christians to regard themselves primarily as the servants of the country and so organise their resources as to be a spearhead of national service.

Large scale demonstrations were staged in Lahore as a protest against the arrest of the League leaders.

25th. The Constituent Assembly adjourned until the month of April after agreeing to set up the Order of Business Committee and the Union Subjects Committee during its next sitting.

Dr. H. O. Mukherjee was unanimously elected as Vice-President of the Indian Constituent Assembly.

Further disturbances took place in Lahore following the Punjab Muslim League Assembly Party's decision to defy the Government ban. British troops were called out as a precautionary measure. Several arrests were made.

Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan, General Secretary of the A. I. Muslim League and Finance Member, Central Government, in a statement at New Delhi, condemned as "insane" the Punjab Government's action against the Muslim National Guards as a "private army."

Sir Akbar Hydari was appointed as the Governor of Assam in succession to H. E. Sir Andrew Clow.

S. C. Rajagopalachari, Member for Industries & Supplies, expressed confidence that "Indian Independence is a certainty by the end of 1948."

26th. The "Independence Day" was celebrated all throughout the country.

All the eight Muslim League leaders arrested on the charge of offering passive resistance, were released in Lahore.

On the occasion of "Independence Day" celebration in London, Prof. Harold Laski, former Chairman of the British Labour Party, urged the Indians to forget their religious and racial differences, called on Hindus to refrain from abusing the Muslim League and Mr. Jinnah, in particular and appealed to all races, castes

and creeds to unite in developing their motherland into a bulwark of the civilized world and into a champion of subject peoples everywhere.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah, President of the A. I. Muslim League, in a statement, condemned the action of the Punjab Government in declaring the Muslim League National Guards as unlawful and urged the Viceroy to intervene and save the situation, "which, otherwise, may take a serious turn for which the entire responsibility will rest with the Viceroy and H. M. G."

Addressing the All-India Jamiat-i-Ulema-i-Islam Conference at Hyderabad (Sind) Mr. Ghaznafar Ali Khan called upon the Muslim League Ministry in Sind to use such powers as they had under the present constitution for the purpose of giving the people, Muslims and Non-Muslims, a foretaste of the administrative and economic policies which would be followed in Pakistan.

27th. Strict adherence to the terms of the Cabinet Mission's statement and opposition to any extension of the powers of the proposed Indian Union were the main points stressed in a draft resolution at a meeting of the two Committees of the Chamber of Princes, viz. the Constitutional Advisory Committee and the Committee of Ministers, at New Delhi.

The A. I. Sikh National Conference passed a resolution appealing to the Sikhs to follow the lead given by the Indian National Congress in the fight for the country's independence.

28th. The Punjab Government withdrew the ban imposed on the Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh and the Muslim League National Guards.

A special meeting of the Constitutional Advisory Committee of the Chamber of Princes was held in New Delhi under the presidentship of H. H. the Nawab of Bhopal.

Large scale demonstration and processions were staged by Muslims in Lahore in defiance of the order under Punjab Public Safety Ordinance. About 600 persons were arrested.

29th. The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, at its meeting in Karachi, considered the situation in the Punjab and the Behar Tragedy, the statement of H. M. G. of December 6, and the resolution of the A. I. C. O.

The British Financial Delegation, including Mr. Cameron, Deputy-Governor of the Bank of England, and Mr. K. Anderson, Head of the Finance Dept. of the India Office, to conduct preliminary discussions with the Government of India for a settlement of the Sterling Balances, arrived in New Delhi.

The Standing Committee of the Chamber of Princes adopted a resolution on the question of Indian States' participation in the Constituent Assembly. This resolution was ratified at a general conference of Rulers of Indian States.

In the Madras Legislative Assembly, Mr. T. Prakasam, the Premier, made a statement explaining the necessity for the promulgation of the Ordinances for Maintenance of Public Order in the province.

30th. The Working Committee of the A. I. Muslim League prepared a draft resolution on the political situation arising out of the British Government's December 6 statement and on the A. I. C. O. resolution accepting the latter.

Mr. H. S. Suhrawardy, Bengal Premier, in a Press statement, expressed the view that Mahatma Gandhi's walking tour in East Bengal has helped in restoring confidence there.

The Punjab Premier, Malik Khizr Hyat Khan Tiwana, in a statement, explained the policy of his Government regarding the Muslim League's decision to defy law and order and appealed to the people for support and co-operation with a view to maintain communal peace in the province.

A concrete proposal towards the formation of an All-India party known as the Azad Hind Party, "pledged to accept unconditionally the ideology of Netaji Subha Chandra Bose" and having as its main aim the completion of Netaji's unfulfilled task, was announced to the Press by K. J. Sarat Chandra Bose at Calcutta.

31st. The Working Committee of the A. I. Muslim League called upon H. M. G. to declare that the constitutional plan formulated by the Cabinet Mission has failed because the Congress has not accepted the statement of May 16, 1946 and recorded the opinion that the Constituent Assembly should be forthwith dissolved. The Committee further characterized the A. I. C. O. resolution "as no more than a dishonest trick and jugglery of words by which the Congress has again attem-

pted to deceive the British Government, the Muslim League and public opinion."

Dr. V. K. R. Rao, Food Adviser to the Indian Embassy and Indian delegate to the International Emergency Food Council, said at Washington, "India is finding herself now in a food position worse than in 1946.

Mrs. Hansa Mehta, the Indian delegate to the United Nations Human Rights Commission at New York, presented India's draft for an International Bill of Human Rights.

A resolution that non-violent and non-communal agitation by the Muslims in the Punjab would be continued unless and until the Punjab Government withdrew all repressive measures and released all Muslim League leaders, was passed by the Working Committees of the Sind Provincial Muslim League.

Various matters connected with the foreign trade in India and the Government of India's policy towards it, was outlined by Mr. I. I. Chundrigar, Commerce Member at Karachi.

Mr. Hossain Imam was appointed President of the Council of State in succession to Sir Maneckji Dadabhai.

Addressing a press conference at New Delhi, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Member for Education and Arts, appealed both to the public and the selected scholars to treat the system of Overseas scholarships as a sacred trust by which the foundations of India's future educational, industrial and technical development were being laid.

February 1947

The Advisory Planning Board suggested measures to improve planning machinery in India.

The Budget session of the Central Legislative Assembly opened in New Delhi.

Talks on the liquidation of India's Sterling Balances opened in New Delhi.

The Working Committee of the A. I. Hindu Mahasabha met in New Delhi under the presidentship of Mr. L. B. Bhopatkar.

Mr. Asaf Ali, the Indian Ambassador to the U. S. A. left for Washington.

The Behar Assembly rejected an Opposition's "no-confidence" motion against the Congress Ministry.

Mr. Ernest Bevin, the British Foreign Secretary, made a strong plea to India to avoid civil strife.

The Standing Committee of the A. I. Newspaper Editor's Conference met in New Delhi under the chairmanship of Sj. Tushar Kanti Ghosh.

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel declared: "Congress would withdraw from the Viceroy's Cabinet if Muslim League members were allowed to remain under present conditions."

The 22nd annual session of the A. I. Trade Union Congress met in Calcutta under the presidentship of Sj. Mrinal Kanti Bose.

The Budget Session of the Council of State commenced in New Delhi.

The first Railway Budget of the Interim Government was presented in the Central Assembly by Dr. John Mathai, Transport Member.

The British Government's White Paper on the constitutional future of India, fixing June 1948 as the final date for transfer to Indian hands, was presented by the Premier, Mr. Clement Attlee in the House of Commons.

Viscount Mountbatten was appointed Governor-General of India.

Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, in a statement, commended the British Government's statement on India as "a wise and courageous one."

Mr. Jinnah declared at Karachi: "The Muslim League will not yield an inch in their demand for Pakistan."

The House of Lords debated a motion criticising the White Paper fixing a date for the transfer of power in India.

The Central Government's Budget for 1947-48 presented to the Central Assembly revealed a deficit of Rs. 48'46 crores.

1st. The Advisory Planning Board published a report suggesting certain measures to improve planning machinery in India. The suggestions included appointment of a Planning Commission of 5 to 5 members under the Central Govt., a Consultative body of 25 to 30 members; a Central Statistical office and a permanent Tariff Board with wider functions.

The Working Committee of the A.I. Muslim League, at its resumed sitting, passed a resolution on the Punjab situation, characterising the Punjab Govt's Public Safety Ordinance as "the biggest and the most high-handed attempt to suppress the activities of the Muslim League in the province."

Dr. Choithram Gidwani, President of the Sind Provincial Congress Committee, commenting on the Muslim League Working Committee's resolution said: "It proves beyond doubt that the Muslim League wants perpetuation of foreign rule."

Mr. H. N. Brailsford, the wellknown British Socialist writer, said at Oxford, "I think Mr. Jinnah is banking on Mr. Churchill's return to power in Great Britain. I do not think that Mr. Jinnah wants a settlement now. He wants to wait until his party is stronger."

Sir Chuni Lal B. Mehta, former President of the Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, expressed disappointment at the way in which the Indian Government had prepared their case for negotiation with the U. K. delegation regarding settlement of the Sterling Balances.

2nd. Commenting on the Punjab situation, Mr. M. A. Jinnah in a statement said: "I once more draw the attention of the Punjab Government, the Governor and the Viceroy not to indulge in any camouflage and deal with the situation boldly and frankly and restore civil liberties of the people of the Punjab." He further appealed to the Muslim Youths to avoid communal conflicts and keep the movement absolutely peaceful.

The A.I. Scheduled Castes' Federation submitted a comprehensive memorandum prepared by Dr. Ambedkar to the U. N. O, in accordance with the resolution adopted by the Federation Executive at Bombay.

The Working Committee of the A. I. Muslim League concluded its session after adopting a number of resolutions on the Bihar tragedy, the eviction policy of the Assam Government, the action by the Central Government against the tribesmen in Hazara District and the general conditions of Muslims in the Congress-governed provinces.

3rd. The Budget Session of the Central Legislative Assembly opened in New Delhi under the Chairmanship of Mr. G. V. Mavlankar.

In reply to an adjournment motion tabled by Sardar Mangal Singh and Nawab Siddique Ali Khan, on raids by tribesmen in Hazara district, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru revealed in the Central Assembly that after great consideration the Government of India decided not to bomb the tribal territories involved in the recent raids in Hazara District, as other steps were taken to meet the situation. "Our decision", he said, "was justified by subsequent events".

Preliminary negotiation on the liquidation of India's Sterling Balances opened in New Delhi between the U. K. delegation and the Government of India representatives.

The *London Times*, in an article on the British Financial Mission to India, declared: "Britain has every sympathy with India's desire to use her sterling balances to finance capital developments but, as a practical question, payment in full to India and other creditors is impossible."

Sardar Swaran Singh, Development Minister, Punjab, in a press interview, repudiated the charge of the League Working Committee that the Punjab Coalition was unrepresentative or anti-League. He asserted that the Coalition

was fully representative and democratic, not only enjoying the majority vote but also reflecting every community and interest of the Province.

In the Central Assembly, the Finance Member, Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan presented the Select Committee's report on the Bill to regulate certain payments, dealings in foreign exchange and securities and the import and export of currency and bullion.

4th. Mr. Churchill, referring to India's Sterling Balances in the House of Commons, declared, "Britain reserved her full right to present her counter-claim on account of effective defence of India by all means—land, sea, air and diplomacy—by which the freedom of India from foreign invasion was secured."

In an editorial on communal alignments in India, the *London Times* criticized the decisions reached by the Working Committee of the Muslim League in Karachi, some of which it described as preposterous and called upon the Congress to try to dispel Muslim fears.

5th. The Central Assembly, by 64 to 16 votes, rejected the Muslim League adjournment motion moved by Mr. Siddiq Alikhan on the punitive fines and the "barbarous and mediæval practice of taking hostages, imposed on the Nandihar tribes.

Details of how plans for the formation of the Indian Foreign Service were developing were disclosed by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in the Central Assembly. "Normal recruitment of young men both to the A. I. Administrative Service and to the Foreign Service," he said, "will be through a single competition conducted by the Federal Public Service Commission, though we shall seek to provide in this competition certain special requirements for the Foreign Service."

6th. An adjournment motion of the Congress Party to censure Government on their failure to check the outbreak of hooliganism in Noakhali and Tipperah districts in October last was defeated by 23 votes to 15 in the Bengal Legislative Council.

In the Bengal Legislative Assembly a similar adjournment motion tabled by the Congress party was rejected by 107 to 74 votes.

The Central Assembly continued the debate on the motion for reference to a Select Committee of Dr. G. M. Desmukh's Bill further to amend the Special Marriage Act 1872 and finally accepted the motion.

A no-confidence motion against the Bihar Ministry for its failure to secure the life and property of the minority community was tabled by the Muslim League party in the Behar Legislative Assembly.

The right of the Princes to select States' People's representatives in the Constituent Assembly was denied in a statement, for presentation to the British Indian Negotiating Committee of the Constituent Assembly, by the States' People's Negotiating Committee, which met in New Delhi under the presidency of Dr. Pattabi Sitaramayya.

Muslims in Calcutta staged "Anti-Suhrawardy" demonstrations outside the premises of the Bengal Legislative Assembly.

7th. A resolution seeking to check and, if possible, to prevent any alien hold on Indian economy in the shape of control of industry, was moved by Sri Prakash in the Central Assembly. The resolution was later withdrawn.

8th. It was officially announced in New Delhi that Advisory Councils would be set up in Delhi and Ajmer-Merwara and would be associated with the Chief Commissioners of these provinces in the discharge of their administrative functions.

The Working Committee of the All India Hindu Mahasabha, which met in New Delhi under the presidency of Mr. L. B. Bhopatkar, considered Dr. Ambedkar's letter embodying the political demands of the Scheduled Castes' Federation and appointed a Committee to contact the Federation and Scheduled Caste leaders to examine them in all their bearings.

The first formal meeting of the Negotiating Committee of the Constituent Assembly and the Indian States began in New Delhi to discuss the terms of the States' participation in the Constituent Assembly and the position of Indian States in the proposed Union.

Mr. Asaf Ali, the Indian Ambassador to the United States, left Karachi for Washington.

9th. The Working Committee of the All India Hindu Mahasabha passed a resolution maintaining that "the Constituent Assembly, as it is, is a properly

constituted legal body with full sovereign power and authority and competent to frame the political constitution of Akhand Hindusthan." The Committee further urged the Princes to join the Constituent Assembly giving adequate representation to their own people and to introduce Responsible Government in their own States.

An expenditure of nearly Rs. 90 lakhs for the construction and equipment of the six National Laboratories for chemical, physical, metallurgical, fuel, glass and road research for the year 1947-48 was approved by the governing body of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research which met in New Delhi under the Chairmanship of Mr. O. Rajagopalachari, Minister for Industries and Supplies.

- 10th. In the Central Assembly, Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan, the Finance Member explained the Government of India's policy regarding restrictions on foreign exchange. Speaking on the Foreign Exchange Regulations Bill, which was passed by the House, he emphasised that Sterling would not be multilaterally convertible for capital transactions.

The Working Committee of the A. I. Hindu Mahasabha passed a resolution resenting "the attempt made by the Muslim League Ministry in Bengal to transfer Muslims from Behar and other provinces with the definite political objective of increasing the Muslim population strength in Muslim minority districts of Western Bengal."

In reply to a question in the Central Assembly, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru said, "Government had no reason whatever to believe that the statement made by Sardar Sardul Singh Caveeshar to the fact that Sri Subhas Chandra Bose was shot dead on the Russo-Chinese border by Allied troops, had any foundation in fact and therefore did not propose to take any further action. Government was convinced that Sri Subhas Chandra Bose died as a result of injuries sustained in an aircraft crash."

The States' Negotiating Committee and the Standing Committee of the Chamber of Princes concluded their joint deliberations after passing a number of resolutions.

- 11th. The Central Assembly passed the motion for consideration of the Labour Member, Sj. Jagjivan Ram's Bill to make provision for the investigation and settlement of Industrial disputes as reported by the Select Committee.

The Bengal Legislative Council rejected by 34 to 13 votes the Congress party's adjournment motion criticising the recent police firing on student demonstrators on "Viet-Nam" Day in Calcutta.

The Orissa Assembly Congress party discussed the letter of resignation placed before the party by the premier, Sj. Hare Krishna Mehtab and then passed a resolution "urging the premier to withdraw his resignation."

Two adjournment motions, tabled by the Congress party, relating to the communal disturbances in Saidpur and the Calcutta Tramway Workers' Strike was lost in the Bengal Assembly.

- 12th. A "no confidence" motion tabled against the Bihar Ministry was moved in the Provincial Assembly by Mr S. M. Ismail, leader of the opposition and leader of the Muslim League Party in the Assembly.

A Press Note issued from New Delhi stated: "In a directive on the appointment of non-Indians to civil posts under the Armed Forces the Governor-General-in-Council has laid down that such appointments shall be made in very exceptional circumstances and then only on contract for the minimum period necessary."

In his post-prayer speech at Noakhali, Mahatma Gandhi visualised an independent India of a casteless and classless people living together with full cultural and religious freedom. "An independent India, as conceived by me," he said, "will have all Indians belonging to different religions living in perfect friendship."

- 13th.—Sj. Sri Krishna Sinha, Prime Minister of Bihar, replying to the debate on the "no confidence" motion against the Ministry, announced in the Assembly the decision of the Bihar Government to appoint a Commission of Enquiry to investigate into the recent disturbances in the province.

A resolution expressing want of confidence in the leadership of Sj. Prakasam, the Premier was tabled by a large number of members of the Madras Congress Legislature Party and handed over to the Premier.

In the Central Assembly, the Defence Secretary, Sj. G. S. Bhalja, introduced

was fully representative and democratic, not only enjoying the majority vote but also reflecting every community and interest of the Province.

In the Central Assembly, the Finance Member, Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan presented the Select Committee's report on the Bill to regulate certain payments, dealings in foreign exchange and securities and the import and export of currency and bullion.

4th. Mr. Churchill, referring to India's Sterling Balances in the House of Commons, declared, "Britain reserved her full right to present her counter-claim on account of effective defence of India by all means—land, sea air and diplomacy—by which the freedom of India from foreign invasion was secured."

In an editorial on communal alignments in India, the *London Times* criticized the decisions reached by the Working Committee of the Muslim League in Karachi, some of which it described as preposterous and called upon the Congress to try to dispel Muslim fears.

5th. The Central Assembly, by 61 to 16 votes, rejected the Muslim League adjournment motion moved by Mr. Siddiq Alikhan on the punitive fines and the "barbarous and mediaeval practice of taking hostages, imposed on the Nandihar tribes.

Details of how plans for the formation of the Indian Foreign Service were developing were disclosed by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in the Central Assembly. "Normal recruitment of young men both to the A. I. Administrative Service and to the Foreign Service," he said, "will be through a single competition conducted by the Federal Public Service Commission, though we shall seek to provide in this competition certain special requirements for the Foreign Service."

6th. An adjournment motion of the Congress Party to censure Government on their failure to check the outbreak of bootiganism in Noakhali and Tipperah districts in October last was defeated by 23 votes to 15 in the Bengal Legislative Council.

In the Bengal Legislative Assembly a similar adjournment motion tabled by the Congress party was rejected by 107 to 74 votes.

The Central Assembly continued the debate on the motion for reference to a Select Committee of Dr. G. M. Desmukh's Bill further to amend the Special Marriage Act 1927 and finally accepted the motion.

A no-confidence motion against the Bihar Ministry for its failure to secure the life and property of the minority community was tabled by the Muslim League party in the Behar Legislative Assembly.

The right of the Princes to select States' People's representatives in the Constituent Assembly was denied in a statement, for presentation to the British Indian Negotiating Committee of the Constituent Assembly, by the States' People's Negotiating Committee, which met in New Delhi under the presidency of Dr. Pattabi Sitaramayya.

Muslims in Calcutta staged "Anti-Suhrawardy" demonstrations outside the premises of the Bengal Legislative Assembly.

7th. A resolution seeking to check and, if possible, to prevent any alien hold on Indian economy in the shape of control of industry, was moved by S. J. Sri Prakash in the Central Assembly. The resolution was later withdrawn.

8th. It was officially announced in New Delhi that Advisory Councils would be set up in Delhi and Ajmer-Merwara and would be associated with the Chief Commissioners of these provinces in the discharge of their administrative functions.

The Working Committee of the All India Hindu Mahasabha, which met in New Delhi under the presidency of Mr. L. B. Bhopatkar, considered Dr. Ambedkar's letter embodying the political demands of the Scheduled Castes' Federation and appointed a Committee to contact the Federation and Scheduled Castes leaders to examine them in all their bearings.

The first formal meeting of the Negotiating Committee of the Constituent Assembly and the Indian States began in New Delhi to discuss the terms of the States' participation in the Constituent Assembly and the position of Indian States in the proposed Union.

Mr. Asaf Ali, the Indian Ambassador to the United States, left Karachi for Washington.

9th. The Working Committee of the All India Hindu Mahasabha passed a resolution maintaining that "the Constituent Assembly, as it is, is a properly

constituted legal body with full sovereign power and authority and competent to frame the political constitution of Akhand Hindusthan." The Committee further urged the Princes to join the Constituent Assembly giving adequate representation to their own people and to introduce Responsible Government in their own States.

An expenditure of nearly Rs. 90 lakhs for the construction and equipment of the six National Laboratories for chemical, physical, metallurgical, fuel, glass and road research for the year 1947-48 was approved by the governing body of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research which met in New Delhi under the Chairmanship of Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, Minister for Industries and Supplies.

10th. In the Central Assembly, Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan, the Finance Member explained the Government of India's policy regarding restrictions on foreign exchange. Speaking on the Foreign Exchange Regulations Bill, which was passed by the House, he emphasised that Sterling would not be multilaterally convertible for capital transactions.

The Working Committee of the A. I. Hindu Mahasabha passed a resolution resenting "the attempt made by the Muslim League Ministry in Bengal to transfer Muslims from Behar and other provinces with the definite political objective of increasing the Muslim population strength in Muslim minority districts of Western Bengal."

In reply to a question in the Central Assembly, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru said, "Government had no reason whatever to believe that the statement made by Sardar Sardul Singh Caveeshar to the fact that Shri Subhas Chandra Bose was shot dead on the Russo-Chinese border by Allied troops, had any foundation in fact and therefore did not propose to take any further action. Government was convinced that Sri Subhas Chandra Bose died as a result of injuries sustained in an aircraft crash."

The States' Negotiating Committee and the Standing Committee of the Chamber of Princes concluded their joint deliberations after passing a number of resolutions.

11th. The Central Assembly passed the motion for consideration of the Labour Member, Sj. Jagjivan Ram's Bill to make provision for the investigation and settlement of Industrial disputes as reported by the Select Committee.

The Bengal Legislative Council rejected by 34 to 13 votes the Congress party's adjournment motion criticising the recent police firing on student demonstrators on "Viet-Nam" Day in Calcutta.

The Orissa Assembly Congress party discussed the letter of resignation placed before the party by the premier, Sj. Hare Krishna Mehtab and then passed a resolution "urging the premier to withdraw his resignation."

Two adjournment motions, tabled by the Congress party, relating to the communal disturbances in Saidpur and the Calcutta Tramway Workers' Strike was lost in the Bengal Assembly.

12th. A "no confidence" motion tabled against the Bihar Ministry was moved in the Provincial Assembly by Mr S. M. Ismail, leader of the opposition and leader of the Muslim League Party in the Assembly.

A Press Note issued from New Delhi stated: "In a directive on the appointment of non-Indians to civil posts under the Armed Forces the Governor-General-in-Council has laid down that such appointments shall be made in very exceptional circumstances and then only on contract for the minimum period necessary."

In his post-prayer speech at Noakhali, Mahatma Gandhi visualised an independent India of a casteless and classless people living together with full cultural and religious freedom. "An independent India, as conceived by me," he said, "will have all Indians belonging to different religions living in perfect friendship."

13th. Sj. Sri Krishna Sinha, Prime Minister of Bihar, replying to the debate on the "no confidence" motion against the Ministry, announced in the Assembly the decision of the Bihar Government to appoint a Commission of Enquiry to investigate into the recent disturbances in the province.

A resolution expressing want of confidence in the leadership of Sj. Prakasam, the Premier was tabled by a large number of members of the Madras Congress Legislature Party and handed over to the Premier.

In the Central Assembly, the Defence Secretary, Si. G. S. Bhalja, introduced

a Bill to enable duties in connection with vital services to be imposed in any emergency on the Armed Forces of the Crown.

A press Note issued from New Delhi announced the Government of India's decision to relax the Newsprint Control Order with effect from April 1947.

Criticising the resolution passed by the Working Committee of the Muslim League at Karachi, the *London Times* stated: "The League's Karachi attack on the Cabinet Mission's plan and on the very existence of the Constituent Assembly was tactical error inspite of the undoubted provocation amply furnished by the Congress Party. It further declared that it is for the advantage of all India that the Muslim League members of the Cabinet should remain there and, as a symbol of their party, play in building up the new Constitution.

14th. The Bihar Legislative Assembly rejected by 92 to 37 votes the Muslim League Party's "no-confidence" motion against the Congress Ministry.

A strong plea to India to avoid civil strife and prove an example to the world by carrying out her transition in a peaceful way was made by Mr. Ernest Bevin, the British Foreign Secretary at London. He added, "Our great desire is to see India—Muslim, Hindu and the rest—joined together and taken over from us as a going concern and not to suffer any disruption in civil life nor to engage in a civil war of any kind."

By 72 to 50 votes, the Bengal Legislative Assembly rejected an Opposition resolution recommending extension of the franchise to women in elections to District and Union Boards.

The view that if the reported quitting of the Interim Government by the Congress Party materialised, it would precipitate a general upheaval in the country and all chances of a constitutional and peaceful transfer of power would be lost for ever, was expressed by Mr. Frank Anthony, M.L.A. (Central) and President of the Anglo-Indian Association at Lahore.

Sj. L. B. Bhopatkar, President of All-India Hindu Mahasabha, at a press conference in New Delhi said that the League's boycott of the Constituent Assembly had made it incumbent on it to vacate its seats in the Interim Government and if the League refuse to do, it was up to H. M. G. to compel it to this course of action.

15th. The Standing Committee of the All-India Newspaper Editors' Conference met in New Delhi under the chairmanship of Sj. Tushar Kanti Ghosh, the President.

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Home Member, declared in an interview that Congress would withdraw from the Viceroy's Cabinet if Muslim League members were allowed to remain under "present conditions." He further said, "Congress members of the Interim Government have asked H. M. G. either to require the Muslim League to share in drafting a new constitution, or to leave the Cabinet. Unless the Muslim League gets out, we will go out."

Exploratory talks on the Indian Sterling Balances between the U. K. delegation and the Government of India's representatives concluded in New Delhi.

A proposal for the establishment of a Central Bureau of Psychology under Government was approved by the Standing Finance Committee which met in New Delhi under the Chairmanship of Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan, Finance Member. The object of the Bureau was to conduct research in selection methods and standardising tests of various types in the Educational field.

U. Aung San, Vice-President of the Burma Interim Government, declared at Rangoon that he was "convinced that a civil war will soon range in India." He further said, "I am definitely convinced that India will not become a world power because of her internal political differences which do not allow the Muslim League and the Congress to come together."

16th. Presiding over the 22nd annual session of the All India Trade Union Congress, which opened in Calcutta, Sj. Mrinalkanti Bose declared, "Only a tremendous politico-social revolution, either violent or non-violent, can bring to an end India's gigantic social inequalities. The A.I.T.U.C., as the spearhead of the labour movement, would have to take a large share in bringing about this revolution."

Delivering the convocation of the Aligarh university, Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan said, "We, Muslims, want to live in this sub-continent as an independent and self-respecting people and are in no way interested in or prepared to submit to a change of masters. We shall live our life as a nation in our own way. This can be possible only if we have a free and independent State of our own and that is Pakistan".

At a meeting of the Punjab Provincial Congress Committee, the no-confidence motion against Dr. S. D. Kitchlew, the president, having become inadmissible and thus ineffective, fell through without even formally being moved.

The working committee of the Bengal Provincial Hindu Mahasabha, at its meeting, decided to convene an all-Bengal conference in Calcutta to consider the desirability of establishing a separate province of the Hindus of Bengal.

Presiding over the Food Ministers' conference at New Delhi, Dr. Rajendra Prasad reviewed the food position in the country and expressed the view that the present controls were ineffective and the time has come when it should be remedied.

17th. The first Railway Budget of the Interim Government of India was presented in the Central Assembly by Dr. John Mathai, Transport Member, when he placed the estimate of revenue and expenditure for the year 1947-48.

A deficit of Rs. 14 crores in the current year and next financial year was disclosed by the Finance Minister, Mr. Mohammed Ali while presenting the Budget estimates in the Bengal Assembly.

The Budget session of the Council of State commenced in New Delhi under the presidentship of Mr. Hossain Imam.

18th. The Central Assembly discussed a non-official resolution to nationalise the Reserve Bank and another to release I. N. A. prisoners.

A wide range of subjects relating to India's education was dealt with by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Education Member, at a Press conference, when he outlined the Government's educational policy. "The Central Government's educational programme", he said, "included the setting up of a National Museum, the allocation of funds for fundamental research work, the development of archaeological studies and the use of broadcasting and films for the purpose of mass education."

Kawaja Nazimuddin, M.L.A. (Central), member of the Council of Action of the All India Muslim League, met the Punjab Governor and discussed with him the situation in the Punjab Province.

Srimati Kamala Devi, member of the Congress Working Committee, in an interview at Bangalore, said, "The people of this country have lost faith in the bonafides of the Labour Government in Britain and if the present drift persisted, a struggle may be expected shortly".

The British Cabinet, at its meeting, considered the issue raised as a result of the Congress Party's representation to Britain that the Muslim League's position in the Interim Government is untenable if the League continued to boycott the Constituent Assembly.

In his presidential address at the 6th Conference of the Behar Congress Socialist Party, Acharya Narendra Dev indicated the nature of the coming struggle for the attainment of India's freedom, which, he said, would not be marked by spontaneous outbreak of violence or the formation of independent local governments, but a people's movement in which the kisans and the mazdoors will take a leading part.

The All-India Trade Union Congress, which concluded its session in Calcutta, declared in a resolution that the aim of the working-class movement in India was the establishment of a Socialist State in which all power would rest in the hands of the producing masses.

19th. Mr. H. S. Suhrawardy, the Bengal Premier, in an interview at Calcutta warned that the present Congress attitude to the League *vis-a-vis* the Interim Government might lead to worsening of the communal relations.

The Governor of the Punjab issued an ordinance to amend the Punjab Public Safety ordinance so as to empower the Provincial Government to detain any person arrested by it or on its direction.

Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, in an interview at Patna, declared, "Provincial Governments under popular Minister were not powerful enough to check any major communal trouble although they themselves might think otherwise and give assurances that they would be able to control any future trouble. Although they are saddled with the responsibility of maintaining law and order, they had no effective power to enforce the law during the critical situations."

20th. The British Government's White Paper on the constitutional future of India was presented by the Prime Minister, Mr. Clement Attlee in the House of Commons. Mr. Attlee made the following announcement:—"His Majesty's Government desire to hand over their responsibility to authorities established by a Con-

titution approved by all parties in India in accordance with the Cabinet Mission's plan, but unfortunately there is at present no clear prospect that such a constitution and such authorities will emerge. The present state of uncertainty is fraught with danger and cannot be indefinitely prolonged. H.M.G. wish to make it clear that it is their definite intention to take necessary steps to effect transference of power into responsible Indian hands by a date not later than June, 1948."

With regard to the Indian States, Mr. Attlee said that the British Government do not intend to hand over their powers and obligations under the paramountcy to any Government of British India.

The statement also announced the termination of Lord Wavell's appointment as war-time Viceroy and added that H.M.G. has approved the appointment of Viscount Mountbatten as his successor, the change of office taking place during March.

The Central Assembly commenced a general discussion on the Railway Budget. The Transport Member's proposal to increase fares and freight rates in the absence of large scale proposals for amenities formed the main subject of discussion.

Mr. Abdul Quiyam Khan, leader of the opposition in the Frontier Assembly was arrested at Mardan.

Fifteen persons were killed as a result of police firing on a mob of villagers at Balurghat (North Bengal) in connection with the "Tebhaga" movement.

21st. The Central Assembly passed the Labour Member, Sj. Jagjivan Ram's Bill to make provision for investigation and settlement of industrial disputes as reported by the Select Committee.

The Nawab of Bhopal, Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes, in a press statement said, "The statement of policy in regard to India issued by H. M. G. will serve a useful purpose as the States will now have their chance of playing a vital part in helping to construct the new India, strong happy and contented holding out for her people the pattern of a fuller and more prosperous life and helping to maintain and inspire the peace and progress of the world. From the statement it can be seen that the British no longer desire to maintain their hold on India through adherence to the principles of 'Divide and Rule.'"

Commenting on the British Government's statement, the Muslim League's organ "Dawn", stated, "The recent statement issued by H. M. G. represents a new approach to the Indian problem. It seems that Mr. Attlee and his colleagues have realised at last what the Muslim League has repeatedly asserted, that the hope of framing an agreed constitution for an United India was an idle dream."

The Frontier Muslim League started its agitation in Mardan to fight the so-called repressive laws of the Frontier Government and "to win back the civil liberties of the people in the provinces."

22nd. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, in a statement, commended the British Government's statement on India as "a wise and courageous one", and declared that the work of the Constituent Assembly must now be carried on with greater speed. "In this great work", he added, "we invite all those who have kept aloof and we ask all to be partners in this joint and historic understanding, casting aside fear and suspicion, which ill become a great people on the eve of freedom."

An appeal to the leaders of the Muslim League and the Congress to convene a round table conference of representatives of political parties for the purpose of bringing about a settlement between the two communities to assume jointly the agency for the transference of power from Britain to India was made by prominent leaders of the Sind Progressive Muslim Jamiat at Karachi.

Welcoming the British Government's announcement, Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherjee, in a statement, declared, "We shall demand with one voice that the transfer of power must be made to a strong Central Government in respect of the whole of the British India. Hindus will resist with their life blood any scheme of the perpetuation of slavery which will be inevitable if Bengal, as she is constituted and administered to-day, is allowed to become a separate independent unit cut off from the rest of India. Nothing can justify the transfer of nearly 35 millions of persons belonging to one community to the perpetual domination of an artificial majority which refuses to identify itself with the rising aspirations of the entire people."

A fervent appeal to root out the weaknesses that have crept into the Congress organisation was made by Acharya (Kripalani), the Congress President, while

inaugurating a Conference of Presidents and Secretaries of all Provincial Congress Committees which opened in Allahabad.

23rd. Mr. M. A. Jinnah declared at Karachi, "The Muslim League will not yield an inch in their demand for Pakistan. Whatever the Hindu may do, we shall ever remain generous and good to all. Our demand is just and is the only way to liberate the ten crores of Muslims in India. The sufferings that the Muslims have undergone in Behar and elsewhere only show more clearly that we should have a separate State of Pakistan."

The Council of State adopted a resolution urging that non-official members of the Central Legislature be associated with the various political, cultural and trade missions sent abroad by the Government of India.

Sj. P. C. Joshi, General Secretary of the Communist Party of India, declared at Bombay, "There is no reason to hail but every reason to be suspicious of Premier Attlee's statement in the House of Commons. It is not a British pledge to quit India, but an imperialist manoeuvre to gain time."

The warning of a possible anarchy in India and a call to Britain not to abandon insistence on agreement among Indians was made by the *London Times* in an editorial. It further expressed the feeling that the Viceroy, Lord Wavell has been "ill-rewarded" by being recalled and made a more pessimistic comment about the fulfilment of agreement reached on India's Sterling Balances and the future defence of India.

Acharya Narendra Dev, the Congress Socialist leader, in a statement at Calcutta, characterised H. M. G's statement on India "as going back upon the Cabinet Mission's decision of May, 1946." He added, "It seems that Mr. Jinnah's slogan of 'divide and quit' is going to be realised, while Congress wanted the British to quit and leave us to our fate without deciding anything."

A resolution declaring that the "Harijans in India are with the Congress" and that they are not prepared to accept Pakistan, Achutshan or Khalistan, was passed at the 15th annual session of the All-India Harijan League, held in New Delhi under the presidency of Sj. Hemabandra Naskar.

24th. The opinion that the existence of organised political parties functioning within the Congress has seriously affected the efficiency and discipline of the Congress organisation and confused the mind of the masses, was expressed by the Conference of the Presidents and Secretaries of Provincial Congress Committees at its concluding session.

Babu Purshottam Das Tandon, Speaker of the U. P. Legislative Assembly, referring to H. M. G's latest announcement on India, said, "We need not think to-day what will be the attitude of the British Government at their time of departure. We should instead realise that it will be the strength of our arms that will dictate the shape of the India of to-morrow."

Mahatma Gandhi, making a reference to Mr. Attlee's statement, said that it has put the burden on various parties of doing what they thought best. He added, "If the Hindus and the Muslims closed their ranks and came together without external pressure, they would not only better their political condition but would also affect that of whole of India and probably the world."

A deficit of Rs. 37 lakhs was revealed in the Behar Budget for 1947-48, presented in the Behar Legislative Assembly by the Finance Minister, Sj. Anugraha Narayan Sinha.

The Muslim League's demonstration in Amritsar and Jullunder took a serious turn. Police opened fire several times, British troops were called as a precautionary measure.

25th. The attitude of the Muslim League towards the minorities was defined by Mr. Jinnah in an interview at Karachi. He said, "The one cardinal principle that I have followed and shall adhere to, is that the minorities to whichever community they belong must be treated fairly and justly and that every effort should be made by the majority community to create in them a sense of security and confidence. In the pursuit of this policy, which we are going to follow definitely, the Opposition must also be a responsible Opposition."

The U. S. Secretary of State, Mr. George Marshall declared at Washington that the British Government's plan for the transfer of power to responsible Indian hands "offers a just basis for co-operation." He further expressed the opinion that Indian political leadership would accept this clear-cut challenge and proceed to break the impasse between the Congress and the Muslim League.

Prime Minister Clement Attlee, in reply to a question in the House of

Commons if he would confirm that the British Government intended to maintain responsibility for the security of India from external attack after June, 1948, said, "Government have declared their intention to transfer full power to Indian hands not later than June 1948 and responsibility for the security of India from external aggression will fall upon India from the date when full power is transferred. If India decided to remain within the British Commonwealth, the position would be similar to that of the U. K. Government and any other members of the Commonwealth. If she decides to leave it, her future would be of great interest and the U. K. Government would be willing to enter into a treaty with India under the U. N. O. Charter."

Mr. I. I. Chundrigar, Commerce Member, at a joint meeting of the Trade Policy Committee and the Consultative Committee of Economists at New Delhi, referred to the broad principles which the Government of India would apply in examining the provisional list of items in respect of which India proposes to seek tariff concessions from other participating countries in the forthcoming international trade talks at Geneva.

The House of Lords debated a motion criticising the White Paper fixing a date for the transfer of power in India. Viscount Templewood (Conservative) opened the debate by moving that the British Government's decision to hand India over to an Indian Government under conditions which appear to be in conflict with previous declarations of the Government on this subject and without any provision for the protection of minorities or the discharge of their other obligations, is likely to imperil the peace and prosperity of India."

26th. Following a compromise between the Punjab Government and the Muslim League in connection with the 34 day-old agitation in the province, the Khan of Mamdot, President of the Punjab Provincial Muslim League called off the Muslim League civil disobedience movement in the province.

The debate on India in the House of Lords concluded with Lord Templewood's withdrawal of his motion criticising the British Government's announcement of February 20. Replying to criticisms, Lord Pethick Lawrence, Secretary of State for India said that it was intended to impress upon Indian parties the British Government's sincerity in their promise to transfer power and the urgency of parties finding a solution of their differences among themselves. He further added that if the parties did not arrive at the main decisions and agreement by the fixed date, "it will be possible for Britain to hand over power to a Provincial Government which can accomplish the remaining part of the task."

27th. The Advisory Committee of the Constituent Assembly on fundamental rights, minorities and excluded and tribal areas held its first session in New Delhi. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel was elected Chairman of the Committee.

The Constitutional Advisory Committee of the Chamber of Princes met in New Delhi to consider the situation that had arisen as a result of the British Government's White Paper on their Indian policy.

A total expenditure of Rs. 2,10,000 in connection with the riots and refugees in the province was revealed in the supplementary estimates of expenditure of the Bengal Government for the current year presented to the Bengal Assembly by the Finance Minister, Mr. Mahammad Ali.

28th. The Central Government's Budget for 1947-48, introduced in the Central Assembly by the Finance Member, Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan, revealed a deficit of Rs. 48.46 crores. Among the proposals made by the Finance Member for meeting the deficit were:—25% tax on business profits exceeding Rs. 1 lakh, doubling the rate of Corporation tax, doubling of the export duty on tea, and a graduated tax on capital gains.

Sj. T. Prakasam, the Madras Premier, at a meeting of the Madras Congress Legislature party, ruled out of order the "no-confidence" motion made against him by 30 members of the opposition. Sj. O. P. Ramaswami Reddiar was elected by the opposition members as the Leader of the party.

Sir A. Ramaswami Mudaliar was unanimously elected President of the United States Economic and Social Council which opened its session in New York.

In the Central Assembly, the Finance Member, Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan, while presenting the Budget Estimates pointed to the relief of the poorer classes for which provision has been made in the Budget by way of abolition of the Salt Tax, subsidization of imported food, grow-more-food grants and other measures. He added, "My first proposal in implementation of the policy I have dictated

is the setting up of a commission to investigate that aspect of great private accumulations of wealth in recent years which is concerned with our taxation."

The Convention of the A. I. Congress Socialist Party at Cawnpore approved of a vital change in the constitution of the party, whereby it would in future be called the Socialist Party (India) and its membership would be thrown open to non-Congressmen also.

March 1947

The Punjab Premier, Sir Khizr Hyat Khan Tiwana, tendered his resignation as Premier of the Cabinet.

The 20th annual session of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry met in New Delhi.

The Governor of the Punjab invited the Khan of Mamdot to form a new Ministry.

Communal disturbances broke out in the Punjab following the resignation of the Punjab Coalition Ministry.

The debate on India commenced in the House of Commons.

Mahatma Gandhi began his tour of the riot-affected area of Behar.

The Governor of the Punjab promulgated Sec. 93 in the province.

Mr. Winston Churchill suggested that the problem of India should be handed over to U. N. O. for solution.

The Congress Working Committee met in new Delhi to consider H.M.G. statement of February 20.

The Working Committee of the A. I. Hindu Mahasabha met in New Delhi to discuss the situation created by the British Govt's announcement of Feb. 20.

The Madras Premier, S. J. T. Prakasam tendered the resignation of his ministry to Acharya Kripalani, the Congress President.

Master Tara Singh said at Lahore: "Punjab is drifting towards a civil war."

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru arrived in Lahore and made a tour of the riot affected areas of the province.

The Central Assembly began a general discussion on the Budget.

The Muslim League decided to boycott the Inter-Asian Relations Conference.

Dr. S. P. Mookherjee declared at Calcutta, "Partition of Bengal is the only solution to the grave communal problem facing the province."

Lord Mountbatten, Governor-General designate of India, arrived in New Delhi.

The Inter-Asian Relations Conference began its historic session in New Delhi. Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru inaugurated the session.

Lord Wavell, the outgoing Viceroy, left New Delhi for London.

Lord Mountbatten was sworn in as Viceroy and Governor-General of India at New Delhi.

The Viceroy invited Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah for talks at New Delhi, Mr. Jinnah accepted the Viceroy's invitation.

Communal disturbances broke out in Calcutta.

Mr. Jinnah, speaking at Bombay, called for a truce on the basis of Pakistan, the elimination of British in India and India for Indians.

Mahatma Gandhi arrived in New Delhi and had an interview with H. E. the Viceroy.

The Standing Committee of the Chamber of Princes met in Bombay under the presidentship of the Nawab of Bhopal.

1st. The Negotiating Committee of the Constituent Assembly and the corresponding Committee of the Chamber of Princes met in New Delhi and appointed a sub-committee to prepare alternative schemes for the selection and allocation of States' representatives to the Constituent Assembly.

The Budget Session of the Madras Legislative Assembly commenced. The Budget estimates for 1947-48 introduced by the Premier, Mr. T. Prakasam, disclosed a small surplus of Rs. 57,000.

The Government of Sind's Budget for 1947-48, presented to the Sind Assembly by Mr. G. H. Hidayatullah, Premier, revealed a surplus of Rs. 3.1 lakhs.

The open session of the 5th conference of the Socialist Party of India at Cawnpore, adopted two resolutions, one demanding that all powers including the power of paramountcy be immediately transferred to the present Interim Government at the centre and all British troops be withdrawn and the other demanding end of personal rule in every State and full transference of power to the States' people.

Addressing the Convocation of the Agra University, Dr. Kailash Nath Katju, Minister of Justice, U. P. observed, "A united India is a historical necessity. The very physical configuration of the country invites the establishment of a central power. It would appear that India can never unlike Europe, contain within herself for any length of time, different sovereign Kingdoms, States and principalities.

2nd. The Punjab Premier, Malik Sir Khizr Hyat Khan Tiwana tendered his resignation as Premier of the Cabinet.

The Committee of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry in a statement on the Budget proposals, said that the 25% tax on profit over Rs. 1 lakh, the increase in the Corporation tax and the proposed tax on capital gains were bound to have serious effects and repercussions on the entire economic structure of the country.

3rd. The view that public enterprise, which offers a very speedy and efficient means of bringing about industrial development and expansion in the country, should not be allowed to stop but greater facilities be given for its development, was expressed by Lala Gurasharan Lal, while presiding over the 20th annual session of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry at New Delhi.

Mahatma Gandhi returned to Sodepore after completing his four months' continuous stay in Noakhali and Tiperrah.

Khan Iftikhar Hussain Khan of Mamdot, Leader of the Muslim League Assembly Party, was invited by the Punjab Governor to form a new Ministry. The decision to oppose "by every possible means the establishment of a Muslim League Government in the provinces so long as its objective is Pakistan or Muslim domination in the Punjab—the homeland of the Sikhs" was taken by the Panthic Akali Party at its meeting in Lahore.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah, in an interview on the resignation of the Punjab Ministry appealed for complete unity among Muslims. He said, "If we establish complete unity, co-operation and harmony among ourselves, it will not be difficult to settle with other communities or parties and the British Government."

In his inaugural address at the annual session of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, referring to the criticism of the Government's Budget proposals, declared, "It is entirely wrong if you imagine that this Government or any member of this Government, is out to injure industry. That would be folly on our part. We want to provide facilities for industry and facilities for production—technical, scientific, power resources and all that."

4th. The Central Assembly began a general discussion on the Budget.

A warning to private industrialists that if they are not willing to help the Government in improving the economic condition of the country, "there are other methods by which we shall be able to achieve that purpose" were uttered by Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan, Finance Member, replying to criticisms of the central

Budget. He further made it clear that Government had no intention to stiffle public enterprises and that proposed business profits tax was only for the current year and therefore those who talk of there being no production in the next year because of this tax are mistaken."

The Federation of the Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry concluded its session after passing a resolution on the economic policy "viewing with concern the deterioration in all spheres of economic activity created as a result of the absence of any definite economic policy on the part of the Government."

A revenue deficit of Rs. 47.2 lakhs were forecast by Mr. Sampurnanand, Finance Minister, while presenting the budget for 1947-48 in the U. P. Legislative Assembly.

The Government of Orissa's Budget estimates for 1947-48, presented by the Premier Sj. Hare Krishna Mahtab in the Orissa Assembly, revealed a deficit of Rs. 1 crore 10 lakhs.

Malik Khizr Hyat Khan Tiwana, the Punjab Premier, tendered the resignation of the Care-taker Government to the Governor of the Punjab.

Following the resignation of the Punjab Coalition Ministry, Hindus and Sikhs staged "Anti-Pakistan" demonstrations in Lahore. Thirteen persons were killed and 105 injured as a result of communal disturbances which broke out in Lahore following the demonstrations. Policed opened fire several times. Military was called out as a precautionary measure.

5th. The debate on India commenced in the House of Commons. Sir Stafford Cripps, President of the Board of Trade, moving the resolution on the February 20 statement, said in the House of Commons, "We have now reached the final and the most critical stage. We will have to take risks as to the effect of our action upon our country, upon India and upon the rest of the world. Our whole policy and action has been based upon acceptance of the Indian claim that they are worthy and fit for self-government and anyone who has the privilege of knowing their leaders would not for a moment doubt that claim." The main speaker of the opposition, Sir John Anderson, criticising the Labour Government's policy said that by fixing a date for withdrawal from India the Government had lost a bargaining power to fulfil their obligations in India.

The Council of State began a general discussion on the Budget proposals.

Mahatma Gandhi and his party arrived in Patna.

The Governor of the Punjab issued a proclamation under Section 93 of the Government of India Act, 1935. Since no alternative ministry was formed, the Governor also prorogued the Punjab Legislative Assembly.

Fresh outbreak of communal trouble occurred in Multan. The situation in Lahore continued unchanged. About 17 persons were killed and 82 others injured as a result of police firing.

Master Tara Singh, the Akali Leader, in a statement at Amritsar, appealed to all those who were opposed to Pakistan, to observe March 11 as "Anti-Pakistan day" to show their resentment of "Muslim League methods and their determination to fight the Muslim League domination."

6th. Mr. Winston Churchill, Leader of the Opposition, opening the second day's debate on India in the House of Commons, suggested that the problem of India should be handed over to the U. N. O. for solution. Declaring that the Indian political parties do not represent the great masses, Mr. Churchill said, "In handing over the Government of India to these so-called political classes, you are handing over to men of straw, of whom in a few years no trace will remain."—The Opposition's amendment declining to accept the Government's policy of transferring power from Britain to India by June, 1948 was defeated in the House of Commons by 337 votes to 185. The Government's motion asking the House to approve its policy was carried without a division. Mr. Attlee, replying to the debate, in the course of his speech, said, "We believe we have done great work in India. We believe the time has come when Indians must shoulder their responsibilities. We can help, but we cannot take the burden on ourselves."

The Congress Working Committee met in New Delhi and had general discussions on the British Government's statement of February 20, the ministerial crisis in Madras and the communal situation in the Punjab.

The situation in Lahore considerably worsened as a result of fresh outbreak of trouble. The day's casualties were 6 dead and 30 others injured. A 24 hour curfew was imposed on the city.

7th. The Congress Working Committee continued discussion on the situation in the Punjab and the implications of the British Government's statement of February 20.

The need for the production of durable cloth, which alone could solve to a very great extent the problem of the shortage of supplies, was emphasised by S. C. Rajagopalachari, Member for Industries and Supplies in his inaugural address at the Fourth A. I. Textile Conference at Cawnpore.

Acharya Kripalani, the Congress President, announced in New Delhi his acceptance of the resignation of S. Jai Prakesh Narsin from the Congress Working Committee.

Mr. H. S. Suhrawardy, the Bengal Premier, said at Rajshahi: "The time has definitely come when one-party rule should be revised in Bengal and other provinces. Government should be reconstituted with all the communities as our prosperity depends on the sole purpose of receiving freedom and retaining it."

The situation in Lahore showed definite signs of improvement, although tension prevailed everywhere. Major disturbances continued in Amritsar, Taxilla and Rawalpindi. The Punjab Peace Committee, including Congress, Sikh and Muslim League leaders issued an appeal to the citizens for a return to normal conditions.

8th. The Congress Working Committee concluded its session after adopting five resolutions on the political situation and on Congress organisational matters. The Committee invited the Muslim League to nominate representatives to meet Congress representatives in order to consider the situation that has arisen from the impending transfer of power and to desire means to meet the situation.

The Committee further demanded that the transfer of power, in order to be smooth, should be preceded by the recognition in practice of the Interim Government as the Dominion Government with effective control over service and administration and the Viceroy and the Governor-General functioning as the Constitutional head of the Government.

Referring to the Punjab events, the Committee urged the necessity of the division of Punjab into two provinces, "so that the predominantly Muslim part may be separated from the predominantly non-Muslim part."

Sardar Ajit Singh, the veteran Indian revolutionary leader, returned to India after 39 years' exile in Germany.

An appeal to the Hindus of Behar to contribute funds for the relief and rehabilitation of riot-affected people in that province was made by Mahatma Gandhi, in his post prayer speech at Patna.

The Working Committee of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha met in New Delhi to discuss the situation created by the British Government's statement of February 20. The Committee also discussed the report about the Punjab situation submitted by S. V. G. Deshpande.

The Madras Legislative Council passed into law the Madras Maintenance of Public Safety Order Bill as a measure directed against the "anarchical elements in the province."

Except for a few stray cases of assaults, Lahore was comparatively quiet. The situation in Amritsar, Multan and Rawalpindi was also under control.

9th. The view that, except for fixing a date for the complete transfer of power to responsible Indian hands, the whole of the announcement of the British Government of February 20 is vague and is likely to lead to unrest and strife in India, was expressed in a resolution passed by the Working Committee of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha. The resolution opposed the transfer of power to Provincial Government's "with regard to areas which are not fully represented in the Constituent Assembly owing to their perversity."

The Working Committee of the All-India Shia Political Conference, held in Lucknow, passed a resolution welcoming the British Government's statement of February 20 and urging the Muslim League to join the Constituent Assembly.

More cases of stray assaults were reported from Lahore. Wide-scale devastation of properties and houses formed the major disturbances in Murree and Taxilla.

10th. S. T. Prakasam, the Madras Premier handed over to the Congress President, Acharya Kripalani his resignation as well as those of his colleagues in the Ministry, so as to give the latter full freedom of action in the reconstitution of

The Budget estimate of the Government of Assam for 1947-48, placed before the Assembly by S. B. R. Medhi, Finance Minister, disclosed a deficit of Rs. 32.28 lakhs.

S. J. Mehr Chand Khanna, Finance Minister, N.W.F.P., presenting the Budget in the Legislative Assembly anticipated a small surplus of Rs. 2 lakhs for the year 1947-48.

The Central Assembly began a five-day discussion on the demands for grants.

The Bengal members of the Central Legislature waited in a deputation on Pt. Nehru and Sardar Patel and discussed the position of Bengal Hindus in the light of H. M. G's statement on India and also the recent parliamentary debates thereon.

The riot situation in Lahore and Rawalpindi was quiet. Large scale looting and arson occurred in Multan and Attock. Police and Military opened fire several times in Amritsar to prevent mob-violence. The Governor of the Punjab visited the riot-affected areas of the province.

11th. In his post-prayer speech at Patna, Mahatma Gandhi said, "The Muslim League cannot achieve Pakistan by the use of the sword nor the Hindus can stop by the use of sword. Even if the Muslim League demands Pakistan at the point of the sword or by the threat of killing, your duty is not to extend a counter-threat, but to tell the Muslim League to educate you about Pakistan and to give you more knowledge about it."

Commenting on the Punjab situation, the *London Times*, in an editorial, stated: "Arson and massacre, which have led all law-abiding citizens of the Punjab to welcome the intervention of British troops, provide a terrible warning of the dangers to public order inseparable from any attempt to enforce a communal-dictatorship by unconstitutional agitation." It added, "The danger is in no way lessened if the agitation claims to be based on democratic principles. It is a curious feature of the campaign conducted in the Punjab by the Muslim League that a 56 percent Muslim majority in the province enables it to invoke these principles, while it fiercely controverts them in other parts of India."

Maulana Abul Hamid Khan, President of the Assam Provincial Muslim League was arrested at Darang district (Assam).

In the Central Assembly, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel stated that the treatment meted out to the scheduled castes in India was one "wholly indefensible" and added, "to our shame. It must be admitted it was more or less a blot on our society."

The Council of State debated a resolution moved by Mr. V. V. Kalikar asking the Government of India to take immediate steps to introduce necessary legislation for abolition of appeals to the Privy Council.

"Anti-Pakistan Day" was observed by the Hindus and Sikhs in Lahore as a protest against the Muslim League attempt to foist communal rule in the province.

Lahore was quiet. The situation in Attock district and Rawalpindi remained unchanged. Looting and arson were reported from several areas.

12th. Master Tara Singh, the veteran Akali leader, said at Lahore, "Punjab is drifting towards a Civil War." He added, "I am not prepared to negotiate a settlement with the Muslim League until the present disturbances cease. The Muslim League want to intimidate us and we are not going to submit. They are the aggressors. It is, therefore, for them to issue an appeal to their followers to stop looting and arson. I see no need for a joint appeal for peace."

Mahatma Gandhi began his tour of the riot-affected areas of Bihar.

Mr. Jinnah, speaking at a party given in his honour by the Bombay Provincial Muslim Journalists' Association, said: "There was no other solution which would do credit and honour to the millions of Muslims in India except Pakistan."

In the Central Assembly, the President ruled out an adjournment motion tabled by S. S. Guruswamy to discuss "the proposed termination of the services of Ordinance Officers (civilian) of the Indian Army Ordinance Corps beginning from March 14, 1947, despite the interim recommendation of the Nationalisation Committee to withdraw the notices and release a corresponding number of British officers."

Wide-spread trouble of raids by armed mobs were reported from Multan, Rawalpindi and Campbellpur. Police and military opened fire at several places. Tension prevailed every where. Sardar Baldev Singh, Defence Member, accom-

panied by Dr. Gopichand Bhargava and Sardar Ujjal Singh visited the riot-affected areas of Rawalpindi.

Communal disturbances broke out in Peshawar, as a result of which curfew was imposed on the city. British troops were called out as a precautionary measure.

- 13th. Dr. Khan Sahab, Frontier Premier, addressing a public meeting at Peshawar, declared, "A false evolution has been forced on us. To-day a party has arisen in the Frontier which is not in favour of achieving India's goal of freedom. These party men are the friends of Mr. Churchill, the reactionary leader of the opposition whose sole aim is to create an unbridgeable gulf between the people of India and Great Britain.

Sir Evan Jenkins, the Governor of the Punjab met His Excellency the Viceroy at New Delhi.

The desirability of a joint Ministry instead of a one-party Government was emphasised by Mr. Suhrawardy, Chief Minister, Bengal, in an interview at Calcutta, discussing the implications of H. M. G's declaration about transference of power into Indian hands by June, 1948.

Several incidents, including cases of looting and arson were reported from some villages in Multan District. Minor disturbances continued in Amritsar. Large number of "goonda" elements were rounded up by the police in Lahore.

The Maharaja of Patiala, in a Communique announced the decision of the Patiala State to participate in the Constituent Assembly.

- 14th. Mr. T. Prakasam, the Madras Premier, tendered the resignation of his Ministry to the Governor. The Governor, however, deferred the acceptance of the resignation and requested Mr. Prakasam and his colleagues to remain in office until the Budget was passed. The Prime Minister agreed to the request. The Central Legislative Assembly concluded the debate on the general Budget demands after five days' discussion and all demands were put to vote and passed without a division. Replying to the cut motion raising the general policy of the Defence Department, both the Defence Member, Sardar Baldev Singh and the Defence Secretary, S. J. G. S. Bhalja gave satisfactory assurances to the members regarding speedy nationalisation of the Armed forces, withdrawal of Indian troops from abroad and reduction in defence expenditure.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru arrived in Lahore and had a discussion with the Punjab Governor on the communal situation in the province.

S. J. Jai Prakash Narain, General Secretary of the All-India Socialist Party, at a press conference in Bombay said, "The decision to change the name of the Congress Socialist party to the Socialist party (India) at the recent Cawnpore session does not account to parting of ways of Congressmen and Socialists."

The riot situation in Lahore and Amritsar was quiet. Renewed clash between the military and the armed raiders occurred in the districts of Campbellpur. Arson, looting and murders on a minor scale continued in Rawalpindi and Attock.

The situation in the riot affected areas in Noskhal and Tipperah was discussed in the Bengal Legislative Assembly in connection with the Budget demands for relief and rehabilitation of riot refugees.

- 15th. The Government of the Punjab in a communique issued from Lahore, placed the number of persons killed during the disturbances in the province, up to March 15, at 1036 and the number seriously injured at 1,110.

The appointment of a committee to review the Press Laws in British India was announced by the Government of India in a resolution in the *Gazette of India* from New Delhi.

An eight-year plan for post-war development of broadcasting in India was explained by Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Member for Information and Broadcasting at a press conference in New Delhi.

S. J. Sarat Chandra Bose, criticising the Congress Working Committee's resolution recommending a division of the Punjab and Bengal, said: "By accepting religion as the sole basis of the distribution of provinces, the Congress has cut itself away from its natural moorings and has almost undone the work it has been doing for the last 80 years. The resolution, in fact, is the result of a defeatist mentality and was no solution of the communal problem." He further urged the establishment of socialism as the only solution for the vexed communal problem in the country.

S. J. L. B. Bhopatkar and S. J. Asutosh Lahiri, president and general

secretary respectively of the A. I. Hindu Mahasabha were served with an order from the Punjab Government at Ferozepore cantt. banning their entry into the province for a period of six months.

The Working Committee of the Jamiat-ul-ulema-i-Hind, at its session in New Delhi, passed a resolution reiterating its faith in a United India and strongly protesting against the division of the country on communal lines.

The question of "inefficiency and communalism" in Police administration in the province was raised by the opposition members during discussion in the Bengal Legislative Assembly.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, accompanied by Sardar Swaran Singh, Dewan Chaman Lal and Dr. Gopichand Bhargava visited the riot-affected areas of Rawalpindi, Master Tara Singh had an interview with Pt. Nehru regarding the Punjab situation.

Except for some localised trouble in Attock district, the situation in the Punjab was quiet.

16th. Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, Minister for Health, United provinces, addressing the convocation of the Lucknow University, defined the role of Indian youth "at a time when suspicion and hatred have captured the minds of our people and are tearing the soul of India asunder."

The Executive Committee of the India Council of World Affairs released the names of the personnel of the Indian delegation to the Asian Relations Conference. It also announced Mrs. Sarojini Naidu as the leader of the Indian delegation.

The Working Committee of the All-India Forward Bloc at Calcutta held a discussion on the British Government's pronouncement of February 20, "and the consequent need for preparations for final seizure of power by the Indian people themselves."

Under the auspices of the Bengal Provincial Hindu Mahasabha a two-day conference of Bengal Hindus at Calcutta passed a resolution advocating the scheme for partition of Bengal as the best means to prevent the destruction of the fabric of Bengal's national life." The Conference further called upon H. M. G. as well as the Interim Government and the Constituent Assembly that Bengal should be immediately partitioned and a separate State for Bengal Hindus must be set up before any transfer of power took place from H. M. G.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru made an aerial tour of the riot-affected areas of Multan and Amritsar. A Joint Peace Committee by Hindu and Muslim leaders was formed to establish cordial relations between the two communities.

17th. Mr. Lisquat Ali Khan, Finance Member, explained at question-time in the Central Assembly that India was not losing anything by continuing as a member of the Dollar Pool. By virtue of her membership, India got from the Pool all the dollar currency that she wanted.

Sr. V. G. Deshpande, General-Secretary of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha was arrested at Lahore on a charge of defying the extirpation order served on him by the Punjab Government.

In an interview at Bombay, Miss Mumtaz Daulatana, General-Secretary of the Punjab Provincial Muslim League, said: "Mr. Jinnah has directed the Punjab Muslim League to give its unstinted and wholehearted co-operation to the administration in the Punjab in restoring order in the province and has also reminded the Mussalmans of the Punjab that it is their sacred duty to protect the minorities that live amongst them."

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru returned to Delhi after paying a visit to the riot-affected areas of the Punjab. Giving his impressions of the tour, Pandit Nehru said, "I have seen ghastly sights and I have heard of behaviour by human beings which would degrade brutes. All that has happened in the Punjab is intimately connected with political affairs. If there is a grain of intelligence in any person he must realise that whatever political objective he may aim at, this is not the way to attain it. Any such attempt must bring, as it has in a measure brought, ruin and destruction."

Sardar Abdur Rab Nishtar, Communications Member, addressing a press conference at Peshawar, said that the main object for starting the Muslim League civil disobedience movement in the Frontier was to redress certain grievances of the Frontier Muslims "against the abuse of powers by the Government which has become intolerable."

Fresh disturbances broke out in Shahapur and Ambala districts, Military

opened fire on several occasions. The situation in Attack, Misawali and Rawalpindi remained still disturbed.

18th. The Central Assembly began the debate on the Commerce Member, Mr. I. I. Obundrigar's bill to continue for a limited period powers to prohibit or control imports and exports, as reported by the select committee.

Disturbances continued in the districts of Attock and Ferozepur. Great tension prevailed in Rohtak as a result of false rumours. Lahore and Multan remained comparatively quiet.

The view that the latest declaration of the British Government to transfer power to Indian hands after 15 months was a "well-designed and serious attempt at disrupting India in the name of bogus transference of power" was expressed in a resolution passed at a 3-day session of the All-India Forward Bloc at Calcutta. The resolution expressed the opinion that British Imperialism had sought through this statement not to voluntarily liquidate itself but to perpetuate its stronghold over India in newer and subtler ways and called upon the people to prepare for fresh struggle under Netaji's slogan 'all power to the India people.'

19th. In the Central Assembly, the Finance Member, Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan presented the report of the select committee on the Business Profits Tax Bill which contains the main financial proposals of the Budget.

The Muslim League party in the Central Legislature, at its meeting, decided to boycott the Asian Relations Conference to be held on March 28 and decline the invitations issued to them.

The Governor of the Punjab enacted legislation called the Punjab Disturbed Areas Act to suppress disorder and to restore and maintain public order in the province. The Act provides the punishment of death for offences of attempted murder, abduction, rape, dacoity and arson committed in the disturbed areas, notwithstanding any punishment prescribed in the Indian Penal Code.

Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherjee declared at Calcutta, "Partition of Bengal alone will offer a peaceful solution of the grave communal problem confronting the province. This will give the two major communities in Bengal full freedom to develop their own culture and tradition in the areas where they are in predominant numbers; both are sure to recognise soon that it will be to their mutual interest to guarantee full protection to the respective minorities in the two (proposed) provinces."

The Central Assembly passed the Commerce Member's Bill to continue prohibition or control of exports and imports.

No fresh incidents were reported from any parts of the Punjab, although tension prevailed everywhere.

20th. Mr. A. V. Alexander, Defence Secretary opening the debate in the House of Commons declared, "Britain will not contemplate total withdrawal of her forces from India in the intervening period before power is transferred."

It was officially announced in Lahore that 2,049 persons have so far been killed and 1,103 seriously injured in the recent disturbances in the Punjab.

21st. On the eve of his departure from India, Lord Wavell, the Governor-General in a broadcast message to the Indian people, said, "You have had dangerous and difficult days ahead. But you will overcome them. I am conscious of mistakes I have made in these years, but hope you will know that I have always tried to work for the welfare of India's inhabitants and for the advancement of India to self-rule."

Formal talks between Sir Khizr Hyat Khan, former Premier of the Punjab and Mr. Ghaznafar Ali Khan, Health Member, took place in Lahore with a view to bringing about a reconciliation between the Muslim League and the Muslim Unionists.

At a meeting of the Madras Congress Legislature Party, S. O. Ramaswami Reddiar, M.L.C. was elected Leader of the Party defeating the former by 116 votes to 78. The Governor of Madras invited S. Reddiar to form a new Ministry.

Master Tara Singh, the Akali leader, at a press conference at New Delhi, expressed his views on the problems facing the Punjab. He said, "We shall not join any Ministry which is dominated by the Muslim League. There are two alternative plans. One is that if there is a change in the composition of the Punjab Assembly on the basis of 30 per cent of seats for Hindus, 30 per

cent for Sikhs and 40 per cent for Muslims, it does not matter who the Premier is. If we cannot get that constitutional change, then in the present set up, the Premier must either be a Sikh or a Hindu."

Sj. Jai Prakash Narain, the Socialist leader, giving his impressions of his tour of the Punjab, said, "The present disturbances in the Punjab were carefully planned and were part of a conspiracy to instal the Muslim League in office as a step towards the final installation of Pakistan. Among other participants in this conspiracy are assuredly Governor Jenkins and his British colleagues in the province."

22nd. Lord Louis Mountbatten, Viceroy and Governor-General designate arrived in New Delhi from London.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah, in a message from Bombay, appealed to the Muslims in India to observe "Pakistan Day" on March 23 strictly in a peaceful manner and in complete co-operation with the authorities and thus maintain perfect law and order.

The Congress Constitution Committee, appointed by the A.I.C.C., which met in Lucknow, under the presidentship of Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, recommended that Congress should ordinarily meet every three years, all Congress elections should be triennial and the Working Committee should consist of 21 members instead of 15 at present.

Khan Iftikhar Hussain Khan of Mamdot, leader of the Muslim League Parliamentary party in the Punjab, had a two-hour interview with Sir Khizr Hyat Khan Tiwana.

Fresh disturbances, including looting, arson and desecration of places of worship broke out in Hazara District in the Frontier. A 24-hour curfew was imposed on the affected areas.

23rd. The Inter-Asian Relations Conference began its historic session in New Delhi. Two-hundred and fifty delegates representing the various Asian countries attended the opening plenary session.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, inaugurating the Asian Relations Conference, said that in this atomic age Asia will have to function effectively in the maintenance of peace." Explaining the objectives of the Conference, Pandit Nehru said, "It is not of the past that we are going to think but rather of the future. That future, we hope, will be greater even than the past. It will not be a future for Asia alone but for the world, for, we do not meet to form a new Asian bloc of nations against others but rather to co-operate with all the nations of the world and help in furthering the cause of peace and freedom."

Viscount Wavell accompanied by Lady Wavell left New Delhi for London.

The New Congress Ministry of Madras assumed office. The following were elected members of the Cabinet:—Sj. O. P. Ramaswamy Reddiar, Dr. T. S. S. Rajan, Dr. P. Subbarayan, Sj. M. Bhaktavatsalam, Sj. B. Gopala Reddy, Sj. K. Chandramouli, Sj. H. Sitarama Reddi and Sj. K. Madhava Menon.

In her presidential address at the Asian Relations Conference, Srimati Sarojini Naidu referred to Asia's resurgence and explained that Asia stood for common ideal of peace—not the peace of negation or surrender, but "the peace of a militant creative human spirit that rises to exaltation."

S. Jagjivan Ram, Labour Member, addressing the 18th. session of the U. P. Depressed Class League conference at Cawnpore, said, "Harijans have been kept suppressed for long and the time has now come when justice should be done to them."

24th. The two-day plenary session of the Inter-Asian Relations Conference concluded after messages wishing success of the conference from various countries of the east were read out.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, addressing the Conference on behalf of India, referred to the essential unity between the various countries of Asia and their peoples and hoped that out of the foundations laid at the conference would grow "that great tree of Asian unity and out of that again will grow something even greater—world peace based on world freedom."

Lord Mountbatten was sworn in as Viceroy and Governor-General of India at the Viceroy's House, New Delhi by Sir Patrick Spens, Chief Justice of India. In a short speech immediately after the swearing-in ceremony, Lord Mountbatten stressed the need for reaching a solution within the next few months and promised his readiness to help those who worked towards this end. He further appealed

to every one to avoid "any word or action which might lead to bitterness or add to the toil of innocent victims.

In the Central Assembly, the Finance Member, S. Liaquat Ali Khan moved for consideration of the Finance Bill.

Communal riot broke out in Girgaon district in the Punjab. Besides looting, arson and devastation of properties, about 8 persons were killed and 19 injured during the day.

The Working Committee of the All-India Majlis-e-Ahbar, at its session in Lahore, passed a resolution "suggesting the revision of its policy of co-operation with the Congress and giving it a new orientation in accordance with the spirit and ideal of the Muslim nation."

Except for a few cases of stray assaults, the situation in the Punjab was quiet.

25th. The Budget estimates of the Punjab Government, published in a Gazette extraordinary issued from Lahore, in view of the promulgation of Section 93 in the province, disclosed a revised surplus of Rs. 47 lakhs for the current year and a surplus of Rs. 125 lakhs for the year 1947-48.

The Finance Member, Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan, announced in the Central Assembly the Government's decision to accept amendments to the Business Profits Tax and the Capital Gains Tax.

The delegates to the Asian Relations Conference began the group discussion on the various common problems facing the Asian countries.

26th. The Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten invited Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. M. A. Jinnah for talks in New Delhi.

The Inter-Asian Relations Conference adopted a four-point report on racial problems and inter-racial migration. The report suggested that there should be a complete legal equality of citizens, complete religious freedom of all citizens, no public social disqualification of any racial group and equality before law of persons of foreign origin who have settled in the country.

Addressing the Baroda Legislative Assembly, Sir B. L. Mitter, Dewan of Baroda gave the assurance that he would work for an undivided India with a strong Centre. He added, "Baroda has decided to join the Union. It is not going to set up as an independent State."

Policemen all over the Behar Province went on a strike as a result of a clash between Indian troops and armed policemen which occurred in Patna.

Communal disturbances broke out afresh in Calcutta. Police opened fire several times. At least 12 persons were killed and over hundred injured during the day.

27th. After a four-day debate, the Central Assembly adopted the Finance Member, Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan's motion for consideration of the Bill to give effect to the financial proposals of the Government for the year beginning April 1, 1947.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah, speaking at a reception in Bombay, called for a truce on the basis of Pakistan, the elimination of British in India and India for Indians. He added, "I am fighting for Pakiatan, which means I am fighting for the freedom of India. I am fighting for Pakiatan because it is the only practical solution for solving the problem and the other ideal of a United India and a rule based on parliamentary system of Government is a vain dream and an impossibility. India is neither a country nor a nation, but is a score of nations."

The Asian Relations Conference adopted the report of the group on Cultural Affairs. The report referred to the need for the development of scientific research in Asia and, after paying tribute to Western achievements in the scientific field, warned the Conference against being tied to the apron strings of Europe. The Conference also discussed a scheme for setting up a Cultural and Scientific Asian Organisation with a permanent secretary to promote scientific and cultural collaboration and suggested that a school of Asian studies be set up for that purpose.

Mr. Jinnah accepted the Viceroy's invitation to meet him in New Delhi.

Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, speaking on the Frontier policy, said in the Central Assembly that Free India could not approach the Frontier on the same terms as the British Government had done in the past. He added, "Our whole approach to the problem has to be in a friendly and co-operative way and not based on hush money and the like, but rather on spending money, on removing their economic difficulties and improving their standards."

There was no marked change in the riot situation in Calcutta. Four persons were killed and 30 others injured in stray incidents that occurred in the northern, eastern and central parts of the city.

28th. The Central Assembly passed the Finance Member's Bill without a division.

Five new Ministers of the Madras Cabinet were sworn in by the Governor of Madras. They were—Sj. T. S. Avinashilingam Chettiar, Mr. Denial Thomas, Sj. V. Kurmayya, Sj. Kala Venkata Rao, and Sj. A. V. Shetty.

Prof. Abdul Bari, President of the Behar Provincial Congress Committee, was shot dead at Khasrupur, about 18 miles east of Patna.

H. E. the Viceroy invited the Governors of all provinces and the Governor-designate of Assam to a Conference in New Delhi to be held in April.

Disturbances, including several cases of rioting, arson assaults and bomb-throwing continued in Calcutta. Unofficial estimates of casualties for the day were 10 killed and 100 others injured. Troops were called out as a precautionary measure.

29th. The Inter-Asian Relations Conference discussed the Group Reports on the transition from colonial to national economy, and agricultural and industrial reconstruction. The first report centred round the role of foreign capital in Asian countries and expressed the view, that in order to bring about the transition from the colonial to the national economy, it is necessary that the State should be able to free itself of the dominance of foreign political influence and of foreign capital and personnel.

Mr. Ghaznafar Ali Khan, Health Member, in a statement demanded that the Governor of the Punjab should either allow the leader of the Muslim League in the provincial Assembly to form a Ministry or dissolve the Legislature and hold fresh elections.

The Council of State began general discussion on the Finance Bill.

The keeping in abeyance of central subsidies to Bengal pending a decision as to whether the Province was to be partitioned or not was urged by Sj. S. K. Roy Choudhry, in the Council of State. He also suggested that the provincial Governor should forthwith be asked to set up regional and zonal Ministries in Bengal.

The riot situation in Calcutta considerably deteriorated as a result of further incidents. Unofficial estimates of the casualties were 18 dead and over 100 others injured during the day.

30th. The decision to start a civil disobedience movement in all the districts of Assam was officially taken by the Working Committee of the Assam Provincial Muslim League, at its meeting in Shillong.

Mahatma Gandhi left Patna for New Delhi in response to the invitation from the Viceroy.

The riot situation in Calcutta showed no signs of improvements. Wide-scale looting, arson, murder etc. continued unabated throughout the day. Trouble also spread to the suburbs. Police and Military opened fire several times. 16 persons were killed and over 150 injured.

Communal disturbances broke out in Bombay, Ranchi and Cawnpore. Unofficial estimates put the number of casualties in Bombay as 40 dead and 137 injured. The Governor of Bombay promulgated a state of Emergency in the city.

The Committee of Ministers of the Chamber of Princes, which met in Bombay, made an exhaustive survey of the political development in the country and also considered the future course of action to be adopted by the States in the light of the British Government's statement of February 20, fixing the date of transfer of power to Indian hands.

The Standing Committee of the Chamber of Princes met in Bombay under the presidency of the Nawab of Bhopal, Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes.

31st. Mahatma Gandhi arrived in New Delhi and had an interview with the Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten and Lady Mountbatten.

The Nawab of Bhopal, Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes commended to the States' Constitutional Advisory Committee for acceptance, the suggestion made by the Committee of Ministers of the Chamber for a round table conference of the major political parties including Indian States. The Conference was suggested by the Ministers to bring about a speedy and satisfactory settlement of the points in dispute and to reach a measure of accord with the

future administrative machinery in India on essential and vital matters like Defence and Communications.

The Council of State passed without a division, the Finance Bill and adjourned till April 3, 1947.

Sardar Baldev Singh, Defence Member, replying to a debate on the Finance Bill in the Council of State, outlined the Government's plan for the nationalisation of the Armed Forces and declared that steps were being adopted to take over Defence along with the transfer of power.

Rioting in Calcutta continued unchanged. At least 10 persons were killed and 44 others injured in incidents during the day. Business life of the city remained completely paralysed.

April 1947

Mahatma Gandhi addressed the Asian Relations Conference.

The Bengal Provincial Hindu Mahasabha Conference urged the immediate partition of Bengal.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah met the Viceroy at New Delhi.

Prominent Hindu and Sikh leaders of the Punjab demanded the partition of the province.

Acharya Kripalani, the Congress President, met the Viceroy.

Communal trouble flared up in Amritsar.

The Budget Session of the Central Legislative Assembly adjourned *sine die*.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru addressed the annual session of the A. I. Manufacturers' Organisation in New Delhi.

Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah issued a joint appeal denouncing violence.

A two-day Conference of Provincial Governors opened in New Delhi.

The Budget Session of the Council of State adjourned *sine die*.

Lord Listowel succeeded Lord Pethic Lawrence as the Secretary of State for India.

The 6th. annual session of the A. I. Newspaper Editors' Conference met in Madras under the presidentship of Sj. Devadas Gandhi.

The annual session of the A. I. States' People's Conference opened at Gwalior, with Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya presiding.

Wide scale communal trouble were reported from the frontier provinces.

Sj. Jagjivan Ram, Labour Member, inaugurated the Indian Labour Conference in New Delhi.

Communal disturbances broke out in Calcutta.

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, in a statement, appealed to the Indian Princes to join the Constituent Assembly.

Mr. H. S. Suhrawardy, the Bengal Premier, urged the creation of an "united, undivided Sovereign Bengal."

The third preliminary session of the Indian Constituent Assembly opened in New Delhi with representatives of eight Indian States.

The Viceroy made a tour of the riot-affected areas of the Frontier province.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah, in a statement, denounced the demand for the partition of the Punjab and Bengal "as a sinister move actuated by spite and bitterness."

The decision of the British Government on the compensation of

members of the Secretary of State's services in India was announced simultaneously in London and New Delhi.

1st. The second Gandhi-Mountbatten meeting took place in New Delhi. The interview lasted over 2 hours.

Mahatma Gandhi, addressing the Asian Relations Conference, urged the delegates assembled to work for the realisation of "One World." He said, "I would not like to live if it was not one world. I would like to see that dream realised in my life time." Gandhiji also expressed the hope that the Conference would meet yearly or once in two or three years, preferably in India.

The Bombay Legislative Assembly passed a resolution recommending to the Government to convey to the Constituent Assembly the opinion that "redistribution of provinces on a linguistic basis is a necessary preliminary to the evolution of an integral Constitution for India and that this question should, therefore, be considered early."

The Central Assembly passed without a division the Business Profits Tax Bill as amended by the Finance Member.

The situation in Calcutta remained unchanged. Stray assaults and arson continued throughout the day.

2nd. The Asian Relations Conference concluded its session in New Delhi. The Conference decided to set up a permanent Asian Relations Organisation and elected a Provincial General Council with two representatives from each of the participating countries. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was unanimously elected President of the Council. It was also provisionally decided that the next session of the Conference would be held in 1949 in China.

Mahatma Gandhi, addressing the Asian Relations Conference, said: "East must conquer West by the message of truth and love."

A Conference of the rulers of Indian States in Bombay, convened by the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes, the Nawab of Bhopal, adopted a resolution ratifying the agreement reached between the Negotiating Committee of the Princes Chamber and the Constituent Assembly. The resolution gave freedom to the individual States to go into the Constituent Assembly "at any time judged appropriate by the States concerned."

The third interview between Mahatma Gandhi and the Viceroy lasted 2 hours.

A deputation of Bengal members of the Central Legislature waited on Mahatma Gandhi and placed before him the case for the creation of a separate autonomous province in Bengal within the Indian Union.

With the exception of a few incidents, the situation in Calcutta was comparatively quiet. Tension prevailed everywhere.

3rd. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, speaking at Ahmedabad, in reply to Mr. Jinnah's recent speech reaffirming the demand of Pakistan, characterised the theory of Pakistan as a "huge joke" and a "child's play" and declared that it could be attained only on the basis of justice and not by force of arms or the sword. He added that the Congress was always prepared to refer the issue to arbitration. Appealing to the Princes to join the Constituent Assembly, Sardar Patel warned them against a policy which might alienate the sympathies of the people.

Prominent Sikh leaders and legislators of the Punjab met in Lahore and unanimously demanded the Partition of the Punjab "as the only solution to the present deadlock in the Province."

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru announced in the Central Assembly that the Government of India proposed to place before the judges of the Federal Court the case of Indian National Army prisoners.

Calcutta was quiet.

4th. Dr. Sultan Sjahrir, the Indonesian Prime Minister, in a broadcast from New Delhi, said, "We are confident that India will soon overcome all her troubles—internal as well as external—and win her freedom without being plunged into disorder and suffering."

The fifth and last meeting between the Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten and Mahatma Gandhi concluded in New Delhi.

The Executive Committee of the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee resolved that "if His Majesty's Government contemplate handing over its power to the existing Government of Bengal, which is determined to the formation into a separate sovereign state and which by its composition is a communal party

Government, such portions of Bengal as are desirous of remaining within the Union of India should be allowed to remain so and be formed into a separate province within the Union of India". The Committee also urged the setting up of a regional Ministry in the interim period pending final transfer of power.

Mr. N. C. Chatterjee, in his presidential address at the 3-day session of the Bengal Provincial Hindu Mahasabha Conference at Tarakeswar, said, "Our demand for the partition of Bengal is prompted by the desire to prevent disintegration of the nationalist element, to preserve Bengal's culture and to secure a homeland for the Hindus of Bengal which will constitute a national State as a part of India and will afford protection to the minority in Eastern Bengal."

5th. Mr. Jinnah, President of the A. I. Muslim League, met the Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten at New Delhi.

The Bengal Provincial Hindu Conference authorized Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherjee to constitute a Council of Action to take steps for the establishment of a separate homeland for the Hindus of Bengal in collaboration with all nationalist elements in the country.

The assertion that on the restoration of normal and peaceful atmosphere, the Sikhs will be prepared to enter into negotiation on the basis of division of the Punjab, which now seemed to be the only solution both for long term and interim arrangements, was made by Sardar Swaran Singh, leader of the Panthic party in the Punjab Assembly and Sardar Ujjal Singh, Member of the Constituent Assembly, in a press interview at Lahore.

6th. Mahatma Gandhi began his 24 hour fast in New Delhi "for the sake of vindicating Swaraj through Hindu Muslim unity."

Mr. B. G. Kher, Premier of Bombay, laid the foundation stone of the National Chemical Laboratory at Poona.

A proposal that 100,000 volunteers should be enrolled by June 30 to carry on a campaign for the establishment of a separate homeland for Hindus in Bengal was adopted at the conference of Bengal Hindus at its concluding session. The Conference also urged that a committee of experts should be appointed to delimit the boundaries of the proposed Hindu province of Bengal and also stated that the Constituent Assembly should appoint a Boundary Commission to settle the frontier and frame a constitution for the new province which would form a part of the Indian Union.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah met H. E. the Viceroy for the second time.

The hope "that prospects of a self-Government for India will begin to improve at once if the political leaders thought and talked less of the power they want to secure and more of the great responsibilities which they have to assume shortly in order to protect the life, honour and liberty of the 400 millions of their countrymen and to raise 90 percent of them from their miserable submerged condition in the scale of humanity", was expressed by Sir Abdur Rahim, former President of the Central Legislative Assembly at New Delhi.

7th. The Central Assembly passed the Income-Tax Act (Amendment) Bill and the Capital Gains Tax Bill as reported by the Select Committee.

The third meeting between Mr. Jinnah and the Viceroy lasted over 2 hours.

A clarion call to the Harijans of India to align themselves wholly with the Congress during the critical days when power was being transferred by the British Government and not to commit political *harakiri* by co-operating with the Muslim League, was made by Pt. H. J. Khandekar, M. L. A. (C. P.), presiding over the 10th annual session of the All-India Depressed Classes League held at Patna. He added, "Those of us who are still flirting with the Muslim League in the hope that something will turn out by such co-operation, have to cast off wisdom to the winds. If Mr. Jinnah says to us that we should not seek quislings in Muslim camps, we must be equally emphatic in our demand that he should seek none among the Harijans."

In his inaugural address at the Kosi Sufferers' Conference at Bhagalpur, S. C. H. Bhabha, member for works, mines and power, outlined the main features of the Kosi project of the Government of India.

8th. The Central Assembly passed the Rubber (Production and Marketing) Bill as reported by the select committee, the Bill to further amend the Reserve Bank of India Act and the Bill further to amend the Tariff Act 1934 and the Sugar Industry (protection) Act 1932.

Commenting on the partition agitation in the province, Mr. H. S. Subrawardy, Chief Minister of Bengal, in an interview, said: "I have always held the view that Bengal cannot be partitioned. I am in favour of an united and greater Bengal."

Addressing the fifth session of the All-India Local Self-Government Conference at New Delhi, Mrs. Vijaya Laxmi Pandit declared, "There can be no political freedom worth the name if its roots are not laid in the narrow circle of local self-government." Mrs. Pandit stressed the need of associating the common man with the administration of the country. The future, she said, should lay in the hands of the people and not with any leader however eminent he might be.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah had a further interview with the Viceroy.

The situation in Calcutta deteriorated as a result of fresh recrudescence of communal trouble.

Mr. Jinnah met the Viceroy for the fifth time.

The Council of State passed the Business Profits Tax Bill.

The Dewan of Cochin, in an interview, announced the States' participation in the working of the Constituent Assembly.

Calcutta remained unchanged.

10th. The Congress President, Acharya Kripalani met H. E. the Viceroy at New Delhi.

Mr. Jinnah had his sixth interview with Lord Mountbatten.

The Central Assembly passed the Bill to amend the Indian Coinage Act. The Bill authorised the Government to issue nickel rupee coins in place of the quaternary silver rupee.

In his post prayer speech, Mahatma Gandhi reiterated his faith in the good intentions of the British Government and the Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten, saying, "British Government are sincere and the Viceroy has come with a good and sincere heart."

Mr. Henry F. Grady, the first U. S. Ambassador-designate to India, declared at Washington, "India has a great future, but the key to that future is the elimination of communal strife and the development of co-operation among all her people. Her strength and the basis of her progress as well as the realisation of her great destiny lie in national unity."

Except for a few stray incidents, Calcutta was quiet.

11th. Eleven representatives from Bengal to the Central Legislature submitted to the Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten a memorandum "asking for the constitution of a separate autonomous province in West and North Bengal within the Indian Union." It also requested the Viceroy to install immediately as an interim and transitional arrangement, two regional administrations with separate ministries under a common Governor for the two parts of the existing province of Bengal as an immediate step to prevent more "blood-shed and chaos" in Calcutta and other parts of Bengal.

Mr. J. N. Mandal, Law Member, introduced into the Central Assembly the Hindu Code Bill which reproduced the draft Hindu code prepared by the Hindu Law Committee. The Bill aimed at providing uniformity in all branches of Hindu law for all provinces and for all sections.

The Council of State passed the Reserve Bank Act (Amendment) Bill de-linking the rupee from sterling, whereby the rupee becomes an independent currency taking its place in its own right among the currencies of nations which are members of the International Monetary Fund.

In the Central Assembly, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Member for External Affairs, moved a resolution recommending ratification of the Peace Treaties with Italy, Roumania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Finland signed in Paris on February 10, 1947 by Sir Samuel Runganadhan, High Commissioner for India in London, on behalf of India.

Maulana Tayyebullah, President of the Assam Provincial Congress Committee, in a press interview, characterised the Muslim League movement of "invasion of Assam" as a move symptomatic of utter political frustration.

There was a sudden recrudescence of communal trouble in Amritsar. Police opened fire at several places. About 16 persons were killed and 46 others injured during the day. A 24-hour curfew was imposed on the city.

12th. Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Food Member, speaking at Bombay, expressed the hope that freedom was near at hand, the unity of India would be main-

tained, and that all sections of the people would stand solidly united behind the Constituent Assembly. Referring to the League's demand for division of India, he said, "If, as desired, we have but to divide our country, we have also to consider the question of dividing those areas where Hindus are in a minority, as we have to divide Bengal and the Punjab."

The Budget session of the Central Legislative Assembly adjourned *sine die* after passing a number of official Bills.

The situation in Amritsar improved slightly although stray assaults and arson continued throughout the day.

- 13th Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, addressing a Jallianwallah Bagh day meeting in New Delhi, said, "Time has now come when we should decide one way or the other. The urgency of the time requires that responsible persons of various political parties should sit round a table and make a final decision. He added, "We do not want to compel any province or portion of the country to join Pakistan or Hindusthan. If parts of Bengal and the Punjab want to separate, no one can compel them the other way."

Addressing the Hindusthan Mazdoor Sevak Sangh at Bombay, Mr. Jagjivan Ram, Labour Member, gave an assurance that the Governments both at the Centre and in the provinces sincerely desired better conditions for workers. He advised the workers to form an united, solid and strong front so that no employer or Government dared refuse their rightful demands.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah presided over the annual general meeting of the Muslim League party in the Central Legislature.

The food position in India was reviewed by Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Food Member, at a press conference in Bombay. He said, "The food situation in the country at this time is somewhat easier than what it was last year about this time; but it is not free from anxiety."

- 14th. The need for rapid industrialisation of India was stressed by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, while inaugurating the 7th annual session of the All-India Manufacturers' Organisation in New Delhi. Referring to the demand for a declaration of the Government's attitude towards nationalisation, Pt. Nehru said that he could not fix any date for such an announcement, because they were now in a peculiar state of transition and crisis and were confronted with hundreds of urgent problems requiring solution. Pandit Nehru also disclosed the Government's decision to set up a "Scientific Man-power Committee" to ensure that no scientific or technical talent in the country was wasted.

An appeal to Congressmen all over the country to unite and face the most critical period lying ahead was made by Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel at Bombay. Sardar Patel added that the time had arrived when the Congress had to settle its differences with the Muslim League one way or the other. He appealed to the League not to look to Britain for conceding its demand of Pakistan, but to reach a settlement with their fellow-countrymen in a constructive spirit.

Mahatma Gandhi returned to Behar from New Delhi.

The riot situation in Amritsar was quiet.

- 15th. The Council of State passed the Bill to amend the Indian Coinage Act, enabling the Government to issue nickel rupee coins.

On H. E. the Viceroy's initiative and request, Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. M. A. Jinnah issued a joint appeal denouncing violence. The following declaration was signed by them and authorised for publication:—"We deeply deplore the recent acts of lawlessness and violence that have brought the utmost disgrace on the fair name of India and the greatest misery to the innocent people, irrespective of who were the aggressors and who were the victims."

"We denounce for all time the use of force to achieve political ends, and we call upon all the communities of India, to whatever persuasion they may belong, not only to refrain from acts of violence and disorder, but also to avoid both in speech and in writing, any incitement to such acts."

A two-day conference of the Governors of the provinces opened in New Delhi at the Viceroy's House to discuss the problems arising out of the British Government's recent declaration. All the Governors, with the exception of the Governor of Bengal, who was represented by Sir Akbar Hydari, Governor-designate of Assam, were present at the Conference.

The Government of India released a resolution on the report of the Ports (Technical) Committee published in May, 1946

Mrs. Pearl S. Buck, the noted American author, declared at New York,

"There is more hope of unity between Muslims and the Hindus in India than there is between the Left and the Right in China. Unless India can act with leadership in the East and for the world, there will be no opposing voice anywhere to-day to the narrow nationalism and the inhuman political creed, which I see in the West."

16th. The two-day conference of Provincial Governors under the presidentship of Lord Mountbatten, concluded its deliberations in New Delhi.

A resolution deploring the severe fresh taxation placed upon the industries in the recent budget and recommending to the Government of India to appoint forthwith an independent committee of which the commercial and industrial community of India should find adequate representation in order to fully examine the present taxation policy with particular reference to the effects of direct and indirect taxation on the future industrialisation of India, was adopted by the A. I. Manufacturers' Organisation Conference in New Delhi.

The Council of State endorsed the joint appeal issued by Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah denouncing acts of lawlessness and violence in the country.

The standing committee of the All-India States' People's Conference, which met in New Delhi under the presidency of Dr. Pattabhai Sitaramayya, discussed a number of draft resolutions to be placed before the annual session to be held in Gwalior.

A two-day Conference of Provincial and States' Labour Ministers opened in New Delhi under the presidentship of Sj. Jagjivan Ram, Labour Member, Government of India.

The Budget session of the Council of State adjourned *sine die* after passing a number of official Bills.

Addressing a public meeting at Surat, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel renewed his appeal to the Muslim League to consider the Congress invitation quickly and send its representatives for direct talks with the Congress to settle the various issues arising out of the British decision to withdraw from India. "Otherwise," he said, "we may not be ready to receive power in 1948 and while posterity may look upon the British Raj as Ram Raj, the British themselves may consider they could stay in India for some more time."

17th. The Congress President, Acharya Kripalani had a 75 minutes' interview with the Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten. Khwaja Nazimuddin, Deputy Leader of the Muslim League party in the Central Assembly also met the Viceroy.

It was officially announced in London that Lord Pethic Lawrence has resigned as Secretary of State for India and Burma and Lord Listowell would succeed him.

A resolution stressing the need for redistribution of provinces on a linguistic basis and recommending to the Government to convey this opinion to the Constituent Assembly was moved by Dr. P. Subbarayan, Minister of Law, in the Madras Assembly. The resolution called for the early appointment of a Boundary Commission or Commissions for the delimitation of the boundaries of these linguistic provinces, especially Tamilnad, Karnatak and Andhra.

Sir. C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, Dewan of Travancore, in a press statement, welcomed the "significant and timely" joint appeal for peace issued by Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah and said that the only chance of resolving the present political deadlock is the immediate summoning of a Round Table Conference consisting of top-ranking leaders of the Congress, the Muslim League, Sikhs, the Christians and the States' representatives.

The text of the correspondence between the general secretaries of the Congress and the Muslim League, regarding the Congress invitation to the League for a joint discussion was released to the press by Sj. Shanker Rao Deo.

Sir Abdur Rahim, former president of the Central Legislative Assembly, in a statement, suggested that the implementation of the Cabinet Mission plan of Ma, 16 by the Viceroy would be the best solution of the problem in India to-day and a move to that effect would have a popular backing in the country.

18th. Presiding over the 6th session of the All-India Newspaper Editors' Conference at Madras, Sj. Devadas Gandhi stressed the responsibility of the Press in India in the period of transition through which the country was passing and urged the newspapers to concentrate on printing the word that will soothe and help and eliminate everything which will irritate and hinder. He added, "In the peculiar circumstances of the country the Press may easily be regarded as coming next to the Army itself as an instrument of order and security."

Dr. Pattabhai Sitaramayya, presiding over the annual session of the All-India States' People's Conference which opened at Gwalior, said, "The need of the hour is a forthright declaration of immediate responsible Government in the largest States—not more than ten or twelve in number—such as Cochin has declared, with a time-limit for the fulfilment of the declaration just as the British Government have adopted with regard to India."

Master Tara Singh, Sardar Baldev Singh and Giani Kartar Singh met H. E. the Viceroy and presented before him the Sikh point of view with regard to the division of the Punjab.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, addressing the A. I. States' People's Conference, declared that any State which did not come into the Constituent Assembly now would be treated as a hostile State by the country. He added, "our aim at the moment is to liberate whatever part of India we can and we then deal with the question of getting independence for the rest. India's march towards freedom would brook no more obstruction."

The Viceroy had a joint discussion with Pandit Nehru, Sir Olaf Caroe, Governor of the Punjab and Dr. Khan Sahab, the Frontier Premier on the general situation in the N. W. F. Province.

A communique issued by the Frontier Government reported wide-scale trouble, including arson, looting, destruction of property, forcible conversion etc. from the districts of Dera Ismail Khan and Hazara.

- 19th. The plenary session of the A. I. States' People's Conference decided to accept the agreement arrived at between the Negotiating Committee of the Constituent Assembly and the Princes regarding the method of election of States' representatives to the Constituent Assembly. The Conference passed another resolution reiterating the object of full responsible Government in the States as integral parts of an United and Free India.

Explaining full agreement on behalf of the people of the States with the Objectives resolution passed by the Constituent Assembly, the resolution endorsed the determination to set up an independent Republic of India in which all power and authority would be derived from the people.

A vigorous plea that the interim Government should hold back all subventions for financing the post-war development programme of Bengal until they are satisfied that the Bengal Government are making serious efforts to stamp out corruption and maintaining proper accounts and have given up their present communal and discriminatory policy was made in a 44-page memorandum submitted by the Bengal Congress Assembly Party to Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru.

The Executive Council of the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee adopted a resolution saying "that in view of the failure of the League Ministry in Bengal to tackle the critical situation in the province, the cabinet should be immediately dissolved and a regional ministry for West Bengal be set up as an interim measure, pending the partitioning of the province."

- 20th. The A. I. Newspaper Editors' Conference concluded its session after passing a number of resolutions. The Conference welcomed the joint appeal for communal peace and harmony issued by Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah and called upon all newspapers of the country to work for the establishment of cordial relations between the communities. The conference also assured Mahatma Gandhi of the determination of the Press to do all in its power towards the restoration of peaceful conditions in the country.

The annual session of the A. I. States' People's Conference concluded after passing all the resolutions as passed by the Subjects Committee. It was decided to hold the next session of the Conference in Hyderabad.

Addressing the probationers of the All-India Administrative Training School at New Delhi, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel stressed the need for discipline among their ranks and said that members of the services must cultivate and maintain an impartial and incorruptible attitude in their administration.

- 21st. Opening the Indian Labour Conference in New Delhi, Sj. Jagjivan Ram, Labour Member, warned workers against political strikes. He said, "No Government can function if it allows the workers to be made a pawn of political parties interested, not in bringing about an improvement in working conditions consistent with the general economic conditions of the country, but in securing a position of advantage for their own parties." A report was submitted to the Conference by the Labour Department of the Government of

India stating that a five-year plan was being drawn up for the amelioration of labour conditions.

The Advisory Committee of the Constituent Assembly met to-day and considered the report of the Fundamental Rights Sub-Committee as amended by the Minorities Committee.

The Standing Committee of the A. I. N. E. C., at its meeting, announced the names of the personnel of the Central Press Advisory Committee.

The assertion that the majority of non-Muslims of Bengal were opposed to the partition of the province and that this could be proved by a referendum was made by S. J. N. Mondal, Law Member, in a press statement at New Delhi. He said that the present communal trouble was a temporary phase which could not last long and that a division of the province was no solution of the problem. It was not in the interest of the Hindus to divide the province and the Scheduled Castes were definitely opposed to partition.

In the Bengal Assembly Mr. Fazlur Rahman, Land Revenue Minister, introduced the Bengal State Acquisition and Tenancy Bill, 1947, which sought to abolish Zamindari system in the province.

The situation in D. I. Khan (Frontier) was reported to be very acute. Arson, loot, murder and forcible conversions continued unabated in the villages. Loss to property, as estimated by the Frontier Government, was of the order of a few crores of rupees.

- 22nd. The demand that immediate steps be taken to divide the Punjab into two, and, if necessary, into three autonomous provinces was made in a joint representation to Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru by Mr. Bhim Sen Sachar and Sardar Swaran Singh, the leader of the Congress and Sikh Panthic parties in the Punjab Assembly.

An opposition adjournment motion objecting to the Press Note issued by the Bengal Government imposing censorship on all news and comments criticising the activities of the police force in Calcutta was defeated by 127 to 73 votes in the Bengal Assembly.

Khwaja Nazimuddin, Deputy Leader of the Muslim League Party in the Central Legislature, in a press statement at Calcutta, declared, "It is my considered opinion that an independent sovereign Bengal is in the best interests of its people, whether Muslims or Non-Muslims, and I am equally certain that partition of Bengal is fatal to the Bengalis as such".

Addressing a public meeting at New Delhi, Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherjee urged that the principle of partition of Bengal must be accepted with the least possible delay. Suggesting that this was the only solution to end communal strife in the province, he declared that even if Pakistan is not conceded Bengal Hindus would still demand the creation of a new province composed of the Hindu majority areas.

- 23rd. Mr. A. V. Alexander, Minister of Defence, speaking on the occasion of the inauguration of a committee for promoting lasting friendship between Britain and India in London, declared, "When the end of the British rule comes in India, it was essential, not only for Britain but for India and the future of world relationships, that we should have all friendship possible continuing between the two countries." Mr. R. A. Butler (conservative) expressed his admiration for the conduct of India's foreign affairs by Pt. Nehru and the contacts he had established through the Asian Relations Conference.

In response to an appeal by the Bengal Provincial Hindu Mahasabha, a one-day hartal was observed in Calcutta, as a protest against the alleged excesses by armed Punjabi policemen in the city.

A further meeting between the Viceroy and Mr. M. A. Jinnah took place and lasted over 3 hours.

There was a sudden flare-up of communal trouble in Calcutta. About seven persons were killed and 31 others injured during the day. Curfew was imposed in several areas.

- 24th. A conference of representatives of the Congress and the Muslim League concluded in Shillong, after arriving at a final settlement of the dispute between the Congress and the League over the eviction policy of the Provincial Government.

The riot situation in Calcutta took a serious turn for the worse. Mass raid, arson and assaults marked the day's incidents.

25th. Syed Ali Zaheer, former member of the Interim Government, in a statement at Lucknow, said that the Congress by demanding the partition of the Punjab has virtually conceded Pakistan to other Muslim dominated areas, ignoring the wishes of a substantial minority of Muslims, Hindus and Sikhs who have all along been opposed to Pakistan.

An All-Bengal Anti-Pakistan Committee was formed in Calcutta with Sj. Sarat Chandra Bose as its President to mobilise public opinion against Pakistan and the partition of Bengal.

The situation in Calcutta considerably worsened. Stray assaults and attacks on transport services formed the major part of the day's incidents. Police opened fire and tear gas on several occasions. About 8 persons were killed and over 50 others injured.

26th. An impassioned appeal to Indian princes to assume the role of constitutional rulers was made by the Maharaja of Cochin, in his inaugural address at the United Kerala Convention at Trichur. He added that as dispassionate and impartial heads of States above party politics and religious antagonisms, Indian Princes had an useful function to perform in India's future.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah had an interview with the Viceroy for the eighth time. The Nawab of Bhopal, Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes also met the Viceroy.

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel issued a statement from New Delhi appealing to the Princes and their people to take their due and honourable share in the shaping of India's destiny by joining the Constituent Assembly. He also paid a tribute to the statement of the Maharaja of Cochin at Trichur and appealed to the Princes to reflect dispassionately on his judicious words and to follow his lead.

The Committee of Action of the Assam Provincial Muslim League, after two days' deliberations, rejected the Bardoloi—Saadulla compromise over the eviction policy of the Assam Government.

An appeal to the journalists to use their power for the greatest good of the people and guide public opinion along proper and healthy channels was made by Dr. T. S. S. Rajan, Minister of Food and Labour, Government of Madras, while addressing the annual meeting of the S. I. Journalists' Federation at Madras.

There was no marked improvement in the riot situation in Calcutta. Unofficial estimates of the day's casualties were 7 dead and 40 others injured. The Governor of Bengal, Sir Frederick Burrows accompanied by the Finance Minister visited the riot-affected areas of the city.

The Draft constitution of the Damodar Valley Corporation was accepted at the fifth Inter-Provincial Conference held in New Delhi under the presidency of Sj. C. H. Bhabha, Member for Works, Mines and Power. Mr. H. S. Suhrawardy, Chief Minister and Sj. T. N. Mukherjee, Irrigation Minister represented Bengal, while Bihar was represented by two Ministers, Sj. Binodananda Jha and Sj. Ramcharita Singh.

27th. Mr. H. S. Suhrawardy, addressing a press conference in New Delhi, made an impassioned plea for a "united, undivided, sovereign Bengal" which would be a great country, the richest and the most prosperous in India, capable of giving to its people a high standard of living. He further attributed the demand for the partition of Bengal to a sense of impatient frustration among a section of the Hindus in the provinces and asserting that such partition would be suicidal even from the view-point of the Hindus.

A two-front struggle, one to compel the Princes to remain within the Indian Union and the other to prevent the partition of India, was envisaged by the Socialist leader, Sj. Jai Prakash Narain, addressing a public meeting in Bangalore.

Three persons were killed and over 20 injured in incidents which continued in Calcutta.

28th. The third preliminary session of the Constituent Assembly met in New Delhi with representatives of eight Indian States. The States which attended the session were Udaipur, Baroda, Cochin, Jaipur, Jodhpur, Bikaner, Rewa and Patiala. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru presented to the Assembly the report of the Committee of the Assembly appointed to negotiate with the States' Negotiating Committee. The report on the Union Powers Committee was presented by Sir N. Gopalaswamy Ayyengar.

Dr. Rajendra Prasad, addressing the Constituent Assembly, indicated that the

House must be prepared not only for a division of India but a division of some provinces and for this the Assembly may have to draw up a constitution based on such a division. He added, "Whatever the nature of the constitution that may have to be drafted, whether for one undivided India or only parts of it, we shall see to it that it gives satisfaction to all coming under the jurisdiction."

The Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten arrived in Peshawar to review the situation in the Frontier.

Mr. H. S. Subrawardy, the Bengal Premier met Mr. Jinnah and discussed with him the question of partition of Bengal.

Stray incidents continued in Calcutta on a wide scale.

29th. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Chairman of the Advisory Committee of the Constituent Assembly, presented to the House the interim report of the Fundamental Rights Sub-committee. In course of his address, Sardar Patel said, "We attach great importance to the constitution making these rights justiciable, and that, in the portion of the Constitution Act dealing with the powers and jurisdiction of the Supreme Court suitable and adequate provision will have to be made to define the scope of the remedies for the enforcement of these fundamental rights." He also emphasised that the rights would have to be respected in all units of the Union as otherwise they would have no value.

The Constituent Assembly passed Sardar Patel's motion seeking extension of time for the presentation of the report of the Advisory Committee on Minorities.

By 29 to 15 votes the Bengal Legislative Council rejected the Congress Party's adjournment motion on the situation created by the decision of the Government of Bengal imposing pre-censorship on all news and comments criticising the activities of the police force in the province.

There was no improvement in the riot situation in Calcutta. Police opened fire on several occasions. Fresh curfew was imposed on the most affected areas.

30th. The Constituent Assembly unanimously voted for the abolition of conferment of titles by the Indian Union. S. J. M. R. Masani's amendment to the original clause as adopted by the House read: "No title shall be conferred by the Union. No citizen shall accept any title from any foreign State. No person holding any office of profit or trust under the State shall, without the consent of the Union Government, accept any present, emoluments, office or title or any kind from any Foreign State."

Denouncing the demand for a partition of the Punjab and Bengal as "a sinister move actuated by spite and bitterness," Mr. M. A. Jinnah declared at New Delhi, "I do hope that neither the Viceroy nor His Majesty's Government will fall into this trap and commit a grave error." Mr. Jinnah also reiterated his demand for the creation of a Moslem National State consisting of the six provinces.

The Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten returned to Delhi from Rawalpindi after concluding his tour of the N. W. F. P.

The decision of the British Government on the compensation of members of the Indian Services, whose careers will be affected by the transfer of power was announced in both the House of Lords and the House of Commons.

In the Constituent Assembly, H. E. the Viceroy made a statement on the compensation for premature termination of the services of members of the Secretary of States' services in India and to regular officers and British warrant officers of Indian armed forces.

Among some of the terms announced both in London and New Delhi, were:— (i) Compensation would not be ordinarily permissible to those who retire before the date of final transfer of power, (ii) Indian members of the services, except in certain specified cases, will not be eligible for compensation, (iii) Compensation should be payable to such Indian officers as are not invited to continue to serve after the transfer of power or those who can satisfy the Governor-General that their actions in course of duty have damaged their prospects or unsatisfactory appointments are offered them and finally those who can show that they have legitimate cause for anxiety regarding their future in the province where they are serving.

Mahatma Gandhi returned to Delhi from Patna. With the exception of a few incidents, Calcutta was comparatively quiet,

May 1947

The Congress Working Committee met at Bhangi Colony, New Delhi.

The Indian Constituent Assembly adjourned *sine die*.

The Indian National Trade Union Congress, a new central organisation of labour, was formed in New Delhi.

Sir Akbar Hydari was sworn in as Governor of Assam.

Mahatma Gandhi had an interview with Mr. M. A. Jinnah in New Delhi for nearly 3 hours.

The Viceroy summoned a conference of Congress, Muslim League and Sikh representatives in New Delhi on June 2 to announce H. M. G.'s plan for transfer of power.

The Governor of Bengal prorogued the Bengal Legislative Assembly.

Mr. H. S. Suhrawardy and S. Sarat Chandra Bose conferred with Mahatma Gandhi over the creation of a sovereign State of Bengal.

Communal disturbances broke out in Lahore.

The Viceroy was invited by H. M. G. to the United Kingdom for final discussions on the question of transfer of power.

The report of the Central Pay Commission was announced in New Delhi.

The Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten had continued discussions with the British Premier, Mr. Attlee in London.

Wide-scale communal trouble flared up in Calcutta.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah, in a statement, demanded a corridor between Eastern and Western Pakistan.

The main British Cabinet-Viceroy talks concluded in London.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru characterised Mr. Jinnah's demand for a corridor as completely "unrealistic."

Sardar Baldev Singh, Defence Member, urged the division of the Indian Armed Forces in case the division of the country is effected.

Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru visited the riot-affected areas of the Punjab.

H. E. the Viceroy returned to New Delhi from London.

Mr. V. V. Giri was appointed as the Indian Representative in Ceylon.

The text of correspondence between Pandit Nehru and F. M. Smuts on the question of Indians in S. Africa was released to the press.

A bi-lateral air transport agreement between the Government of India and the Netherlands was signed in New Delhi.

1st. The Constituent Assembly passed the clause relating to religious freedom without a debate. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel accepted an amendment moved by S. K. M. Munshi to the original clause. The clause adopted by the House read: "All persons are equally entitled to freedom of conscience and the right freely to profess, practice and propagate religion—subject to public order, morality or health and the other provisions of this chapter. Other clauses passed were freedom of commerce between units of the Indian Union, non-employment of children below 14 in mines and factories and safe-guarding of the cultural and educational rights of minorities.

The Congress Working Committee met at the Bhangi Colony in New Delhi and discussed the political situation in the country, the disturbances and their background and the agitation for the division of the Punjab and Bengal. Mahatma Gandhi was present at the meeting.

2nd. The Constituent Assembly adjourned *sine die* after passing the remaining five clauses in the interim report on the Fundamental Rights. The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad made a suggestion that the constitution framed by the

Assembly should be written in Hindusthani and English. The House endorsed the suggestion.

A convention of Hindu and Sikh members of the Punjab Assembly, the Central Assembly, and the Constituent Assembly, met in New Delhi under the chairmanship of Ch. Labiri Singh, former Minister of the Punjab and prepared a draft memorandum on the partition of the Punjab, to be submitted to the Congress Working Committee.

A deputation from Bengal, which waited on the Congress Working Committee, presented a memorandum to the Committee, explaining the case for the creation of a separate province for West Bengal inclusive of the port of Calcutta, which consisted of nearly 77 percent Hindu population.

The Congress Working Committee further considered the situation in the N. W. F. P. with particular reference to the reported desire of the authorities to hold fresh elections in the province.

Mr. Jinnah had another interview with the Viceroy.

- 3rd. The decision to form a new central organisation of labour, known as the "Indian National Trade Union Congress" was taken at a meeting of the Central Board of the Hindusthan Mazdoor Sevak Sangh held in New Delhi under the presidentship of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel.

The liquidation of the Secretary of State's services in India was discussed in New Delhi at a meeting of eight Congress Provincial Ministers, presided over by Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel.

Characterising Mr. Jinnah's claim for Assam as a homeland for the Muslims as "nothing short of a fantasy," Mr. Gopinath Bardoloi, Assam Premier, declared, "Unless we are expected to assume Mr. Jinnah's dream as realities and his wishes as facts, I can't find any logic for his claim to regard Assam as the national homeland for the Muslims."

The Working Committee of the A. I. Youth Congress adopted a 8-point programme to enlarge its activities on all fronts—physical, social, cultural, political etc.—to build up the youth of India in accordance with the Gandhian ideology.

- 4th. The Congress Working Committee concluded its 3-day session and adjourned *sine die*.

Sir Akbar Hydari was sworn in as the new Governor of Assam.

Mahatma Gandhi had 90 minutes' interview with H. E. the Viceroy, when the communal situation in the Frontier, Assam, Bengal and the Punjab was discussed. Mr. Jinnah and Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan also met the Viceroy.

Acharya Jugal Kishore, general secretary of the Congress, and Dewan Chamaulal, who toured the Frontier, issued a report on the League agitation in the Frontier. In their statement they said, "It is not the Ministry that should be dismissed; but the Governor, Sir Olaf Caroe and the officials who look to him for support and who have failed in preserving law and order."

- 5th. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel were elected chairmen of the two Committees of the Constituent Assembly appointed to draft the principles for the Union Constitution and the model Provincial Constitution respectively.

The constitution of the newly formed Indian National Trade Union Congress was unanimously adopted at a conference of workers which met in New Delhi under the presidentship of Sardar Patel.

The Working Committee of the Assam Provincial Congress Committee met in Gauhati under the presidentship of Mr. Muhammad Tayebulla to discuss the latest political situation in the country.

Mahatma Gandhi, in a press interview, said at New Delhi: "The British withdrawal—one of the noblest acts in the history of the British Nation, if honestly and fully carried out—must take place according to schedule, irrespective of internal conditions. Communal division of India was not inevitable; personally I have always said no, and I say no even now."

- 6th. Mahatma Gandhi met Mr. M. A. Jinnah at the latter's residence. The interview lasted nearly 3 hours. The Pakistan demand was discussed and Gandhiji expressed his opposition to it. The two leaders also discussed steps to more effectively carry out the joint peace appeal issued by them.

An emergent meeting of the Congress Working Committee, held in New Delhi, heard Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan's report on the Frontier situation.

An appeal to the Socialist party to throw its full weight in favour of the newly

created Indian National Trade Union Congress and make it a real and effective mouthpiece of the Indian working class, was made by Sj. Harihar Nath Shastri, former President of the A. I. T. U. C. and a member of the National Executive of the Socialist party, in a statement at New Delhi.

7th. Mr. M. A. Jinnah, in a statement on the Frontier situation, accused the N. W. F. P. Government of a ruthless policy of crushing the Muslims and the Muslim League organisation there and agreed with the Frontier League leaders' decision, taken on May 4, not to call off the movement.

Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherjee, the Hindu Mahasabha Leader, in a cable to the Secretary of State for India, urged the partition of Bengal and also demanded the dissolution of the present Ministry and the immediate establishment of regional Ministries for the interim period. He said, "In the interest of peace and harmony and the political and economic advancement of the people, it is essential that a separate Province, including Calcutta, which has 75 percent Hindu population, must be created in Bengal comprising Hindu majority areas which will remain within the Indian Union."

Mahatma Gandhi left New Delhi for Calcutta.

Sj. N. M. Joshi, General Secretary of the A. I. T. U. C. in a statement, repudiated the charges made that the A. I. T. U. C. is dominated by Communists, that it admits "paper" unions, that it is opposed to arbitration and that its policy is to hamper production. He stated, "It is true that communists have to-day a majority in the A. I. T. U. C. but all the decisions taken by the A. I. T. U. C. are those of the A. I. T. U. C. alone and not those of the Communist Party."

Mr. Rajani Palme Dutt, Vice-Chairman of the Communist Party of Great Britain, declared at London, "Communists in Britain will do all in their power to prevent imperialistic plans for dismemberment of India."

8th. Mr. Jai Prakash Narain, the Socialist leader, was arrested in Hyderabad and extruded from the State.

Dr. Khan Sahab, the Frontier Premier, declared at a press conference, that the Pathans would not tolerate the foisting of Section 93 in the province or anything forced on them unjustly. He added, "As far as the will of the people is concerned, a plebiscite after departure of the British will show what the Pathans want. That plebiscite should be an honest vote of the people of the N. W. F. P. without being interfered with or influenced by those who had always been deceiving the Pathans."

The Working Committee of the Bengal Provincial Muslim League held a three hour discussion on the Bengal Partition movement.

9th. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel declared that the current British policy of "remaining neutral but holding power is a way of propagating civil war in the country" and asserted that India's political impasse would be broken at once if power were transferred to the present Interim Government.

Mahatma Gandhi and his party arrived in Calcutta. Later, he held discussions with Bengal leaders over the communal situation.

Mr. M. A. Maister, President of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry, in a statement at Bombay, characterised the demand for substantially scaling down the Sterling Balances made by the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Hugh Dalton, as morally indefensible and economically unsustainable and pointed out that India's contribution to the war efforts was far larger than that of the United Kingdom.

The opinion of the Congress with regard to the partition of the Punjab and Bengal was explained by Dr. Prafulla Chandra Ghosh, Member, Congress Working Committee, in course of a press statement. He said, "Just as the Congress cannot think in terms of compelling the Muslim majority areas to remain within the Indian Union, it cannot also think in terms of Hindu majority areas being compelled to go out of the Indian Union. Therefore division of Bengal and the Punjab becomes the logical corollary of the division of India. The Congress Working Committee has come to this logical conclusion."

10th. H. E. the Viceroy summoned a Conference of Congress, Muslim League and Sikh leaders in New Delhi on May 17 to announce the plan of the British Government for transferring power to Indian hands. The following leaders were invited:—Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Mr. M. A. Jinnah, Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan and Sardar Baldev Singh. The Viceroy also invited repre-

sentives of the Indian States who were on the States Negotiating Committee to meet him on that day.

The Governor of Bengal prorogued the Bengal Legislative Assembly.

There was a sudden deterioration in the situation in Amritsar, as a result of further recrudescence of communal trouble.

Addressing a press conference at Bangalore, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Food Member, declared that India was facing a difficult food situation, owing to the failure of wheat crops in India and inadequate arrival of the allotted quantity of food grains from abroad.

- 11th. The following communique was issued from the Viceregal Lodge, Simla : "Owing to the imminence of the Parliamentary recess in London, it has been found necessary to postpone H. E. the Viceroy's meeting with Indian leaders, announced to begin on May 17, until June 2, 1948."

Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, Member for Industries and Supplies, addressing a public meeting at Madras, made a fervent appeal to Indians to settle their differences and put a stop to their internecine quarrels.

Mr. H. S. Suhrawardy, the Bengal Premier had a 90 minutes interview with Mahatma Gandhi at Sodepur. The question of the desirability and possibility of a United, sovereign Bengal, with a view to prevent partition was discussed.

A resolution expressing the opposition to Pakistan, Akhand Hindusthan and the partition of the Punjab and Bengal was unanimously passed after a 2-day debate by the General Council of the Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind at Lucknow.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah declared at a press interview that if the British decide India must be divided, then the Central Government must be dissolved and all power should be transferred to the Constituent Assemblies formed and representing Pakistan and Hindusthan.

Police opened fire on several occasions in Amritsar to quell rioting which continued in the city.

- 12th. In his presidential address at the 15th All-India Conference of Registrars of Co-operative Societies at Madras, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Food Member, emphasized the need for expanding and strengthening the co-operative movement in the country "for the great bulk of our vast population."

Dr. Suresh Chandra Bannerjee, President of the newly formed I. N. T. U. C., declared at Calcutta, "The object of the Indian National Trade Union Congress is to give a correct lead to the labourers of India. At this critical juncture in the country, it is essential that every nationalist should see that the working class of India does not become a mere tool in the hands of a Party, which will not hesitate to do anything anti-national. The policy of the I. N. T. U. C. as regards labour organisation also is fundamentally different from the policy of the Communist Party."

Mr. H. S. Suhrawardy and Sj. Sarat Chandra Bose had further interviews with Mahatma Gandhi over the partition question.

The Socialist Party of India, at its meeting in Bombay, decided not to join the Indian National Trade Union Congress.

Disturbances continued in Amritsar inspite of a 48 hour curfew in certain areas. Armed raids, arson etc. marked the day's incidents.

- 13th. Qazi Attaullah Khan, Revenue Minister, N. W. F. P. in a press statement, referred to the demand for an independent sovereign State of Pathans in the future constitution of India which will ultimately negotiate on an equal footing either with Hindusthan or Pakistan and declared that the Pathans would not tolerate any domination. He added, "We will never agree to sacrifice Pathans' interests at the altar of Pakistan. When there is no political or moral obligation; why should we sell ourselves to Hindusthan or Pakistan."

The view that any decision to put Harijans in Pakistan against their will would be resisted with all forces at their command was expressed by Sri Bhagat Amin Chand, General Secretary of the All-India Harijan League, at Lahore.

Sj. Sarat Chandra Bose had a further interview with Mahatma Gandhi over the question of creation of a sovereign State of Bengal.

An appeal to the Muslim Leaguers to sit with the Khudai Khidmatgars in a joint *firqa* to tackle various important issues that are likely to crop up after British departure from India, was made by Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, at Peshawar.

- 14th. Mr. H. S. Suhrawardy, the Bengal Premier, met H. E. the Viceroy at New Delhi and discussed with him the future of Bengal.

Mahatma Gandhi made a two-hour non-stop tour of the riot-affected areas of Calcutta.

Dr. S. P. Mukherjee, the Hindu Mahasabha leader, in a statement, denounced the scheme for a sovereign Bengal or for a socialist republic of Bengal, separated from the rest of India. He said, "It is nothing but a surrender to Pakistan, and we demand that it must be nipped in the bud."

There was a sudden recrudescence of communal trouble in Lahore.

The hope that whatever might be the political attachment of the people of Sylhet, they would stand united as a solid rock and resist the move for the separation of Sylhet from Assam and would not certainly commit "suicide", was made by S. J. Baidyanath Mookherjee, Deputy Leader of the Assam Congress Parliamentary Party, in a press statement at Shillong.

- 15th. It was officially announced in New Delhi that the Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten has been invited by His Majesty's Government to the United Kingdom for final discussions with the British Government on the question of transfer of power.

The names of the personnel of the Indian delegation to the International Labour Conference at Geneva, were announced in New Delhi.

- 16th. The report of the Central Pay Commission, as appointed by the Government of India, was announced in New Delhi. A minimum basic salary of Rs. 30 per month and a maximum salary of Rs. 2,000 per month, to be relaxed only in the case of a few selected posts, were among the main recommendations of the Commission's report.

H. E. the Viceroy continued his talks with the Congress members of the Interim Government and Mr. Jinnah regarding arrangements for final transfer of power.

- 17th. Thirty one persons were killed and 61 injured as a result of a serious train accident between Kamalagar and Narayanpur stations on the B. A. Rly.

Dr. G. M. Naicker and Dr. Y. M. Dadoo, the two South African Indian leaders, met Mahatma Gandhi at Patna and discussed with him the conditions of Indians in South Africa.

Mr. M. S. Aney, Government of India's representative in Ceylon, in a press interview, expressed the view that a broadening of the basis of nationalism that prevails in India and Ceylon was absolutely necessary for the settlement of differences existing between the two countries.

The opinion that the decision of the Socialist Party of India to continue to stay in the All-India Trade Union Congress and not to join the Indian National Trade Union Congress will help in strengthening the Communist Party in India, was expressed by Dr. Suresh Chandra Bannerjee, President of the newly formed I. N. T. U. C. at Calcutta.

The death occurred at Agartala of H. H. the Maharaja of Tripura at the age of 39.

Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, Dewan of Travancore, at a press conference, clarified the attitude of the Travancore Government with regard to her internal problems and those affecting her relations with British India, England, America and other countries. He further defended the decision of the State not to join the Constituent Assembly.

Characterising the idea of a Sovereign Socialist Republic of Bengal, Mr. Jai Prakash Narain, the Socialist leader, declared at Jubulpore, "Socialism is a negation of communalism. There is no sense in a Socialist republic remaining aloof from the rest of India. As Socialism has become so popular with the masses, everybody wants to take advantage of its label."

The categorical assertion that the Constituent Assembly would go ahead with the task of framing a constitution for India was made by Dr. Rajendra Prasad, President of the Indian Constituent Assembly, while inaugurating the annual conference of the Cochin State Praja Mandal.

The situation in Lahore considerably deteriorated as a result of wide scale arson and stabbing. The day's casualties were 6 dead and over 20 injured.

- 18th. The Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten, accompanied by Lady Mountbatten and S. J. V. P. Menon, Reforms Commissioner, left New Delhi for London for talks with the British Cabinet.

Acharya Kripalani, the Congress President, had a 3 hour interview with the Kashmir Premier, Pandit Ramchandra Kak and discussed with him certain

proposals for the dissolution of the present political impasse in Kashmir and the State's participation in the Constituent Assembly.

The Governor of the C. P. & Berar promulgated an Ordinance, declaring the death penalty for persons committing an offence of attempt to murder and the death penalty or transportation for life for those found guilty of stabbing.

A strong plea for intensifying the movement for unification of Maharashtra was made by Mr. M. R. Jayakar, presiding over the Greater Maharashtra Conference at Poona.

There was no improvement in the situation in Lahore.

19th. Lord Mountbatten, the Viceroy arrived in London. Later he had a 3-hour meeting with the British Prime Minister, Mr. Clement Attlee and experts on India in the British Cabinet.

Sir John Colville, Governor of Bombay, was sworn in as acting Governor-General of India in the absence of Lord Mountbatten.

Sir S. V. Ramamurti was sworn in as acting Governor of Bombay.

An appeal to the Congress leaders and all the parties concerned not to decide the fate of India without getting a clear verdict of the majority of Indians by a plebiscite or referendum on this issue, was made by Mr. G. O. Desmukh, Secretary of the A. I. Hindu Mahasabha, in a statement at Lahore.

Six persons were killed and over 60 others injured in communal disturbances that broke out in Calcutta. Curfew was imposed on the affected areas.

With the exception of a few incidents, Lahore was comparatively quiet.

Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Food Member, speaking at Hyderabad (Dn.) directed the present year as "critical for the whole country in matters of food." He also declared, "No political considerations are weighed with the Government of India in regard to the food problem which is always kept above politics and communal bias."

20th. The unification of India sooner or later after June 1948, was forecast by Sir Frederick James, former member of the Indian Legislative Assembly at London. He said, "Sooner or later after June 1948, the collective personality of India will assert itself, and while preserving and protecting its diverse and separate elements will bring to life a Union which will enable Indian Industry and genius to make its unique contribution to peace, progress and stability of the world."

The opinion that the lower and middle class workers would be benefited substantially by the recommendations of the Central Pay Commission was made by Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan, Finance Member, in a broadcast from New Delhi. He added, "In accepting the recommendations of the Pay Commission, the object of the Government is to reduce the earning of the lower paid employees and to reduce the difference between the minimum and maximum salaries of Central Government servants. This, in government view, is a measure of social equity which had long been overdue."

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Education Member, in his inaugural address at the session of the Standing Committee of the Legislature on Education at Simla, declared, "Education is a provincial subject. Provinces will, therefore, carry the actual work, but it is the task of the Centre to set a standard for national education. I do not suggest any encroachment on provincial autonomy, but if we are to get the most desirable results, it is necessary that there should be one common pattern and herein the Centre is of very great importance."

Disturbances continued in Calcutta, mainly in the central and eastern parts of the city. The day's casualties were 5 dead and over 20 injured.

21st. The demand for a corridor between Eastern and Western Pakistan, friendly and reciprocal relations between Hindusthan and Pakistan, a military alliance, pact or treaty between the two and membership of the United Nations for Pakistan, were made by Mr. M. A. Jinnah, President, A. I. Muslim League, in a press interview at New Delhi.

Lord Listowel, Secretary of the State for India, in reply to a question in the House of Commons, said that since Nov. 18 last year (1946), 4014 people were killed and 3616 injured in communal disturbances in India.

The International Emergency Food Council in Washington announced the allocation of 485,000 tons of rice for India for the year 1947.

Four persons were killed and 34 injured in incidents which continued in Calcutta.

A conference between Sj. Sarat Chandra Bose and certain prominent

Congress and League leaders in Calcutta, approved of definite terms regarding the future constitution of Bengal and the formation of a new cabinet,—to be placed before the Congress and the Muslim League organisation for discussion.

22nd. S. J. J. Singh, President of the India League of America, declared at New York, "there cannot and will not be a large scale civil war in India. A civil war between Hindus and Muslims either now or after the withdrawal of the British is neither practical nor feasible.

Stray assaults and bomb attacks continued in Calcutta on a wide-scale.

23rd. The main British Cabinet—Viceroy talks concluded in London at a meeting of the full Cabinet. The meeting gave a broad approval to the Viceroy's plan of procedure for the final transfer of power to India. Lord Mountbatten was not present at the meeting.

Dr. Rajendra Prasad, President of the Constituent Assembly, declared at New Delhi that Mr. Jinnah's demand for a corridor to link up the north-eastern and north-western Pakistan areas was untenable.

A demand that the Congress High Command should reconsider the Indian constitutional situation in the light of Mr. Jinnah's latest demands and revert to its original stand for an undivided India, was made by S. J. Choithram Gidwani, President of the Sind Provincial Congress Committee, in a telegram to S. J. Shankarrao Deo, General-Secretary of the Congress.

India's protest against the meagre rice allocation, made by the International Food Council at Washington, was voiced by Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Food Member at New Delhi. He further asked the Council for a supplementary allocation to meet the acute shortage of grains in the country.

The situation in Calcutta deteriorated considerably in certain areas. Nine persons were killed and 33 others injured during the day.

24th. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, commenting on Mr. Jinnah's demand for a corridor, declared at a press interview, "Mr. Jinnah's recent statement is completely unrealistic and indicates that he desires no settlement of any kind." He added, "We stand for the Union of India, with the right of particular areas to opt out. In no event can we agree to any part of India having foreign bases or extra-territorial rights."

Dr. S. P. Mookherjee, speaking at Dacca, strongly denounced the move "for a free State of Bengal" made by S. J. Sarat Chandra Bose and Mr. Abdul Hashim, the Bengal Muslim League leader. He said, "Hindus of Bengal would never accept nor be deceived by the cry of 'Free State of Bengal.' The Muslim League wanted to grab the whole of India and the cry of sovereign Bengal was a great hoax to include the whole of Bengal in Pakistan."

Sardar Abdur Rab Nishtar, Communications Member, speaking at Cawnpore emphasised that Pakistan was the natural solution of the majority problems of this country and in the event of excesses committed by the majority community in their provinces, the matter could be referred to the U. N. O. He said, "By our exemplary behaviour with the minorities in the Pakistan provinces, we will be safeguarding the interests of our majorities in the Hindu majority provinces."

Police opened fire on several occasions to quell rioting which continued without any change in Calcutta.

25th. Sardar Baldev Singh, Defence Member, in a press interview at New Delhi, declared that the division of India must inevitably result in the division of the Indian Armed forces though, quite obviously, this was not in the interests of either part of divided India. He added, "It will be an extremely difficult job to nationalise and carry out the division of the Armed Forces before June, 1948. This would have terrible effects on the Armed Forces, but if the country is divided, then the forces must be also partitioned."

Mr. Sumner Wells, former U. S. Under Secretary of State, declared at Washington that communism had recently strengthened its hold in all cities in India and was rapidly spreading to the rural areas. He further added, "A solution to the Indian problem will only be found if and when the Indian leaders are willing to think in terms of India rather than that of their own communities and are also willing to enter into agreement about the federative system similar to that in the United States."

Speaking at Gauhati, Sir Akbar Hydari, Governor of Assam, stressed the necessity for improving the standard of administration of the province to bear the

heavy responsibilities which it would have to face after the final transfer of power.

There was a slight improvement in the situation in Calcutta.

26th. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Home Member, characterised Mr. Jinnah's recent demand for a corridor connecting the eastern and western zones of Pakistan as "such fantastic nonsense as not to be taken seriously at all." He added, "The demand discloses the sponsor's lack in the Pakistani scheme."

The Muslim League Party in the U. P. Legislative Assembly, submitted a note of a motion of no-confidence in the Speaker, Babu Purushottamdas Tandon, in connection with some speeches made by him at Jhansi and Barilly.

27th. A firm determination to maintain peace in the province whatever might be the terms of the June announcement, was expressed by H. E. Sir Frederick Burrows, Governor of Bengal, in a broadcast from Calcutta.

Acharya Kripalani and Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru met Mahatma Gandhi at New Delhi.

The Conference of the Depressed Classes League at Calcutta adopted a resolution demanding that a separate province be formed of such areas of Bengal as were willing to join the Indian Union. The Conference also condemned Mr. J. N. Mandal's action in opposing the idea of partition and expressed the view that the scheme for a united sovereign Bengal would perpetuate communalism in the province.

28th. Acharya Kripalani, Congress President, declared in a press interview that if there is to be division of India, it should not be carried out by the British Government. He said, "The British must allow the Interim Government to function as a Dominion Government and it should then be for their Government to decide whether there should be partition or not and if partition is decided upon, on what principle it was to be effected." Acharya Kripalani also urged that if responsibility for internal security was thrown upon the Interim Government there was every possibility of stabilising peace in the provinces and stoppage of communal rioting.

The Working Committee of the Bengal Provincial Muslim League adopted a resolution expressing opposition to the creation of a free State of Bengal and declaring that it stood firmly by the Muslim League for Pakistan.

29th. Mr. Ernest Bevin, Foreign Minister, in a speech at the British Labour Party Conference, declared, "India is going through the birth pangs of complete independence. The peace of the world in the future and for many years to come will depend to a very great extent on the solution of the Indian problem." He added, "That is one of the places where, if by any chance there is a breakdown or chaos or civil war, it might create the vacuum which everybody is frightened of. The same thing applies to Burma."

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru arrived in Lahore on a tour of the riot-affected areas of the province.

Mr. S. A. Dange, President of the A. I. T. U. C., declared at London, "The All India Trade Union Congress and the Communist Party of India will maintain their organisational unity on an All-India basis, should the country be partitioned and will continue to work as a basic unifying factor providing expressions of common struggles and aspiration of the working people of India."

The demand that the British Government should adhere to the Cabinet Mission's proposals of May 16 (1946) was reaffirmed by Mahatma Gandhi in his post-prayer speech in New Delhi. Gandhiji warned the British Government that they should not commit a "breach of faith" by going back on the Cabinet Mission's proposals which they themselves declared to be the last word so far as Britain and India were concerned.

Mr. L. B. Bhopatkar, President of the A. I. Hindu Mahasabha, in a statement, appealed to Congress leaders "to refuse to be a consenting party to India's vivisection and to all that follows in its trail and, if need be, to kick away the Legislatures, the Interim Government and even the Constituent Assembly."

The necessity of creation of a large body of technical personnel with a view to improve the machinery for the provision of higher technical education in the country and the nationalisation of industries on a comprehensive scale, was urged by Mr. N. B. Sarkar, Chairman of the A. I. Council of Technical Education, addressing the annual meeting of the Council at Bangalore.

30th. The Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten returned to New Delhi from London.

The text of the correspondence between Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Field Marshal Smuts on the question of Indians in South Africa was released in New Delhi.

A Press communique issued from New Delhi announced the appointment of Mr. V. V. Giri, former Labour Minister of Madras, as the Indian Representative in Ceylon, in succession to Mr. M. S. Aney.

Dr. Rajendra Prasad, in an interview, categorically asserted, "If the League rejects the partition of provinces, the Congress would reject the division of the country itself."

The situation in Calcutta considerably deteriorated. Serious cases of rioting, and looting occurred in several areas. At least 13 persons were killed and over 60 injured during the day.

31st. The Congress Working Committee met at Bhangi Colony in New Delhi and discussed the political situation in the country.

A bilateral air transport agreement between the Government of India and the Netherlands was signed in New Delhi by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Sardar Abdur Rab Nishtar on behalf of the Government of India and by Mr. A. M. L. Wiukelman, Charge d'Affaires Ad. Interim, the Netherlands Embassy in India, on behalf of the Government of Netherlands.

Mahatma Gandhi, in his post-prayer speech, declared: "The Princes would be wisely advised if they join the Constituent Assembly and if the British were sincere they would see to it that there were no Prince left capable of doing mischief."

An appeal to the Congress not to yield to the demand for the division of India and thereby betray its sublime principles, was made by Baba Kharak Singh, President of the Central Akali Dal and the A. I. Sikh League, in a statement at Mussoorie.

There was a marked improvement in the situation in Calcutta.

June 1947

The Congress Working Committee met in New Delhi.

The Working Committee of the A. I. Muslim League met under the Presidentship of Mr. Jinnah.

The Conference between the Viceroy and the seven Indian leaders began in New Delhi.

The British Government's plan for the final transfer of power to Indian hands was officially announced in New Delhi.

Congress, Muslim League and Sikh representations formally accepted H. M. G.'s plan.

The Nawab of Bhopal resigned his Chancellorship of the Chamber of Princes.

The Standing Committee of the Chamber of Princes met under the Chairmanship of the Maharaja of Patiala.

The Council of the A. I. Hindu Mahasabha began its session in New Delhi under the presidentship of Sj. F. Bhopatkar.

The Council of the A. I. Muslim League accepted the British Government's plan for the partition of the Punjab and Bengal.

The Socialist Party of India expressed its disapproval of H. M. G.'s plan for the partition of the country.

The Standing Committee of the A. I. States' People's Conference met in New Delhi under the presidentship of Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya.

The Nizam of Hyderabad issued a Firman declaring independence of the State on the lapse of paramountcy.

The A. I. C. C. at its session in New Delhi accepted H. M. G.'s June 3 statement by 157 votes to 29.

The Viceroy, Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah jointly conferred on the Frontier situation.

Partition of Bengal was decided upon in Calcutta.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of India strongly criticised the British Government's plan for the partition of the country.

Communal trouble flared up in Lahore.

Partition of the Punjab was decided upon in Lahore.

Dr. P. C. Ghosh was elected leader of the West Bengal Congress Assembly Party.

Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit was appointed the Indian Ambassador to the U. S. S. R.

The Sind Legislative Assembly decided to join the New Pakistan Constituent Assembly.

The Partition Council of India came into formal existence in New Delhi.

Baluchistan decided to join Pakistan.

The personnel of the Boundary Commissions for the Punjab and Bengal were announced in New Delhi.

1st. The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, which met in New Delhi under the presidentship of Mr. M. A. Jinnah, considered the political situation in the country.

The Congress Working Committee, at its session, discussed details relating to the division of provinces.

H. E. the Viceroy accompanied by the Governor of the Punjab visited the riot-affected areas of the province.

2nd. The Conference between the Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten and the seven Indian leaders began at Viceroy's House in New Delhi. The following leaders attended the conference:—Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and Acharya Kripalani on behalf of the Congress, Mr. M. A. Jinnah, Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan and Mr. Abdur Rab Nishtar on behalf of the Muslim League and Sardar Baldev Singh on behalf of the Sikhs.

At the meeting the Viceroy gave a full account of his discussions both in India and in England which had led up to the formulation of H. M. G's plan and of arguments which had resulted in its adoption. The Conference, after a two-hours' session, adjourned for the next day.

The Congress Working Committee met to-day and considered H. M. G's proposals for the constitutional transfer of power to India. It was also decided to convene an emergent meeting of the All-India Congress Committee by the middle of June to ratify the decision of the Working Committee.

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League discussed H. M. G's plan as explained by the Viceroy at the Leaders' Conference. The Committee further summoned a meeting of the Council of the All-India Muslim League on June 9 (1947) to consider the British Government's statement.

Sir Mirza Ismail, Prime Minister of Hyderabad State, advocated that the British place dominion powers in the hands of an eight or nine-man Cabinet embodying parity between Caste-Hindus and Muslims as a solution of India's political problems.

Prominent Sikh leaders, including Sardar Baldev Singh, Giani Kartar Singh, Master Tara Singh, Sardar Ujjal Singh and Sardar Mangal Singh, held a conference in New Delhi and considered H. M. G's plan for the transfer of power.

3rd. The Conference between H. E. the Viceroy and the seven Indian leaders concluded to-day after a 90 minutes session. At the meeting the Congress, Muslim League and Sikh representatives placed their respective formal acceptance of the British Government's plan. The Viceroy also had a meeting with the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes and the other members of the States' Negotiating Committee.

The British Government's plan for the constitutional transfer of power from British to Indian hands was officially announced in New Delhi.

The following were the high lights of the plan :—

(i) Division of India into Hindustan and Pakistan and immediate measures for the partition of the Punjab and Bengal.

(ii) No change in the Interim Government until partition has been effected when two separate Governments will be set up with complete powers in all subjects.

(iii) Each provincial legislature to vote on the issue of partition of India.

(iv) The final shape of partition will be decided by a Boundary Commission appointed for the purpose.

(v) As the implications of partition in the spheres of Defence, Communications and External Affairs are expected to take time in working out, there will be provision for joint working until the two Constituent Assemblies are in a position to come to a final decision.

(vi) Referendum in N. W. F. P. without any disturbance in the present Ministry to decide which of the two Constituent Assemblies they would join.

(vii) Until the position of Bengal is clear, Sylhet district will continue as at present when there will be a referendum to decide which province it will be part of, Bengal or Assam.

(viii) While Paramountcy will lapse, according to H. M. G's declarations of May 12 and May 16 (1946), H. M. G. will not enter into military or other agreements with Indian States and they will use their influence to persuade the States to join one or other of the two Dominions.

(ix) The attainment of Dominion Status will be without prejudice to the right of the Indian Constituent Assemblies to decide in due course whether or not the part of India in respect of which they have authority will remain in the British Commonwealth of Nations.

H. E. the Viceroy, in a broadcast from New Delhi, said, "If the transfer of power is to be effected in a peaceful and orderly manner, every single one of us must bend all his efforts to the task. This is no time for bickering, much less for the continuation in any shape or form of the disorders and lawlessnesses of the past few months. We cannot afford any toleration of violence." The Viceroy also expressed the opinion that "with a reasonable measure of goodwill between the communities, a unified India would be by far the best solution of the problem."

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, in a broadcast, declared, "We have decided to accept these (H. M. G's) proposals and recommended to our larger Committees that they do likewise. The plan promises a big advance towards complete independence and such a big chance must have full concurrence of the people before effect could be given to it, for the future of India can only be decided by the people of India and not by any outside authority, however friendly."

Mr. M. A. Jinnah said in his broadcast that the final decision on H. M. G's plan for India could only be taken by League Council meeting on June 9. "Of course," he said, "the plan has got to be very carefully examined in its pros and cons before the final decision can be taken." Mr. Jinnah also appealed to every community and particularly to Muslim India to maintain peace and order.

Sardar Baldev Singh, Defence Member, commenting on H. M. G's plan, declared, "The plan that has been announced steers a course above the conflicting claims. It is not a compromise. It is a settlement. It does not please everybody nor the Sikh community, but it is certainly something worth while."

Prime Minister Clement Attlee announced in the House of Commons the British Government's plan for the final transfer of power to India.

4th. Lord Listowel, Secretary of State for India, announcing the new British policy in the House of Lords, clarified the future of the Princely States to which the new plan expressly does not apply. He said, "After the transfer of power, the Princely States would be free to choose their own future and that British Paramountcy would end. Courses left open to them would be autonomy or affiliation with either Pakistan or Hindustan."

The Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten, addressing a Press Conference, asserted that power will be transferred as quickly this year as it ever would have been by June 1948. Explaining the British Government's attitude towards the States, he said

that the States would be free to enter either Constituent Assembly or make such arrangement as might be necessary but they cannot enter separately as Dominions, "The British would help the States to reach agreement with the parties in India", he added.

The Nawab of Bhopal resigned his Chancellorship of the Chamber of Princes. The Maharaja of Patiala took over the office of Chancellorship.

The Working Committee of the A. I. Muslim League held a two hour discussion on the British Government's plan for the transfer of power.

Mr. P. C. Joshi, General Secretary of the Communist Party of India, declared at Bombay, "The British Government's statement is a desperate imperialist offensive against the freedom movement of the country. British-planned partition will not mean peace but fratricide immediately."

Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherjee, in a statement, said, "The British Plan which provides for the partition cannot be approved from the Hindu point of view. It is, however, preferable to the Cabinet Mission Plan, which, while giving formal unity of India, gave a weak Centre and a veto to communal intransigence. Under the new plan it will be open to the Constituent Assembly representing three fourths of India, to go ahead and prepare a constitution of its choice with a strong and effective centre that may work for internal peace and progress unfettered by communalism.

Master Tara Singh, the Akali leader, in a statement declared, "Although H. M. G's plan proceeded the principle of partition of the Punjab, it is unsatisfactory and disappointing in several respects for the Sikhs. There is no positive provision at all for giving the Sikhs their homeland and their deserved status or political power, nor have they been armed with means to safeguard their rights in constitution-making.

Mr. E. G. Casey, Former Governor of Bengal, declared at Melbourne, "Australia is vitally interested in a peaceful settlement in India, which lay athwart her lines of communication and was also a vast potential market. While not taking sides, Australia would help the new Hindustan and Pakistan Governments."

5th. The preliminary steps towards the partition of India were taken at a conference of the seven Indian leaders and the Viceroy at New Delhi. It was decided to set up a small high-power Committee consisting of representatives of the Congress, the League and the Sikhs and presided over by the Viceroy to consider the problems connected with the plan for the two Dominions.

The Standing Committee of the Chamber of Princes, which met under the Chairmanship of the Maharaja of Patiala, adopted a resolution recommending to the Crown Representative that in view of the lapse of Paramountcy, the Chamber of Princes will cease to exist.

A Board of Research in Atomic Energy was set up in New Delhi under the auspices of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research with Prof. Homi Bhabha, as the Chairman.

Mr. L. B. Bhopatkar, President of the Hindu Mahasabha, in a statement characterised the British Government's new plan for the transfer of power "as a triumph of the Muslim League leadership" and expressed the fear that in course of time, the League would "succeed in coercing the Congress and Britain into including the whole of the Punjab and Bengal in the Pakistan area" as also a reasonably wide corridor linking these two provinces.

The Union and Provincial Constitution Committees of the Constituent Assembly held a joint session and decided to accelerate the drafts in view of the pending constitutional changes.

U. Aung San, Deputy Chairman of the Burmese Interim Government, declared at Rangoon, "A divided India augurs ill not only for the Indian people, but also for all Asia and world peace.

6th. Mahatma Gandhi met H. E. the Viceroy and discussed with him the question of partition of the Punjab and Bengal.

The Committee of Action of the A. I. Muslim League passed a resolution advising the Assam Provincial Muslim League to withdraw the civil disobedience movement in the province in view of the impending referendum which vitally affects the province of Assam.

7th. The All-India Council of the Hindu Mahasabha which began its session in New Delhi under the presidency of S. J. Bhopatkar, discussed the latest plan of H. M. G. for the final transfer of power.

The Federal constitution for India with a strong centre was visualised by the Union and Provincial Constitution Sub-Committee of the Constituent Assembly at their joint meeting. It was decided that if the States join the Federation, their relations with the Centre would be on the basis of the Cabinet Mission plan and they would surrender only three subjects, viz. Foreign Affairs, Defence and Communications to the Centre.

Mr. Asaf Ali, the Indian Ambassador to the U. S. A., in a broadcast from Washington, pledged India's support to every effort that the U. S. A. would make towards the establishment of peace, freedom and prosperity in the world. He added, "It would be only reasonable for any peace-loving people, who want an orderly settlement of the world's problems, to expect the U. S. A. to give the lead to post-war world in the moral, economic and political fields."

A resolution characterising the recommendations of the Central Pay Commission regarding the wages of railwaymen as "inadequate and unsatisfactory" was passed at the two-day convention of the All-India Railwaymen's Federation at Gorakhpur.

- 8th. The All-India Committee of the Hindu Mahasabha reiterated its opposition to partition of the country and declared that "there will never be peace unless the separated areas are brought back into the Indian Union and made its integral parts." Regarding the partition of the Punjab and Bengal, the Committee expressed the view that the tentative allocation of the territories was "unjust and unfair to the Non-Muslims" and strongly urged that the Hindus and Sikhs in the Punjab and Hindus in Bengal are entitled to claim considerable additional territories."

The Committee further demanded that the same principle on which referendum was proposed in respect of Sylhet in Assam be adopted in respect to the Hindu majority areas in Sind and the Chittagong Hill Tracts in East Bengal.

Strongly criticising the British Government's plan, Sj. Sarat Chandra Bose declared at Calcutta, "India could not get peace by accepting H. M. G's plan of June 3 as it sounds the death knell of freedom. The plan is bound to lead to perpetual conflicts between Hindus and Muslims in both the Hindu and Muslim majority provinces."

An appeal to the people to cease fighting among themselves was made by Mahatma Gandhi, in his post-prayer speech in New Delhi. Referring to the move for a united sovereign Bengal, Gandhiji said he would never be guilty of supporting anything that could not be publicly and honestly defended.

Sir V. T. Krishnamachari, Prime Minister of Jaipur and Sardar M. K. Pannikar, Prime Minister of Bikaner, in a joint statement appealed to all the States to join the Constituent Assembly at the earliest possible date so as to give their co-operation and help to those engaged in the task of framing India's new constitution.

- 9th. The Council of the All-India Muslim League, which met in New Delhi under the presidency of Mr. M. A. Jinnah, adopted a resolution accepting "as a compromise" the British Government's plan for the partition of the Punjab and Bengal and the conferment of Dominion Status. The resolution, *inter alia*, deplored the partition of the two provinces, but nevertheless recommended its acceptance in the interests of peace and tranquility.

The Council also authorised Mr. Jinnah to conduct such negotiations as might be necessary for the division of the defence forces, assets and liabilities and other cognate issues arising out of the partition.

A campaign of non-violent non-co-operation movement in order to force the recalcitrant Princes to join the Indian Union was envisaged by Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, President of the A. I. States' People's Conference, in a press interview at Bombay.

The death occurred of H. H. the Maharaja Jodhpur.

- 10th. The procedure to give effect to paragraphs five to eight of H. M. G's statement of June 3 which lays down the principle for the partition of the Punjab and Bengal was announced by the Governor-General in New Delhi.

The National Executive of the Socialist Party of India at New Delhi, in a resolution on the British Government's plan, expressed its disapproval of and grief at the proposed division of the country. It also decided to keep out of the A. I. T. U. C and the I. N. T. U. C and build a separate Socialist Trade Union movement.

An appeal to the youth of South-East Asia to take an intelligent part in shaping the education in their respective countries so as to achieve the democratic aim of social service was made by Dr. Zakir Hussain, Chairman of the International Student Service Co-ordinating Committee, while presiding over the East-Asia Regional Conference of the I. S. S. at Madras.

Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Aiyar, Member of the Constituent Assembly, in a statement declared that there are only two courses open to the Indian States—either to enter into constitutional relationship with the Indian Union or to enter into quasi-constitutional relationship of the nature of paramountcy with the Indian Union.

- 11th. The Governor of Bengal summoned meetings of the Indian members of the Bengal Legislative Assembly representing the Muslim-majority and non-Muslim majority districts on June 20 (1947) to decide the issues of partition and of Constituent Assembly.

A Sub-committee to go into the subject of formation of linguistic provinces was appointed by the joint meeting of the Union Constitution Committee and Provincial Constitution Committee of the Constituent Assembly.

The Standing Committee of the All India States' People's Conference met in New Delhi under the presidency of Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya and discussed the situation created by H. M. G.'s latest statement.

Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, Dewan of Travancore, announced the decision of the Travancore State to declare itself independent on August 15 and appealed to the people to stand solidly behind His Highness in the stand the State has taken to assert its independence, which he described as a matter of life and death.

The 3-months old Civil Disobedience Movement in Assam was called off by the Assam Provincial Muslim League.

- 12th. The Congress Working Committee met in New Delhi to draft the resolution to be placed before the A. I. U. C. on the acceptance of the Mountbatten Plan of partition of India.

The Nizam of Hyderabad issued a Firman declaring that with the lapse of Paramountcy in pursuance of H. M. G.'s plan, Hyderabad would become an independent sovereign State and not join either of the two Constituent Assemblies of Hindustan and Pakistan.

The Standing Committee of A. I. State's People's Conference, in a resolution on H. M. G.'s statement, declared that "on the lapse of Paramountcy, sovereignty resides in the people of the States and the Princes can only be constitutional rulers embodying the peoples' sovereignty." The Committee also criticised the move in Hyderabad and Travancore to declare the States' independence on the lapse of Paramountcy and stated that any such declaration would amount to an expression of hostility on the part of the rulers concerned, not only to the Indian people but to their own people.

- 13th. The Congress Working Committee approved of the draft resolution to be placed before the A. I. U. C. on the acceptance of the partition plan. The resolution also appealed to and demanded of every Congressman to forget petty differences and disputes and to stand by, vigilant, disciplined and prepared to serve the cause of India's freedom and defend it from all who may seek to do it injury.

The Working Committee of the All-India Majlis-e-Ahrar, in a resolution on the British Cabinet's Plan, said that it would result in the "political subjugation of Pakistan in the shape of economic and defence alliances. Ahrars have always stood for complete independence and, as such, the Majlis cannot lend its support to it."

H. E. the Viceroy had a further meeting with the seven Indian leaders in New Delhi. The meeting lasted over 3 hours.

- 14th. The All-India Congress Committee commenced its session in New Delhi. The Committee discussed for over 6 hours the Working Committee's draft resolution accepting H. M. G.'s plan for June 3 for the final transfer of power. Pandit Govinda Ballabh Pant, who moved the resolution, described the June 3 plan as the only way to achieve freedom and liberty for the country.

Dr. Khan Sahib, the Frontier Premier, at a press conference declared, "A free Frontier is our goal, and that goal is almost achieved. As Pathans we want to be absolutely free and independent from any foreign domination."

15th. The All-India Congress Committee concluded its session after passing the resolution, accepting H. M. G.'s June 3 statement, by 15 votes to 29. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel wound up the debate on the resolution which lasted nearly 9 hours. Both Pandit Nehru and Sardar Patel bluntly told the Committee that the alternative before the Committee was either to accept partition or to be faced with complete Balkanisation and anarchy.

The Committee also unanimously passed the resolution on the Indian States repudiating the right of any Indian State to declare itself independent and to live in isolation from the rest of India. Pandit Nehru, speaking on the resolution, declared, "We will not recognise the independence of States in India. Further, any recognition of such independence by any foreign Power will be considered as an unfriendly act."

The Provisional Executive of the Indian National Trade Union Congress, at a meeting in New Delhi, adopted a resolution expressing the view that the division of India would be detrimental to the interests of the toiling masses of the country" and "hoping that the division may be a temporary phase in the struggle for freedom." The Committee also passed another resolution welcoming the recommendations of the Central Pay Commission as a first step in the progressive socio-economic policy of the State.

16th. The "Super Committee" appointed by the Viceroy to settle details of procedure concerning the forthcoming constitutional changes, met in New Delhi under the chairmanship of the Viceroy. The Committee consisted of Mr. Lingayat Ali Khan, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Dr. Rajendra Prasad and Mr. Abdur Rab Nishtar.

The Congress Working Committee met in New Delhi and discussed the question of Congress participation in the proposed referendum in the N.W.F.P. under the British plan for the transfer of power. The Committee endorsed the decision of the N.W.F.P. Congress Committee authorising Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan to take whatever action he thought best to deal with the situation in the province. After a 3-hour sitting the Committee adjourned *sine die*.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah, in a statement, appealed to every Muslim to contribute to the "Pakistan Fund" to be set up and utilised for the various tasks connected with the partition including referendum in the two areas (Sylhet and N. W. F. P.) and to the work of the Constituent Assembly of Pakistan.

In his presidential address to the first session of the Hyderabad State Congress, Swami Ramananda Tirtha, President of the Congress, appealed to the Nizam's Government to join the Indian Union and participate in the existing Constituent Assembly. He also urged the Government to convene a Constituent Assembly for the State, elected on the basis of adult franchise, to frame a democratic constitution with responsible Government, under the aegis of the Nizam for Hyderabad as an integral part of the free Indian Union.

17th. Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, the Scheduled Castes' leader, in a statement at Bombay, urged the Interim Government to notify H. M. G. that the British Parliament had no right to abrogate Paramountcy and that any clause in the legislation conferring Dominion Status on India would be treated by the people of India as repugnant to their sovereignty and therefore, null and void. He added that Independent India can make a valid claim for the inheritance of Paramountcy.

Sir A. Ramaswami Mudaliar, Dewan of Mysore, announced the decision of the State to participate in the deliberations in the Constituent Assembly.

Discussions were held in New Delhi between the Viceroy, Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. M. A. Jinnah on the situation in the N. W. F. P. and the proposed referendum in the province.

Mr. M. A. Jinnah, in a statement, declared, "with the termination of Paramountcy, Indian States would be independent sovereign States and they would be free to join either the Hindustan Constituent Assembly or the Pakistan Constituent Assembly or remain Independent."

18th. Acharya Kripalani, the Congress President, arrived in Calcutta.

Talks between Mahatma Gandhi, Mr. Jinnah and Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, aimed at reaching a peaceful settlement of the Frontier Provinces issue, continued in New Delhi. Possible alternatives to a referendum, to which

Frontier Congress leaders were opposed, and the question of fresh elections and an independent Pathan State were some of the subjects discussed.

A communique issued from the Viceroy's House announced that Lieut. General Sir Robert Lockhart has been appointed as the Governor of the N. W. F. P. in place of Sir Olaf Caroe, for a period of two months during which time the referendum is to be held there.

Mr. Pattom Thonu Pillai, President of the Travancore Congress, envisaged a "mighty conflict" in the form of a mass civil disobedience movement between the Travancore Government and the people of the State, if the demand for Responsible Government under the aegis of the Ruler and the entry into the Constituent Assembly and the Indian Union was not conceded.

Sir O. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, Dewan of Travancore, in a press conference, asserted that the independence for which the State stood was the independence of its ruler as well as of its people and stressed that the declaration of the State had evoked tremendous enthusiasm and exhilaration among all sections of the population who, he was convinced, would consider no sacrifice too great for the achievement of this great ideal.

19th. Congress and Muslim League members of the Bengal Assembly held a conference in Calcutta under two sectional chairmen and decided the procedure to be adopted at the meeting on June 20 on the question of partition of the province.

The Working Committee of the Mysore State Congress passed a resolution welcoming the announcement of the Maharaja that Mysore would join the Indian Constituent Assembly.

20th. The partition of Bengal was decided upon at a meeting of the members of the Bengal Assembly from the non-Muslim majority area by 58 votes to 21. The non-Muslim majority section was presided over by the Maharaja of Burdwan. Members of the Muslim majority areas gave their verdict against partition by 106 votes to 35. Mr. Nurul Amin, the Speaker of the House, presided over this section.

By 58 votes to 21, the members of the non-Muslim majority areas also decided that the constitution of the separated province consisting of the non-Muslim majority areas should be framed in the existing Constituent Assembly. The Muslim majority areas, voting on this issue, decided not to join the existing Constituent Assembly by 107 votes to 34.

A joint meeting of the two sections was held to decide whether the province of Bengal as a whole would join the existing Constituent Assembly or a new and separate Constituent Assembly if it was decided by the two parts to remain united. 60 members voted for joining the existing Constituent Assembly and 129 for a new and separate one.

The Muslim majority section also decided by 105 votes to 31 that the new province of East Bengal should agree to the amalgamation of Sylhet district with it if the referendum to be held there resulted in favour of such amalgamation.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of India, which concluded its 10-day session in New Delhi, in a resolution on H. M. G's plan of June 3, declared, "The Mountbatten award does not give India real independence, but is the culmination of a double faced imperial policy which, while making concessions to the national demand to transfer power, sets in motion disruptive and reactionary forces to obstruct the realisation of real independence. The British policy of divide and rule, exploiting Hindu Muslim differences, produced an unprecedented civil war and has now culminated in the final act of partition of the country into two hostile States which they plan to control by entering into new alliances with reactionary forces to the different partitioned areas.

The Council of the Servants of India Society which met in Poona under the Chairmanship of Pandit H. N. Kunzru, passed a resolution welcoming the British Labour Government's decision to make India fully self-governing by the middle of August 1947.

21st. The procedure to be adopted for holding a referendum in Sylhet in pursuance of H. M. G's statement was announced by the Governor-General in New Delhi.

The Executive Committee of the Central Akali Dal at its meeting in Lahore, decided to reject H. M. G's plan of June 3 and oppose its implementation.

Eighteen persons were killed and over 55 others injured as a result of sudden recurrence of communal trouble in Lahore.

An assurance of justice and fairplay to the Anglo-Indian community in Pakistan was given by Malik Feroze Khan Noon, addressing the Anglo-Pakistan Association in Lahore.

22nd. Dr. Profulla Chandra Ghosh, Member of the Congress Working Committee, was unanimously elected leader of the Congress Assembly Party of West Bengal (non-Muslim majority areas) at a meeting of the Party held in Calcutta under the presidency of Acharya Kripalani, the Congress President.

The Council of the National Liberal Federation of India, which met in Poona, adopted a resolution expressing the opinion "that the division of the country, as contemplated in the Mountbatten Plan, would be contrary to the country's economic and strategic interests.

Mr. G. H. Hidayatullah, Premier of Sind, in a press interview, affirmed his faith in the economic potentiality of Pakistan and called upon the Hindus of Sind to co-operate with the League Government.

The creation of a free Pathan State with a constitution framed on the basis of Islamic conception of democracy, equality and social justice, was demanded at a joint meeting of the Frontier Congress Committee, the Frontier Congress Parliamentary Party and the Red Shirts at Peshawar.

Police opened fire at several places to quell rioting in Lahore.

23rd. The partition of the Punjab was decided upon at a meeting of the Eastern section of the Punjab Assembly in Lahore by 50 votes to 22. Sardar Kapur Singh, Deputy-speaker of the Assembly, was in the chair. The Western Punjab section of the Punjab Assembly, meeting under the presidency of Dewan Bahadur S. P. Singha, the Speaker of the Assembly, voted against partition of the province by 69 votes to 27.

At a joint session of the two sections of the Punjab Assembly—Western and Eastern Punjab—held under the chairmanship of Dewan Bahadur S. P. Singha, 91 members voted for a new Constituent Assembly and 77 for the present Constituent Assembly.

Acharya Kripalani, Congress President, announced the appointment of a 14-man Central Committee with B. J. Atul Gupta as Chairman and Prof Nirmal Bose as Secretary to present the Bengal nationalists' case before the Boundary Commission.

24th. Mr. Kiran Sankar Roy was elected leader of the East Bengal Congress Assembly Party.

At a joint meeting of the Frontier Congress Committee, the Frontier Congress Parliamentary Party, and Khudai Khidmatgars at Peshawar, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan issued a statement urging the Pathans to boycott the proposed referendum in the Province.

A strong plea for "Hinduising Indian politics and militarising Hindudom" was made by B. L. B. Bhopatkar, President of the All-India Hindu Mahasabha, addressing a public meeting at Madras. He further charged the Congress with betraying the electorate by accepting the British plan of June 3 and agreeing to the vivisection of the country.

Wide scale arson, stabbing etc continued in Lahore. Police made a large number of arrests.

25th. It was officially announced in New Delhi the appointment of Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit, Minister of Local-self Government of U. P. as the first Indian Ambassador to the U. S. S. R.

The Working Committee of the All-India Jamiat-ul-Ulema, meeting in New Delhi, adopted a resolution demanding that the proposed referendum in the Frontier Province should be on the wider principle of giving full freedom of opinion so that the people of the provinces may freely choose the form of Government they want; they should in no case be forced to choose only between Pakistan and Hindustan."

Dr. Henry F. Grady, the first U. S. Ambassador to India, arrived at Bombay from U. S. A.

S. L. B. Bhopatkar, President of A. I. Hindu Mahasabha, in a press conference, declared that the Hindu Mahasabha would give its whole-hearted support to the Maharaja of Travancore and his Government to resist any step taken by the State Congress or any movement that might be launched at the instance of the Congress against the Government to force it join the Constituent Assembly.

Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan, Mr. H. S. Subrawardy, Khawaja Nazimuddin, and Mr. A. K. Fazlul Huq were among the 29 candidates nominated by the Central Muslim League Parliamentary Party for election from East Bengal to the proposed Pakistan Constituent Assembly.

26th. The Sind Legislative Assembly, at a special sitting, decided by 33 votes to 20 that Sind should join the new Pakistan Constituent Assembly.

The four-member Bengal Partition Council met for the first time at Calcutta under the presidentship of Sir Frederick Burrows, Governor of Bengal. The members of the Council were Mr. H. S. Subrawardy and Khawaja Nazimuddin representing the Muslim League and Sj. Nalini Ranjan Sirkar and Sj. Dharendra Narayan Mukerjee representing the Congress. At the Council, the Governor outlined the task before it and emphasized the need for quick decisions.

Dr. Khan Sahab, the Frontier Premier, at a press conference, explained the circumstances which led the Frontier Congress to demand a separate sovereign State of Pathanistan and boycott the referendum. He said, "The division of the Punjab having been decided upon, it is almost impossible for us to continue to remain in Hindustan. And because a definite verdict against Pakistan has already been given by the Frontier people during the last elections, there is no alternative left to us but to have a separate sovereign State of our own."

A stirring appeal to the citizens of Lahore and the people of the Punjab to stop senseless slaughters, arson and loot was made by the leaders of various political parties held in Lahore under the chairmanship of the Governor of the Punjab. A security committee, consisting of Khan Iftikar Hussain Khan of Mamdot, Lala Bhim Sen Sachar and Sardar Swaran Singh was formed to review daily the state of law and order in the province.

The Governor of Assam promulgated an Ordinance called the Assam (Sylhet) Referendum Offences Ordinance 1947, which makes it an offence certain acts and provide punishments for such acts if committed in connection with the referendum in Sylhet.

The Partition Committee of the Cabinet met in New Delhi, the Viceroy presiding. The Committee reviewed the progress made by the various committees in regard to partition. An Army Reconstitution Committee was also set up to carry out the division of the Indian armed forces with one sub-committee each for the Army, Air Force and the Navy.

27th. The Partition Council of India came into existence at a meeting of the party held in New Delhi under the chairmanship of the Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten. Mr. M. A. Jinnah also attended the meeting.

The strong determination of the people of Hyderabad to resist the declaration of independence of the State was expressed by Swami Ramananda Tirtha, President of the State Congress, in a press interview at Bombay.

28th. Mr. M. A. Jinnah, in a statement on the N. W. F. F., said that the resolution of the Frontier Congress demanding a free Pathan State of the Pakhtoon is a direct breach of the Congress acceptance of H. M. G.'s plan of June 3. He added, "I want the Muslims of Frontier to understand that they are Muslims first and Pathans afterwards and that the province will meet a disastrous fate if it does not join the Pakistan Constituent Assembly. The three and half million people of that province, which is economically deficit, will not be able to stand, even for a few months, by themselves and politically and geographically the province will be reduced to a non-entity."

The Bengal Partition Council met for the second time in Calcutta with Sir Frederick Burrows, the Governor, presiding. The Council appointed two committees, one on organisation, personnel and records, and the other on assets and liabilities with an equal number of nominees for the Congress and the League.

Sj. R. S. Ruiker, Vice-President of the A. I. Forward Bloc resigned his membership of the Executive of the All-India Trade Union Congress.

Dr. P. C. Ghosh, leader of the West Bengal Congress Parliamentary Party met Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Nehru in New Delhi and discussed the various issues consequent on the dissolution of the Ministry in Bengal.

29th. At a special joint meeting of the members of the Shahi Jigra (excluding the Sardars nominated by the Kalat State) and the non-official members of the Quetta Municipality, Baluchistan decided to join Pakistan. Fifty-four

members voted in favour of the new Constituent Assembly. The non-Muslim members were absent.

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Education Member, in a press statement, referred to the apprehension of minorities both in the Indian Union and the seceding areas following the acceptance of the June 3 plan, and suggested a joint meeting of representatives of the two Constituent Assemblies to draw up a common charter of rights of minorities in both the States.

Mr Liaquat Ali Khan, General-Secretary of the All-India Muslim League, issued a statement directing all Muslim League members from the Hindu-majority Provinces to attend the Union Constituent Assembly and ask for adequate safeguards in the New Constitution that may be framed by the Assembly.

The Bihar Provincial Congress Committee unanimously elected S. Mahamaya Prasad as its President.

30th. The personnel of the two Boundary Commissions to demarcate the boundaries of the two parts of Bengal and the Punjab were announced in New Delhi. It was decided that the same person would serve as Chairman of both the Boundary Commissions. The members appointed were—S. Justice Bijan Kumar Mukherjee, S. Justice O. C. Biswas, Mr. Justice Mohamed Akram and Mr. Justice S. A. Rahman for Bengal; Mr. Justice Din Mohammad, Mr. Justice Muhammad Munir, Mr. Justice Mehr Chand Mahajan and S. Justice Teja Singh for the Punjab.

It was officially announced from the Government House at Calcutta that new ministers would be appointed to the Bengal Government to represent the view-point of West Bengal. These ministers would have the power to veto cabinet decision and initiate new policy in matters relating to West Bengal.

The Union Constitution Committee and the Union Powers Committee of the Constituent Assembly at its joint meeting, discussed the scope of federal taxation with particular reference to the Indian States.

There was a sudden recrudescence of communal trouble in Calcutta. 15 persons were killed and over 40 others injured in incidents which took place in the city and suburbs.

Notes on Indian History

It has truly been said that a History of India that reveals the whole panorama of the vast millennia of her distinctive life and civilisation in its actual shape and colour and due proportion and perspective, still remains to be written. The materials for drawing such a vast outline and making such a comprehensive and connected sketch are not yet in hand. A fairly definite outline and connected sketch which gives the promise of being some day developed into what is called "scientific history" has, however, been steadily emerging out of the mist that veils the immensity of India's past—a mist which (thanks to the labours of the investigators) has perceptibly thinned without being as yet actually lifted as far as one can now make one's incursion into the age that saw the birth of Buddhism and Jainism in India in the Sixth Century B. C. Beyond that there is still only "cosmic nebulae" relieved here and there by a few stray constellations of lucidly distinct historical facts. These "nebulae" have probably a depth and density to be measured only in terms of millennia. But from the position where we can now make our historical prospecting, these vast remote dark spaces of Indian history recede and shrink and fold up and, at last, look like a far-away blank, black spherule beyond the galaxy of human remembrance.

Ancient Indian history is apparently, "full" of such gaps and blanks. Beyond the time when Alexander the Great invaded the Punjab (326 B. C.), the galactical system of detailed and authentic Indian history does not far extend. There are too many unexplored blank spaces and unformed, chaotic nebulae beyond that time still. Beginning approximately with that period we are furnished, sometimes in abundance with fairly trustworthy material in the shape of contemporary Greek testimony bearing on Indian history, and also, as time rolls on, with inscriptional and other kinds of decipherable and dependable domestic evidence. Of course, an immense mass of "documentary" evidence and evidence in the more or less fluid, volatile state of tradition, heresy and folk-lore (written or unwritten) have always lain by the side of the historian hitherto busy with its inscriptions, plates, coins, artefacts and any corroborative evidence that may be forthcoming from outside. And that mass of ancient Indian documentary evidence and tradition has, generally, lain neglected by his side. It has been, generally, of little help to him in reconstructing, "on scientific lines", the missing skeleton of ancient Indian History. It has been, however, of great use to the comparative mythologist, philologist and anthropologist.

But even the historian who seeks to reconstruct on scientific line the missing skeleton of ancient history, whether of India or of any other country, should do well to remember that the dry bones of the skeleton he may have been able to put together will not be true, living history unless they can be made intinct with the touch of life which literature, art, tradition, 'myths', folk-lore, religious and social institutions in their earlier and later forms alone can give. From coins, plates etc., we can build a possible or even probably frame-work of chronology into which we can put our little bits of tested facts according to one possible plan or other. Such a mosaic of dates and facts (mainly relating to dynastic succession, war and conquest) is of course important as necessary ground-plan of history. But it is not the completed structure of history. It is not history as organic process of evolution. So we have to distinguish between structural or morphological history and organic "physiological" history.

Now India has been so poor in comparison with some other ancient countries like Egypt, Babylonia and China in her "materials" for writing the first kind of history, and the available materials, as we saw, do not carry us much beyond the time of Budha and Mahavir in the Sixth Century B. C. Recently, however, a very old and apparently, a high order of civilisation has been unearthed in the Indus Valley in the Punjab and in Sind, which according to current official beliefs, is of Sumerian pattern. The buried cities now discovered bring to light not only very interesting features of a civilisation thriving in the western part of India in so remote a past (when the Indo-Aryans had not, according to the common view, yet migrated into India), but they even put into our hands interesting clues that may eventually help us to unravel many of the riddles of our Vedic and post-Vedic history. The Tantrik cult, for instance, may have older and deeper roots in the soil of India than have so far been granted or suspected. Nothing contemporaneous with or earlier than the Indus Valley civilisation has yet been unearthed in

other parts of the sub-continent. So the present trend of speculation is to regard the Indus Valley civilisation as a short wedge driven into Western India—the whole of which was still at the low level of aboriginal darkness (with the possible exception of some parts that might have risen to the Dravidian 'light' level)—probably by the races and civilisation of Sumer.

We are still in the dusk-land of probabilities or even less than probabilities as to the date, origin, early habitats and earlier forms not only of the Indus Valley but also of the Dravidians and Indo-Aryan people. We do not know for certainty when and from where the Indo-Aryans came into India. The fact of Aryan immigration into India itself, though generally accepted, is still disputed. And if immigration be admitted we have, probably, to admit not one but several successive streams of immigration. Such theory, apparently called for to account for some of the critical turnings and "sudden mutations" in our ancient historical evolution, will lead to many unexplored avenues of enquiry as to ages and dates, origins and characteristics.

THE RIGVEDA

The Rigveda—the earliest and the most informing and instructive "documentary" evidence that we possess—appears to set the stage amidst scenes which show the Aboriginal, Dravidian and Anglo-Aryan factors fighting for supremacy first in the Vindhya Range which with the impenetrable forest mantle, stood as barrier between Northern India (Aryavatta) and Deccan. Gradually we find the aborigines cornered and driven to the hills and forests where their descendants, more or less Aryanised, still continue to live. In considerable parts they were also absorbed into the fold of an Aryan society and culture. And in being absorbed they did not fail to impart some little part of their own character of the Aryan complex. There was not so much of racial or even linguistic fusion as of cultural assimilation. The process of Aryanisation in language, culture, etc., has been a process admitting, naturally, of different shapes and degrees, leaving at the one end aboriginal races that have almost kept aloof from Aryan influences and having at the other others that have become part and parcel of the Aryan system. The Aryanisation of the Dravidian peoples, especially in religion, culture and civilisation, has been a much more perfected process. But on the other hand the Dravidian impress on the Aryan system is also in many places, deep and unmistakable. The Dravidian is co-ordinated or even subordinated to the Aryan but not lost in the latter. This power of assimilation of alien races and cultures without losing the individuality of its own essential Type or Pattern and without at the same time making the diverse elements assimilated lose whatever is essential in them—has been a special characteristic of the Indo-Aryan race and culture-complex. This has meant organic unity or unity in diversity of a more fundamental and abiding nature than can, perhaps, be claimed for the political or national unity with which histories are completely familiar. Historians, accordingly, commonly miss the unity which lies deep and sees only the diversity which lies on the surface. India to them is thus a veritable chaos of jarring elements of races, languages, religions, castes, sects and cultures which have never known unity before the days of the unitary political rule of the British. Of course the introduction, in later times, of the Semitic religions—Muhammadanism and Christianity—disturbed to some extent the ages-long unity and balance of the Arya-Dravidian culture and social system in India. But even these elements were in the process of being slowly drawn into the sphere of influence of what we may call the genius of India. In other words, a slow but sure process of cultural assimilation even of these "militant" factors was going apace. Buddhism, which had risen as a "revolt" against orthodox Hinduism but yet as a revolt from within—and which dominated the situation in India for several centuries, ended in the land of its birth by being eventually absorbed and assimilated into the parent religion. Jainism and many other old or later "revolts" have thus "squared their accounts" with the same parent religion, and have been for many centuries living peacefully side by side with one another and with the later.

This power of assimilation and co-ordination in which all the components make their own contributions and are permitted to live side by side as members of a commonwealth of cultures, has been the secret of the wonderful resisting and staying of power of the Indian culture-complex against such disintegrating forces as have smashed up many and old and glorious civilisations of the world. And it can be easily shown from facts that this staying power has been in evidence not only in the realm of cultural contacts and impacts but also in that of social and political

ones. There have been many raids into India and invasions before and after Christ, but it is a travesty of facts to imagine that Indian resistance has always been weak and short-lived and that such invasions are typically like the raids of Mahmud of Ghazni which even swept away Indian armies and kingdoms like cobweb or a house of cards. Before her final subjugation by the Mahammadan Power—and the final subjugation of the whole of India was anything like an accomplished fact only for a time during the reign of great Mogul Emperors—India had been, it should be borne in mind, a mighty Power and a Model of civilisation and culture for at least three thousand years. And it should be remembered further that when the British in India turned from trade to conquest (always with native help and alliance) they had to settle their accounts not only with Haider Ali and Tipu Sultan in the South but mainly the Maharatta and Sikh Powers which had risen on the ruins of the Mahammadan Power in India.

UNITARY INDIAN EMPIRE

But here were and still have been other factors which, to some extent, operate against India developing a compact and coherent political and military organisation except occasionally like, for instance, the Great Roman Empire of old or the British Empire in modern times. We possess, apparently, no connected retrospect of the remote past of which the Vedas, Epics and Puranas speak. But as far as appearances go an unitary, centralised Indian Empire was the exception and not the rule. In later times also, an Empire like that of Asoka was not a common achievement. As we said, India has possessed deep-laid cultural and institutional unity beneath all her diversities. India has fought, and fought bravely, for the integrity of her sacred Land, her sacred religion and tradition, and for their sacred visible Symbols and Embodiment. But one has rarely fought for the "State" as such or an Empire as such. The spirit of her culture did not favour the formation and consolidation of Nationalism in the sense it is commonly understood and her basic institutions would hardly consist with any forms of centralised State control. The all-controlling and co-ordinating Principle was Dharma (the Principle of Human Values and Conduct) rather than any State agency. Each village, for example, was a self-contained commune and autonomous unit owing permanent allegiance to the reign of Dharma and only temporary allegiance to any kingship that might function for the time being. So the village communes continued to live though kingdoms after kingdoms rose and fell. They were but little affected by the accident and exigencies of politics.

Again, the spirit of Dharma (which should not be translated as religion) has definitely and systematically favoured all human or even all living values and tendencies and cosmopolitan outlook and has opposed militant, aggressive, "predatory" nationalism. The old Upanishads are clear and courageous in their conception of those higher values; and the Dharmashastras (Codes laying down social and individual conduct) were bold and consistent in their execution of those ideas. Later, Buddhism and Jainism and other "reforming" movements have tended only to stress such values as non-violence and fellowship with all men and all living beings. These forces operating through the ages tended to produce in the Indian classes and masses a common disposition not quite favourable to the formation and consideration of an unitary military state for purposes of offence and defence.

Of the immense back-ground of Indian History which is represented by the Vedas (Samhitas, Brahmanas, Aranyakas and Upanishads), the various Sutras (or Digests) Philosophies, Epics (the Ramayana and Mahabharata), Puranas and Tantras (our statement here is not anything like full), we possess (unless one is prepared to grant the claim of the Puranas recently put forth in their behalf that they do contain materials for reconstructing a fairly connected chronological history beginning with the very earliest times) very little precise and connected information for the purpose of writing a political history both copious and correct as to facts and their chronological order. But of the ideal and ideas, practices and institutions of the times we do possess a very full, informing and instructive presentation. And after all, what is real history but this? Scholars have been busy with their sketches and drawings of the ancient orders and specimens of ideas, beliefs, and practices that existed in India. But oftener than not their reviews and retrospects have been made from modern standpoints, with modern notions, criteria and standards of testing facts and appraising values. This has not enabled us in any just measure, to understand, much less appreciate, a civilisation (not confined to India but, possibly, reaching some of its greatest heights in this country) which was essentially of a different kind, and cannot therefore, be represented as only the first uncertain and timid step taken on the

road which has through a long long march, at last brought us to our present advanced stage. The ideology, plan and methods of that ancient civilisation we have yet not seriously studied and rightly understood. Much of that civilisation we still regard, without understanding as consisting of "savage" magic, meaningless ritualism, "theological twaddle" and crude superstition. Side by side with all this we find, however, the highest philosophy, deepest mysticism and pure ethics. There is also much that is of original and genuine value from the point of view of human material and mundane progress. This seems to us a curious medley of what is nearly the highest and what is about the lowest. But let us pass on.

Coming to "historical" times we find that the invasion by Alexander the Great of India proved in the result to be little more than a brilliant raid. His victorious armies could only cut off a small slice of North-Western India and this little slice the Macedonian would ingest, but could not digest. His steam-roller of conquest speedily developed "war-weariness" on the plains of the Punjab, and he had to go back only adding a bit of India to his vast Empire. He had won some of his battles in India, but it had not been an "easy walk-over" with him.

CHANDRAGUPTA AND ASOKA

After his death shortly afterwards, the vast Macedonian Empire practically went to pieces. Chandragupta, who became the king of Magadha, proved himself too powerful for the Greek invaders who had violated the sanctity and integrity of the sacred Land of the Five Rivers. As the result of the formidable opposition by the armies of Chandragupta a treaty was concluded between him and the Greek Megasthenes, who was sent by Seleucus as an ambassador to the court of Chandragupta, left a very valuable record of the times of the customs and morals of the people, and of the administration, which though unfortunately fragmentary, bears an eloquent, and admiring testimony to the high order of material and moral civilization attained by the Hindus centuries before Christian era. And this high civilisation was evolved in India not in isolation but in commerce with other civilisations that flourished in ancient times such as the Babylonian, Greek, Persian and Chinese. Chandragupta's son was Bindusara who was succeeded by Asoka (269-231 B. C.) who was undoubtedly, one of the greatest rulers of men holding their sway for the material and spiritual good of mankind. Numerous edicts and inscriptions record the noble and glorious achievements of his reign which, in its later stages, left the bloody path of war and conquest and devoted itself to the much more noble and fruitful task and the moral and spiritual conquest and redemption of ourselves and our fellow beings. With commendable catholicity and tolerance, not seeking to impose it upon others by his great Imperial authority and power, he exercised that authority and power for the purpose of transforming Buddhism, which had been more or less a local sect in the Ganges Valley, into one of the greatest and most potent living world religions. Asoka's reign is therefore rightly held to be an epoch in the history of the world. His edicts also show the man, his ideals and his methods. But all this had not allowed or favoured the cement of the great Maurya Empire setting into the requisite hardness. Independent kingdoms like Bactria and Parthia took their rise in the border land, and the Greeks renewed their incursions. New races (the Yuen-chi) came in a surge of migration which swept all before them, and in the first century A. D. a considerable portion of the North-west India came under their influence.

GUPTA DYNASTY

Kaniska, who made Peshawar his capital, proved great as a ruler and as a patron and missionary of the Buddhist religion. Under him the Kushan Branch of the Yuen-chi reached the zenith of his power. But this power fell as another power in middle India rose—the Andhra dynasty. A peak like Amaravati or Ujjain would some time, rise and shine in the midst of moving vastness of Indian waters. In the beginning of the fourth century the centre of political influence in India was again shifted to Pataliputra in Magadha as the Gupta dynasty emerged into power. Samudragupta, who ruled for fifty years, and his son Chandragupta greatly distinguished themselves not only in war but in the sphere of peaceful and fruitful administration, promoting general prosperity and giving liberal encouragement to art and literature a glorious tribute to which was paid by the Chinese pilgrim Fa-hien. According to his testimony, their Empires were vast and their administration just, enlightened. Towards the end of the Fifth Century—when the White Huns from Central Asia began to pour themselves into India—the sun of the Gupta dynasty set (during whose regime, it should be noted, there had been a revival and

reconstruction of ancient Brahmanism and Brahmanical culture as evidenced especially by the literature of the Purans: but this reviving process was very largely, a process of quiet adaptation and peaceful assimilation. More than a century had elapsed after the fall of the Gupta dynasty before there rose another great and enlightened monarch who could emulate with no mean success the greatest of the Indian rulers in historical time—Asoka. Emperor Harsha, who consolidated his authority practically over the whole of Northern India in the beginning of the seventh century, was famous equally for his great prowess, his high intellectual attainments and for the broad catholicity of his religious outlook. An account of his times has been left by a Chinese, Huen Tsiang by name. In that, India is still painted in generally bright and even glowing colours.

MEDIAEVAL INDIA

After the death of Harsha, and gradually with the emergence of India into what may be called the mediaeval period, the conditions which had made the political unification of India sometimes possible in the past, nearly disappeared, and India was thrown into a state of political confusion and chaos in which petty kingdoms rose like mushrooms and constant internecine strife prevailed. Some outstanding figures like Vikramaditya would occasionally appear on the stage; but such events were few and far between. In the south of India was being enacted a very interesting but involved drama in which the Andhras, Ballavas, Chalukyas and Cholas were the principal actors. Kashmere in the North, Kanauj in the Doab and Bengal in the east were also alive with many vivid and vital scenes and events of political, cultural and social interests. But we shall not try to make a review of them here. One outstanding event in the confusion and complexity of the general Indian situation which deserves notice even passing was the rise of the Rajput power upon which the mantle of the old caste Kshatrias (the warrior and ruling caste) fell and which was the chief opposition that the waves of Mahammedan invasion coming one after another ever since the second quarter of the 7th century, had to encounter and ultimately bear down. Guzrat, Malwa, Ajmer, Kanauj and Delhi were the principal scenes of the new drama of Rajput ascendancy—a drama so full of episodes of superhuman bravery, noble heroism and sacrifice for sacred cause of religion and liberty that they ever since lived in human memory as models which future generations of patriots in any country might well try to emulate. Though Rajput opposition was borne down in Northern India by the end of the twelfth century, Rajput bravery and the spirit that animated it survived the crash of the Hindu Empire of Delhi and Ajmere over which Prithvi Raj, the hero, the last of the Hindu emperors, though not the last of the Hindu rulers, had held sway. Rajput bravery and Rajput love of independence were still factors to reckon with in the days of the great Moghuls—Akbar, Jahangir, Shahjahan and Aurangzab. Ool. Todd and some others have narrated the story, and it constitutes one of his proudest annals in the vast archives of the Hindu glory in India. As to the conquest of Northern India by the Mahammedans, it should be noted, the great prize was not very easily or quickly won; that the first Mahammedan impact was in the seventh century shortly after the passing away of the Prophet, and a Mahammedan kingdom in Northern India came into being towards the end of the 12th. century. Even this did not mean either a complete or final subjugation of India, and there is another thing to be noted. Hindu power fell not because its resistance was weak and its bravery and heroism in the field was not backed by adequate tact, strategy and discipline in diplomacy, planning and preparation.

The centuries of the mediaeval age in India were marked by a conspicuous lack of political unity and solidarity. But they were by no means unimportant and barren. It was not a "dark" Age. In the Gupta period and in the centuries before and after, a marvellous process of social, cultural and religious reconstruction was going apace. The old Vedic scheme of social economy (involving as it did the four Varnas of "caste" and the four Ashrams or "stages" of life) was being transformed through a process of adaptation, assimilation and multiplication which made society more comprehensive and at the same time more complex. The influence of Buddhism, Hellenism and that of Mongoloid races also led to adaptations and assimilations. In many important directions in the older order of Indian customs and institutions. The gradual assimilation of Buddhism itself was a phenomenon of the greatest importance. The Vedic religion survived but it was transformed. The Puranas and Tantras renewed and gave a new expression to the Sanatana Dharma. In the domain of literature, art (both useful and fine), science and mathematics, philosophy and metaphysics these centuries were also productive of fruits that were and still are of

the greatest interest and value. Great poets like Kalidas and Bhavabhuti, and great Philosophers like Shankaracharya and Ramanuja and also other pioneers and masters in other fields formed a galaxy of men of genius and talents which showed that an age of political dis-equilibrium and confusion in India was yet not necessarily an age of cultural depression and darkness and social disruption. The soul of India could, apparently, function to its best advantage inspite of her troubled politics.

But whilst it was true for some time it could not be true for all time. Her politics at last began to tell on her constitution. We do not, however, propose to continue the story through the Mahammedan and British periods. The history of these periods is more settled and definite in features, and these are, generally, well-known. One special feature, which is not always clearly recognised and to which we should like to draw attention is this. From the twelfth century right up to the eighteenth, or even some time later, the Hindu power of revival and regeneration, of initiation and execution was never like dead or even dying. Independent and often powerful kingdoms like Vijayanagar in South, those of Pratap, Shivaji and the Peshwas in the west (we do not mention some others e.g. those in Bengal) would now and then proudly lift their heads and challenge the authority of the great Moslem emperors. Under that authority, too, there flourished many great Hindu administrators, ministers, governors, generals and financiers. In short, during the Mahammedan era, the Hindu genius was not at its best but it was not quite decadent.

THE MAHAMMEDAN RULE

The Mahammedan conquerors, again, from Mohamed Ghori who wrested the sceptre of the kingdom of Delhi from Prithviraj after a first successful attempt, came to India as foreigners but they did not remain here as foreigners. India was the land of their adoption. Raids like those by Chengis Khan or Nadir Shah were rare and they did not represent the normal course of events. India suffered, and sometimes some of the Mahammedan rulers. But the great Moghuls were as much "children of the soul" as the humblest of the Hindu "heathen." And this sharing together by the Hindus and Mussalmans of a common "hearth and home" naturally tendered to breed a consciousness of community of interests in both as India's offspring. There was a steady assimilation of the semitic and Indo-Aryan cultures also and even a growing understanding and appreciation of one religion by the other. The religions touched and even blended with each other at their highest points—e.g., in Sufism and Vedantic mysticism. They also met and evolved a broad common "shrine" to which folk beliefs, practices and institutions would bring their united homage. Even a common dialect (Urdu or Hindustani) was evolved between the two in Northern India which gradually blossomed into a fine literature. The patronage extended by the Muhammedan emperors to Music, Architecture etc. was also fruitful of very fine result. India's wealth attracted the trade and commerce of the civilised world. In fact, America and the West India was discovered in an attempt to discover an western route to the Indian market. British, French, Dutch and Portuguese traders all came and scrambled for market, and eventually for political power in India. It is also worthy of note that even under the sway of such masterful monarchs as Sher Shah, Akbar or Aurangzeb, the government of the country was in the main decentralised, allowing provincial and local autonomy—down to the autonomy of the village units—to adequately function. Even petty local chiefs—like the feudal lords of the mediæval West—never learnt the art of fighting and governing. So it was always possible for a man of ambition and ability, like Shivaji for example, to evolve sanctions whereby he could implement his high political aspirations. It was the very large measure of local autonomy and local initiative that existed that rendered possible the rise of the Mahratta and Sikh Powers and also of the kingdoms of Hyder Ali and the Nizam in the south. And British Power in India in its rise to paramountcy found its most formidable rivals or powerful allies in them.

THE BRITISH RULE

In 1599 during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, some merchants of London formed an association for the purpose of trade with India and this association was granted a royal charter of incorporation. At first this Company was purely a trading concern establishing factories in the east and west coasts of India and in Bengal and administering its affairs in the three "presidencies" which were at first independent of one another but subordinate to the Board of Directors at home. In course of time

however, chiefly with a view to preserving and consolidating its growing and extensive trade in India, in the face of the French rivalry and intrigue and the prevailing political anarchy and unrest in the land, it established military garrisons of defence which soon became involved in hostilities that saddled it with territorial responsibilities. It fought some decisive battles in Madras and in Bengal, which raised a trading company to the status of a political Power in India. French intrigue failed and French rivalry practically died down in India. One of the most decisive battles fought was the battle of Plassey in 1757. The battle was won with the aid of faithful native battalions and with the active or passive support of the generals and noblemen of the unfortunate young Nawab of Bengal. It is worthy of note that the path of British supremacy in India, and often, its influence and prestige abroad has been paved amongst other things, with the consent, alliance and willing co-operation of the Natives of India. It was so even during the critical period of the Sepoy Mutiny one hundred years after the battle of Plassey. It was again so during the "ordeal" of the last great war. The machinery of administration by the East India Company was from time to time modified by Acts of Parliament (1774, 1784, and the Charter Acts of 1793 and 1833). By these a Governor-General in-Council was made the supreme administrative authority in India subject to a Board of Control at home. By the last Act the Company ceased to be a commercial concern and became a political and administrative body only. After the Sepoy Mutiny another Act was passed by which the Government of India was transferred from the Company to the Crown, and thenceforth the Governor-General was also the Viceroy of India. The functions of the Government of India are wide and its responsibilities heavy. But its responsibilities are to the Crown and the Parliament. It has not rested on an elective popular basis. There have been legislative bodies, but its motions, resolutions and votes have not, except as regards certain matters of secondary importance under the Act of 1919, a binding effect on the Government.

India's contributions and sacrifices in the great War were great, but the "reward" that came in the shape of the Parliamentary Declaration promising her a "progressive realisation of responsible government," the stages and times of which were to be determined by the Parliament alone was not comforting to her nationalist aspiration. And the Government of India Act of 1919 which is still in actual function though it has been, apparently, broadened and amplified in some directions by a recent Parliamentary Statute, did not meet the wishes or expectations of India. By that Act dyarchy or a kind of dual responsibility was established in the provinces where the "nation-building" subjects were "transferred" to Ministers (not responsible however to the legislature), whilst the more important subjects were "reserved." In practice the transference of certain subjects to Ministers (who were appointed by, held office under the pleasure of and were responsible to the Governor) meant little more than a complication of the administrative machinery which became in consequence more cumbersome and expensive. The Central Government continued to remain unitary under the scheme. The legislative bodies, both provincial and central, were expanded with non-official majorities, but this placed little power for construction or even for obstruction, in the hands of the popular parties. Whilst the liberals proceeded to work the scheme, the main body of nationalist forces, as represented by the Indian National Congress, would not first even look at it. But some time later under the guidance of S. C. R. Das and Pandit Motilal Nehru, a Swaraj Party, analogous to the present Congress Parliamentary Party, was formed which entered the legislatures, both provincial and central, in telling numbers and by its obstructionist tactics caused not a little embarrassment to those entrusted with the work of day to day administration. In some provinces it was even able to "wreck" dyarchy for a time. Generally, however, the system has worked, though not satisfactorily even according to official appreciation. We need not in particular refer to the unwelcome labours of the All-White Statutory Simon Commission, to which even the habitually co-operating liberals refused to lend their co-operation. Meanwhile the Congress ideology was becoming bolder day by day, and the Lahore session adopted a resolution setting as the goal of India complete independence or *Purna Swaraj*. A campaign of civil disobedience followed to create "sanctions" under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi who has been really at the helm of Congress affairs since the early twenties. The Round Table idea was broached rather too late: but Mahatma Gandhi after concluding, what is known as the Gandhi-Irwin Pact, joined the Conference subsequently. The result of the deliberations of that body fell short of the Congress demand. And the Congress again withdrew its offer of co-operation. This was forced on the Congress by the way in which the British ruling classes used, during the Round Table Conference discussions, India's internal

differences as an excuse for the frustration of her political ambitions. The "Communal Award" of the British Premier Ramsay MacDonald that imparted a "vote value" to religious differences and social inferiorities revealed the tactics of the Anglo-Indian bureaucracy. It was modified by the epic fast of Mahatma Gandhi so far as the Hindus were concerned. But in its wider ramifications, it has stimulated separatist conceits and ambitions that in course of the last ten years have created a "civil war" mentality in the country where almost every creed and class has been organizing themselves to capture political power in the name of their particularistic interests. It is well-known that Mahatma Gandhi wanted to avoid a fight so soon after the Gandhi-Irwin Pact. This attitude was evidenced by the wording of his telegram to Lord Willingdon sent on the 29th December, 1931—"whether you expect me to see you and receive guidance from you as to the course I am to pursue in advising the Congress." Lord Willingdon rejected this opportunity of cementing co-operation between Indian Nationalism and the enlightened self-interest of British Imperialism. The second Civil Disobedience Movement was the natural result which continuing for about two years—1932-'34.—prepared by repression the mind of India to receive the constitutional changes made by the Act of 1935. The genesis and the long drawn processes of shaping this machinery were informed by a spirit of arrogant imperialism, ignoring at every step Indian self-respect. The Imperial Government could not accept any of the suggestions made in the Joint Memorandum of the Indian delegates nominated by itself. The arrival of "provincial autonomy" changed in no way "a relationship that rests on conquest," whose "sanction" was the physical might of Britain, to quote the words of the well-known British publicist, Mr. Brasfield.

With the passage of this Act the ruling authorities hoped that they had been able to so provide things that the men and women of India would remain satisfied with their enlarged electorates from 70 lakhs to about 4 crores, and with the Ministries charged with the solution of "things that matter"—the problems of health, education and economic well-being with which are intimately bound up the life of the majority of the people. These problems of dirt, disease and ignorance could not be neglected any more without doing permanent injury to the body politic. The increasing recognition of this sorry state of affairs joined to the increasing resentment with the pretensions of "external authority", felt by increasing numbers of Indians, created a conflict in the mind of India that was reflected in the discussion of public affairs—a contradiction between the spoken word and the practice that sought to give it shape and form. The organization of the election campaign on behalf of the Congress was characterized by this contradiction. The purpose of sending Congress representatives to the Legislatures was declared to be to "combat" and to "end" the Act of which these were the products, the incorporation of the "Fundamental Rights" resolution (passed at the Karachi Congress, 1931) and of the "Agrarian Programme" (accepted at the Lucknow Congress 1936) in the Congress Election Manifesto (22 August, 1936) held the promise of relief through these Legislatures of the many ills—political and economic and social—from which the people suffered. Facing the Congress Party in this battle for votes, stood the upholders of varied interests, communal and class, that under various disguises and with radical programmes on their lips tried to canalize the rising temper and the organized feeling of the country. In the election contest the Congress secured absolute majorities in the provinces—Madras, the United Provinces, the Central Provinces and Berar, Behar, and Orissa; it was the single largest party in four—Bombay, Bengal, Assam and the North West Frontier Province; in the Punjab and Sind Congress members were in a minority—a negligible minority.

When their leaders were called upon by the Governors in the provinces to help him in forming the Ministries, they demanded of the Governors' assurance that use would not be made of their veto and emergency powers, and that the advice of the Ministries would not be "set aside in regard to their constitutional activities." The Governors expressed inability to divest themselves of "certain obligations" which the Parliament had imposed on them. Ensued a constitutional deadlock; the Assemblies were not called in seven provinces; "interim ministries" were appointed to "conceal" this "breakdown" of the constitutional device, said Lord Berriedale Keith. For four months the controversy waxed and waned. As the statutory period for the convening of the Assemblies drew nearer the Government, "ultra-sensitive over questions of prestige", yielded, Congress Ministries were formed in seven provinces; in Bengal and Assam, in the Punjab and Sind coalition ministries were functioning from April, 1937; the Congress Ministries from the last week of July, 1937. The refusal of the Congress

to entertain the idea of allowing its members to enter into coalition even as the predominant partner, as it was possible in Bengal and Assam, enabled Muslim communalist Ministries to set up in these two provinces whose activities helped to work havoc with the decencies of civilised life, to inflame the bitterness of communal feeling and wait its position all over the country. The lowest depth of this degradation was reached when outbreaks of arson and loot in the city of Dacca and the country side within the district occurred during 1941. The device of the "Communal Award" has been working towards its logical end.

The India Act of 1935 had a federal scheme to introduce. A sort of Diarchy was contemplated, and vast areas of power in the administration were withheld from the people's representatives; the nominees of the rulers of Indian States were given a disproportionately big representation in both the upper and lower houses of the Central Legislature. The Reserve Bank and the Federal Railway Authority were instances of the former; and the so called State's representatives were so many "pocket-boroughs" under the command of the external authority represented by the Governor-General. These and the industrial and commercial and political "safeguards" with which the Federal Scheme bristled repelled public opinion in India. The majority of Muslim politicians were afraid of a central Government where their communalist politics will keep them in a perpetual minority and where they were not prepared to play their part in politics free from narrow appeals to credal and class conceits and ambitions. The rulers of the Indian States were reported to be trying to press hard bargains in their negotiation over the "Instrument of Accession", both in their relation with the "Paramount Power" and in their apprehensions of the rising tide of democracy in their own States. For two years Lord Linlithgow was kept busy smoothing all this opposition with his utmost diplomacy when in September, 1939, the World War II of the 20th century burst upon the world.

India was declared a belligerent by the Governor-General without even the pretence of consultation with the Central Legislature. This was regarded as an insult to Indian self-respect; it exposed before all the world the unnatural relation that subsisted between India with her 40 crores of people and Britain with her 5; it exposed the hollowness of the slogan raised by Britain that she was being forced into the present war for the defence of democracy. The declaration was no panic measure; the ground had been prepared for it six months earlier by a new Section—Section 128A—in the Act of 1935 securing to the Central Government of India "essential powers of direction and control" over the Provincial Governments when an emergency due to war was proclaimed by the Governor-General under Section 102 of the Act. The emergency power granted by this latter Section had been given to the Central Legislature elected on a wide popular franchise, whereas the new Section empowered an irresponsible Executive with power to "give direction to a Province as to the manner in which the executive thereof is to be exercised." The majority of the Provincial Ministries raised objections to this "invasion by the Centre on the sphere of authority conferred by the Act on the Province." Technically the British Government might have been right. But in relations like those that subsist between India and Britain legal and constitutional correctness does not pay a helpful hand.

The actual outbreak of the war did not ease the tension between Indian Nationalism and British Imperialism. The Indian National Congress voiced almost universal Indian feeling when in a statement issued on the 14th, September, 1939 it called upon the British Government to declare their "war aims in regard to Democracy and Imperialism and the New Order that it envisaged; in particular, how these aims are going to apply to India and to be given effect to in the present." Such a declaration, said Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, in a message to the *London Daily Chronicle*, will be able to "make the people of India enthusiastic for a war which was not theirs." The Congress invitation to the British Government was international in its import. Dissatisfaction with the vague generalities of British politicians that found expression even in the statements of British leaders of thought was a proof that these "war aims" needed clear statement. Other organisations of vocal Indian opinion—the Muslim League, the Hindu Mahasabha, the *Jamiat-ul-Ulema-i-Hind*—the organisation of Muslim divines of India for instance—were in their statements as insistent on the clarification of Britain's war aims and their application to the peculiar conditions of India. Up to 1942 the British Government has not been able to satisfy any party in India to set up a Central Government at Delhi-Simla that would enlist the self-respect and self-interest of the country on the side of this

war of continent and oceans. This failure had led to the resignation of eight of the eleven Provincial Ministers of the country—Bombay, Madras, Central Provinces & Berar, Orissa, Bihar, Assam, the United Provinces, and the North-West Frontier Province. Two of these have since been revived—Orissa and Assam—carrying on pale imitation of "Provincial autonomy"—under the rule of the military bureaucracy in India whom this "world war" has placed in this dominant position.

Apart from this argument between Indian Nationalism and British Imperialism the various elements in Indian composite life have not shown that unity of ends and means that would have wrested political power from unwilling hands. The "Pakistan" claim of the Muslim League demands that areas where the Muslims happen to be in a majority should be constituted into a sovereign "Independent State." This claim has been recognised by opinion in India and in the wide world outside as a threat to the unity and integrity of India. Confronted by such a situation the British Government stands in anxious helplessness. Priding itself on its concern for minorities it finds itself coercing the majority at every step. Since the 8th August (1940) proposals of Lord Lighthgow for the enlargement of the Executive Council, there have been two enlargements thereof till to-day it consists of eleven Indians and four Europeans inclusive of His Excellency. The increasing "Indianisation" and the "Draft Declaration" brought by Sir Stafford Cripps on behalf of the British Cabinet in March, 1942, have not for divergent reasons appealed to any responsible party in India. Japan's starting success in Burma, in Malaya, in the Philippines, in the Dutch East Indies, the failure of Britain, the U. S. A. and Holland to stand up to the far-flung Japanese aggression have brought down their prestige in the market place of world affairs. And the people of these along with those of India have reasons to be apprehensive of their future. A sense of frustration appears to be oppressing the minds of the men and women of India. It is not fear of Japanese invasion alone that is responsible for this state of things. The evacuation orders on people living in the coastal areas of the country has disturbed and disrupted their habits of life; practically no arrangements have been made on behalf of the State for life in newer places and surroundings for hundreds of thousands of men, women and children; the orgy of profiteering in the necessaries of life; the incompetence of officialdom in face of these anti-social activities—all these, the later two specially, have spread a feeling of helplessness in the country. This mentality has been affecting, however indirectly, the "war work" that was to repel the enemy and wrest victory from his grasp. Since the "Mutiny" days eighty-five years back the certainties of existence for the people of this continental country have not been so rudely shaken as during the first six months of 1942. The break-down of the machinery of civil administration in Malaya and Burma have sent more than five lakhs of refugees to India—men and women of India who had made their living in those countries. This has also added to the confusion of the times. These betokened changes for which the minds of the people had not been prepared. This unpreparedness has created difficulties both for the rulers and the ruled. The Japanese occupation of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands in the heart of the Bay of Bengal, the advance of Japan's hosts towards India's north-eastern borders, the hurried defence arrangements set up in the eastern districts of India—all these signs and portents confront us.

JAPANESE INVASION & ITS EFFECTS

The undeclared war of Japan on British possessions in east Asia on December 7, 1941, caught the British rulers unready. The same happened to be the case with the United States. The air attack on Pearl Harbour high-lighted this unpreparedness and absence of vigilance. Thereafter India became an unwilling belligerent against Japan as she had remained since Lord Lighthgow had declared her at war with Germany in September, 1939. These two acts had demonstrated India's equivocal position in the comity of modern nations. The sacrifices and sufferings, incidental to all wars, she underwent; but she lacked the exaltation of feelings that enables free peoples to welcome these with gladness as part of their duty as citizens. She lacked this consolation, and when Japan brought the horrors of war to her very doors, she bore these with a spirit of fatalism and undisguised resentment that not all her proverbial philosophy could assuage. The leadership of the Indian National Congress tried to guide these into channels of constructive thought and activity, to "non-violent" ways. For about three years it tried to control the rising temper of dissatisfaction with conditions of scarcity in the material necessaries of every-day life, with the rising prices of all consumer goods. Mahatma

Gandhi specially would not hear of creating difficulties for the British bureaucracy in India fighting for survival of their system of rule over the country; his chivalry would not allow him to hit them when they were fighting with their backs to the wall. As the Japanese armies backed their way through Burma and as her navy ploughed triumphantly over the Indian Ocean and the Bay of Bengal, there appeared to be panic and consternation even in the counsels of the British rulers in India. And it was regarded as a possibility that they might fall back from Assam, Bengal, Orissa and the other eastern Provinces of the country and take their stand in the hills and dales at their back. This danger upset the whole administrative machinery, acting against the incipient dissatisfaction of the people and demoralized both the ruling authorities and the subject population. The former resorted to panic measures in pursuit of a "denial policy" that will deny the advancing Japanese any help and facilities that might be forthcoming from a dissatisfied people, a section of the latter found an opportunity to exploit the anarchy of the occasion to profiteer at the expense of the State and of their own people, thus creating conditions of scarcity that made for a famine in Bengal, in parts of Orissa, in parts of the States of Travancore and Cochin and British Malabar on the west coast of India.

"QUIT INDIA" MOVEMENT (1942)

From September, 1939 to April, 1942, Gandhiji had helped to keep the peace in India by impressing upon our people that it was not manly to create difficulties for Britain when she had been fighting, as has been said, with her back to the wall. But Britain would not understand this generosity, and in her efforts to solve the political problem in India she made announcements of policy that complicated matters the more. In August, 1940, at the instance of the Imperial Government, the then Governor-General of India, Lord Linlithgow made public a statement of policy that put a veto in the hands of the minorities of the country, specially the Muslims, on all political progress. It talked of a constitutional arrangement that may be repudiated by elements in the Indian population and the British Government's inability to suggest or construct such a machinery. Then came the Cripps Mission (March 1942) when the Japanese were almost at the eastern gate of India, having rolled over British forces all through Burma. The plan that Sir Stafford Cripps brought with him visualized an Indian Union with rights secured to unite, to accede or not to do it; at the same time it was declared that the Indian Union might or might not adhere to the Commonwealth of British Nations. None of the Indian parties, contacted by Sir Stafford Cripps, were satisfied by the various interpretations put forward by him. As the Plan was subjected to analysis by keen students of affairs and Constitutional *pundits* it developed characteristics that did not appeal to any body; perhaps, these were inherent in the Cripps plan. Even Gandhiji with his anxiety to understand the other man's point of view was constrained to give his first impression of the "Draft Declaration" brought by Cripps, as "a post-dated cheque". A member of the Princely Order in India, rulers of the Indian States, embellished this phrase by adding the words "on a crashing bank." The details of the negotiations with the representatives of Indian parties are not available. But it is not wrong to say that the Cripps Plan did not contemplate the transfer of any real power, the control of and by Indians of the defence policy of the country even in face of the crisis which was sought to be tided over with the help of sincere Indian Nationalists. And we are convinced that it was on this rock that the Cripps Plan floundered. Even before the negotiations started Sir Stafford Cripps had made this point clear on March 29, 1942, when he said: "The defence of India will not be in Indian hands, even if the parties want it. It would be the worst thing for the defence of India." The insult and the distrust implicit in this announcement dealt the hardest blow to any chances of acceptance of the Cripps Plan by and on behalf of India. And from this time on, the moral repulsion of India from the British Government was complete. And Gandhiji voiced it forth through the columns of *Harijan*, the weekly organ of his views and thought. All through April to the first week of August, 1942, he synthesized it in cry of "Quit India" by Britain of her authority in the country. Sir Stafford Cripps had propagated the thesis that it was Hindu-Muslim disagreement that had really wrecked his Plan. Gandhiji countered that as long as the "Third Party", that is, "the British Government" remained, this disagreement would remain and persist. Since then he and every Indian Nationalist has never abated in their faith in this demand. The All-India Congress Committee, the policy-maker of the Indian National Congress, the body that can put the ultimate seal of approval or disapproval on the suggestions of the Working Committee of the Congress, the supreme executive of

the Indian National Congress, accepted and passed the "Quit India" resolution on August 8, 1942. Before the sun rose over the next day, all the leaders of the Congress were arrested and spirited away to unknown destinations which later turned out to be the Aga Khan's palace in Poona and the Moghul Fort of Ahmednagar. This arrest and detention was the signal for the outbreak of a mass revolt and mass frenzy that had few parallels in India's recent history since the Revolt of 1857. Gandhiji had planned a non-violent fight after failure of negotiations with the Governor-General which he was authorized to carry on by the same resolution. But the arrest and detention of Congress leaders scotched this plan, and the mass mind of India reacted to it with unplanned sabotage of railway communications and disorganized attacks on Police stations, post offices and Law Courts in certain areas. Their fury was at its height in the western districts of Bihar, in the eastern districts of the United Provinces, in the Midnapore district of Bengal, in particular areas in the Andhra Desa and Assam, and in the district of Satara in Bombay. It took the British military authorities to stamp the violent expressions of these no more than three months. But where the people had set up National Governments, *Jatiya Sarkars*, the fight could be carried on with more or less vigour for more than a year; in certain areas, in Midnapore and Satara for instance, it was more than two years before the people slackened in their efforts, and could be beaten down into inactivity. Scarcity rather than repression had weakened resistance.

BENGAL FAMINE (1943-'44)

This scarcity had been created by the co-operation of the British bureaucracy with the Indian trading classes. It released over the whole country forces of such a moral obliquity that it will take years to eliminate these from our body politic. Administrative inefficiency could be got rid of, but the greediness of manufacturing and trading interests, generated by war conditions and encouraged and tolerated by the British bureaucracy in India, will require more years to treat. For, it has become a moral epidemic that can be controlled only by honest administrators and an awakened public opinion, vowed to fight out all anti-social habits. Two reports, one that which enquired into the genesis of famine in Bengal, and the other that was prepared to suggest measures for the re-organization of Bengal's administrative machinery, have exposed all the dishonesties that have crept into Bengal. The Famine Commission was presided over by Sir John Woodhead, for a little while Governor of Bengal during the early thirties. The Bengal Administrative Re-organization Committee was presided over by Sir Archibald Rowlands, later Finance Member in Lord Wavell's Executive Council. Both the reports indicated the process of dishonesty and incompetence that have afflicted Bengal since communalism began to play its part in guiding the destinies of the Province. The former said that the Bengal famine caused the death of 15 to 20 lakh persons; that the profiteers had made a profit of Rs. 150 crores, one life at the cost of Rs. 1,000. The latter said that dishonesty appeared to have been accepted as the rule against which there appear to be no remedy. Since 1937, with the inauguration of "autonomy" Ministries, Muslim communalism had dominated the Bengal administration, and during the war year, war contracts under its disposal and the Civil Supply Department have opened the door to jobbery and corruption. These played their part in twisting the natural course of events both during the famine year and since then. It may also be said that this jobbery and corruption have become all-India phenomena, and scarcities of food have become as extensive. In 1946 it became the turn of south India, the State of Mysore, parts of Madras and the Bombay Presidencies to become scenes of dire distress. It was help from the outside world made possible by the cessation of war and the easier shipping conditions as also rigid rationing inside India, that have halted famine. But malnutrition stalks over the land and will continue as long as India does not become self-sufficient with regard to food. As we write (in March, 1947), we see no prospect of this efficiency, and the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization cannot hold out better prospects of world production and sufficiency.

1943, 1944, 1945

These years, except the last six months of the last year, were times of frustration to the Indian people. They were economically hit by the scarcities created by war and by the profiteering and black-marketing that had been thriving under the direct patronage of the Government. Food and cloth had been rationed, and even with controls, the Government could not secure to the people even the minimum of their requirements. The needs of the war had driven all other considerations out of their view, and the people continued to stint and suffer because they saw no

other alternative. The leaders of the Congress were behind prison bars, and even Gandhiji's release sometime in the middle of 1944 did not help break the deadlock. The leaders of the Muslim League were officially non-co-operating with the war activities but practically trying to extract all advantages that war contracts and Civil Supplies Departments had to dispose of. Thus was built up wealthy class amongst the Muslims of India that became identified with and felt itself bound with the fortune and power of the Muslim League. It is this class that made the Muslim League, encouraged by the British bureaucracy, the instrument of their continued existence. This interpretation partly explains the growth of the tension between the communities in India which was not unwelcome to British Imperialists as a road-block to India's advance to the status of a free nation with a new dignity as a free state. But behind these frustrations had been gathering forces that after the dragooning of 1942 had not lost their impulse to revolt; these were found as ready to renew the fight as in 1942. In June, 1945, when the Congress leaders were released, the flood-tide burst and seemed able to carry every thing before it. Economic scarcities, the scars of war exactions, everything was forgotten, and in one bound the people threw away the memory of suppression, and rebound to a new attack on the ramparts of imperialism. These showed cracks and signs of yielding. The people were upheld in their new courage by the story of the Azad Hind Fouz, the army of Indian Liberation, organized under the dynamic leadership of Subhas Chandra Bose, who had fled from the country in the middle of January 1941. The trial of some of his commanders, held at Red Fort, Delhi which had witnessed the trial of Bahadur Shah, the last of the Moghul Emperors of Delhi, in 1857-58 after the suppression of the Revolt of that year, told the story how a Provisional Government of Free India had been formed, recognized by the States ranged against the Anglo-Saxon Powers, Britain and the United States, thus giving an international status to it. Under it an Army had been formed which had marched towards India penetrating its frontiers in Manipur, Naga Hills and Arakan. The invasion had failed. But the story of that failure had a miraculously opposite effect. It found the people a new centre of hope, a new assurance of their powers, as moulders of a State, as creators of an army, as fighters for a Free India reared on the sufferings and sacrifices of millions, all, more or less unconsciously responding to the call of destiny in the belief that the end of the journey is *Swaraj*. The last six months of 1945 and the first three months of 1946 marked the highest water-mark of this mass awakening.

CABINET DELEGATION'S PLANS

The Churchill Government of Britain, a Coalition of all the parties in the country, was dissolved when as a result of the election held in the middle of 1945, the Labour Party registered a strength in the House of Commons, surpassing all the other parties combined. Mr. Clement Attlee became Prime Minister of Britain, and Lord Pethic Lawrence, Secretary of State for India. For about eight months, the new Government did not attempt to make any change in the policy of the Indian Administration; they allowed Lord Wavell to carry on in his own way. But on March 15, 1946, Mr. Attlee made a statement on behalf of his Government in course of which occurred words that were interpreted as indicating a new method of straightening out the political dead-lock in India. While mindful that the minorities in the country should be able to live and work "free from fear," Mr. Attlee declared that "on the other hand, we cannot allow a minority to place a veto on the advances of the majority." The general body of politically-minded people in India hailed this declaration as a rebuff to Muslim League intransigence; and the leaders of this organization protested against this new policy.

But as the negotiations proceeded between the Cabinet Delegation, specially sent out to India consisting of the Secretary of State, Sir Stafford Cripps and Mr. Albert Alexander, to hammer out a definite plan for the transfer to Indian hands of State power, the difficulties created by the British policy of balancing Hindu and Muslim interests erupted into view in all its ugliness. In dubious ways the members of this Delegation were forced into the acceptance of the theory of "two-nations" in India—Hindu and Muslim—adumbrated by the Muslim League. Hindu majority areas and Muslim majority areas were put into the Cabinet Delegation's Plan as separate units held together by a Central Government concerned with Defence, Foreign Affairs and the Transport System of the country. The then existing Provinces were to form the units of this Federation disregarding the fact that in these Provinces there were continuous Hindu and Muslim areas which would find themselves in a difficulty in accepting the new arrangement, poisoned

as these had been by the ill-will created by the Muslim League propaganda during about ten years since 1937.

On May 16, 1946, the Cabinet Delegation announced its own Plan made in the absence of agreement between the main political parties in India represented in the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League. The clever device of Groups ultimately proved the main stumbling block. The Province of Assam, a Hindu majority area, was linked up with Bengal, a Muslim majority area in a Group, and the refusal of this smallest of the Indian Provinces to be bound up with Bengal wrecked the whole Plan. For, the representatives of the Indian National Congress stood firmly on their attitude that the feelings of a particular area could not be brushed aside; and the leadership of the All-India Muslim League could not budge from its insistence on this particular Grouping. The Plan also envisaged a Constituent Assembly where the future constitution of the country would be framed by members returned by the Groups of Provinces. This was called the long-range Plan, while the setting up of a wholly Indian Executive Council of the Governor-General of India was felt to be necessary as a short-range Plan to work during the interim period till the constitution of free India was framed and began to function. The Muslim League accepted at first both these Plans, while the National Congress rejected the former and accepted the latter only. But on July 29, 1946, the Council of the All-India Muslim League rejected both the Plans and decided on a campaign of "Direct Action" to assert and establish their claims for a separate State in India to be constituted of Muslim majority Provinces. We do not know the reasons that influenced this decision of the Muslim League as the whole correspondence of its leader with the British authorities has not seen the light of day.

MUSLIM LEAGUES "DIRECT ACTION" AND ITS AFTERMATH

This "Direct Action" in actual practice opened a new chapter in our recent history. In other parts of India, the day of "Direct Action," August 16, 1946, was celebrated in a peaceful manner. But at Calcutta, the capital city of the Province of Bengal, with a Ministry constituted of Muslim League members, the day was celebrated by Muslims with loot, assault, arson from the morning of the day. The majority of the citizens were caught unready, and the Muslims, where they were in a majority in this city, carried everything before them and started to murder their Hindu neighbours. The peaceful amongst Muslims were no match for the fanatics and Crescentadors, and for more than 24 hours murder was out in the streets and lanes of Calcutta organized under Muslim League National Guards, the Police turning away their eyes from the gruesome scenes. Then the Hindus rallied, organised the defence of their life, honour and property and retaliated on the offenders and their dupes. Thus ensued mutual destruction, and it has been estimated that not less 10 thousand men, women and children lost their lives in course of 80 hours, and the number of wounded was four times as much; the value of property looted and destroyed has been estimated at Rs. 10 crores, the major share of the loss falling on the Hindus. Thus did it come to pass that under Muslim League inspiration the "Direct Action" of the Muslims for gaining their political objective was directed not against those who held the reins of State power and who under law were competent to grant the Muslims their "Pakistan", but against their neighbours who were subject to the same irresponsible authority. The Ministry in Bengal under Mr. Hussain Sabeed Suhrawardy with Sir Frederick Barrows, a Trade Union leader of Britain, as Governor went from one folly to another. They helped to create the impression in their community's mind that in Calcutta they had suffered a defeat which had to be retrieved in a field where they were in a majority. On October 10, 1946, there burst out in a part of Noakhali, a district in East Bengal where the Muslims were 80 percent of the population, a frenzy of communal hatred to which fell victims men, women and children amongst Hindus. The majority of them, about fifty thousand, were perverted from their ancestral faith at the point of the sword. Amid scenes of general demoralization there were instances of heroic resistance. The name of Rajendralal Roy Chowdhury, a leader of the Noakhali Bar, will live in the history of this episode. He was in his village home, and for about three days he kept the marauders at bay, killing them and at last succumbing to sheer weight of numbers.

This brutality had its reaction in Bihar where in four districts the Muslim minority were subjected to all the horrors which the Hindus in Bengal had passed through. The countryside went mad with lust of revenge and hatred; the generally

apathetic villager forgot his duty to his neighbours and murdered and raped them of honour and property. The contagion leapt over from Bihar to the north-western districts of the United Provinces. In face of this break-down of civilized life, the Central Government of India, and the Provincial Governments in Bengal, Bihar and the United Provinces proved themselves inadequate to the demands of this emergency. On August 16, 1946, Lord Wavell as Governor-General of India with men in the Executive Council of his own choice, had been as inefficient or indifferent. In the first week of September, 1946, members of the Congress and other organizations minus the Muslim League came into his Executive Council, the selection being in the hands of the Congress. By the end of October the Muslim League felt it necessary to get inside this Council, replacing five of those who had been selected by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. But neither in the case of Noakhali, nor of Bihar, or of the United Provinces could the representatives of the Congress or the League halt the ever-expanding anarchy, the guardians of Law and Order, the Police, having by that time divided themselves into communal blocs, Hindu or Muslim. Gandhiji tried to stop the riots by moving about in the devastated areas of Noakhali and Bihar. He succeeded for a while only. The same inefficiency or supineness marked the conduct of the Administration in the Punjab when in March-April, 1947, the Muslims were allowed to get loose on their Hindu and Sikh neighbours in Lahore, in Rawalpindi, in Multan and other western districts of the Province. A British Governor, Sir Evan Jenkins, and a Muslim Chief Minister, Malik Khizr Hayat Khan not belonging to the Muslim League, were helpless spectators of an administrative break-down that would require some explanation. This Punjab debacle appears to have had some influence on the British Government in London deciding to recall Lord Wavell as a mis-fit in India and send in his place Lord Mountbatten, the titular victor over the Japanese in Burma, to straighten matters out.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF FEBRUARY 20, 1947—STATEMENT OF JUNE 3, 1947

This change in the headship of the Indian Administration was hastened by the announcement of February 20, 1947, that the Government of His Britannic Majesty had decided "to take necessary steps to effect the transfer of power to responsible Indian hands by a date not later than June, 1948." It was speculated during this time that Lord Wavell had by his conduct proved himself inadequate to the situation; and the choice of Lord Mountbatten had been influenced by the thought that the younger man would be bringing a fresh mind to the solution of the Indo-British deadlock. Muslim League circles read into the terms of this announcement the concession of "Pakistan"; the Congress interpreted it as removing "misconception and suspicion" and bringing "reality and a certain dynamic quality to the present situation in India", to quote Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's words. This announcement was sought to be justified to the British public by Lord Pethick Lawrence in his speech in the House of Lords made on February 25, 1947 on the plea that "British Raj cannot be maintained in its existing basis with adequate efficiency after 1948;" that if it was proposed to retain the "old position" it would be necessary "to guarantee that we would stay in India for 10, 15 or even more years." This prospect the Labour Government was evidently not prepared to face. And they sent Lord Mountbatten out to implement their new policy. He reached New Delhi on March 23, 1947, and straight-away went into his work. And when he found that the leadership of the Muslim League was dead set against co-operation with the work of framing a constitution for India already proceeding in the Constituent Assembly, he was left with no choice but the dreaded one—that India should suffer division into States, as Britain could not agree to use coercion on recalcitrant elements in India for the sake of India's unity and integrity. So on June 3, 1947, the statement was issued indicating the lines on which the division was to be effected. And according to Para 20 of this Statement, the Indian Independence Bill was introduced into and passed by the British Parliament by July, 1947 without a division and with a speed that was unprecedented in parliamentary legislation. It was an "enabling" Act—enabling the representatives of India and 'Pakistan' to draft their own constitutions, to adapt the word of the British Prime Minister. Clause (1) Section (1) provided for the setting up from and on August 15, 1947, of two "Independent Dominions."

TWO STATES IN INDIA

So, on the 15th of August, 1947, within the geographical unity of India were set up two independent States—the Union of India and the Union of "Pakistan", both agreeing to remain members of the British Commonwealth of Nations. The

peaceful transfer of power from Britain were, however, marred by inter-communal bestiality in India that re-enacted a million-fold the scenes that had been witnessed at Calcutta, in Noakhali, in Bihar, and in the Punjab. This out-burst resulted in the uprooting of millions from their ancestral houses in the Punjab, in Sind, in the N. W. Frontier Province, in Delhi and in East Bengal. There is controversy with regard to the fact as to who started the murder campaign leading to this movement of populations.

The pattern of conduct set on August 16, 1947, threatens to become stabilized in the relations between the two States. The incursion into Kashmir of "Pakistani" hordes high-lights the malice and bitterness that gave birth to the State of "Pakistan". The partition has produced more problems than it was intended to solve. And the year 1947 will live in the mind of millions as the time during which the policy of the alien State in India, conducted and controlled by Britain, fulfilled the dread prophecy made by Rabiindra Nath Tagore : "The wheels of fate will some day compel the English to give up their Indian Empire. But what kind of India will they leave behind, what stark misery ! When the stream of their centuries' administration runs dry at last, what a waste of mud and silt will they leave behind them !" Perhaps, it was a cruel verdict when it was uttered in 1941. But 1947 has proved its truth.

India In Home Polity

The year 1947 of the Christian era will live long in India's history, as during seven months of its withdrawal of British control over her administration was announced and given effect to. In previous volumes of the *Indian Annual Register* we have traced the development of certain personal and impersonal forces that co-operated to compel Britain to retire from domination over India which, in the words of Sir John Seely, she had acquired one hundred and ninety years back in a 'fit of absent-mindedness' 1757 to 1947 has been a long enough period during which, for good or evil, the two countries—India and Britain—have affected each other to no small extent. The balance-sheet of this transaction can wait drawing up on a future occasion. But reviewing events that occurred during the first six months of 1947 from a distance of about 18 months, in November, 1948, one felt that any argument with Britain with regard to the *bona-fide* of her last acts as ruler of India is a *post-mortem* examination that led nowhere except poisoning relations. As the majority of our country desire above all other things to forget the British regime as a bad old dream, we feel that in writing on the acts of commission and omission of these days, the past be forgotten for this once, and a factual delineation of the events of January—June, 1947, be attempted without passion or prejudice. It is not easy to do so. For, we have had experience of so much of British malice even during these fateful days that the frenzy of resentment sweeping over the country could not but indirectly influence the publicist in India. But we will try to do our best to keep this feeling under control in making these comments and criticisms. In doing this, however, we should like our readers to refresh their memory with the records of events that happened when the British Cabinet Delegation was actually in India on and from the 23rd of March to the 29th of June, 1946. The Secretary of State for India held a Press Conference on March 25, 1946, in course of which he declared that beyond the "fixed intention" of helping Indians to "achieve independence", the Cabinet Delegation have "open minds and are not committed to any particular views." During the next six weeks they were engaged individually or collectively in tapping the minds of Indian leaders, of members of the Princely Order, with a view to get the greatest common measure of agreement amongst them. In this process they must have picked up and chosen certain ideas and proposals which with additions and alterations were reduced to concrete shape for the solution of the deadlock in India's constitutional problem. We know not when and how they did stumble on the words—"succession Government or Succession Governments in British India"—which did occur in the "Memorandum on States' Treaties and Paramountcy" which they sent to the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes, His Highness the Nawab of Bhopal, on the 12th of May, 1946—four days before they—the three British Ministers and Lord Wavell, the Governor-General of India—issued their statement on the plan for India's

“Independence.” The use of these words—“Succession Government or Succession Governments”—was significant of a change full of sinister possibilities to the unity and integrity of India. We have it on the authority of Dr. Pattabhi Sektaramayya a member of the Congress Working Committee, the highest Executive of the Indian National Congress, that this particular Memorandum had not been made available to them when they first sat down to consider the proposals embodied in the Statement of May 16, 1946. Why they were kept in the dark on this Memorandum we do not yet know. And when it was made public on May 22 (1946) the Cabinet Delegation gave an explanation of the use of these words in the following terms:

“The Cabinet Delegation is to make it clear that the document issued to-day (22nd May) entitled *Memorandum on States' Treaties and Paramountcy* presented by the Cabinet Delegation to His Highness the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes was drawn up before the Mission began its discussion with party leaders, and represented the substance of what they communicated to the representatives of the States at their first interview with the Mission. This is the explanation of the use of the words—“Succession Government or Governments in British India”—an expression which would not, of course, have been used after the issue of the Delegation's recent Statement.”

We do not know whether or not this explanation removed any doubts about the mind and policy of the Cabinet Delegation in their “conclusion that neither a larger nor a smaller sovereign State of ‘Pakistan’ would provide an acceptable solution of the communal problem.” significant Now that this question has become an idle one, we may not derive satisfaction of curiosity by questions with regard to the British intention at the back of these words, disruptive of India's economy in State. On the 2nd of April, 1946, the Cabinet Delegation met the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes. Was it on this occasion that the Memorandum containing these words was presented to him for his special benefit, a privilege that had been withheld from the Congress leaders? If our surmise be a fact, we arrive at the conclusion that between March 25 and April 2, 1946, the Cabinet Delegation had almost accepted the idea of the division of India into two States, as demanded by the Muslim League. Knowing the mind of the Nawab of Bhopal as sympathetic to this idea, we would not be far wrong if we say that he must have carried this gladsome news to the League leader, Mr. Mohammed Ali Jinnah. With this knowledge at the latter's elbow, it was but natural that he should drive his advantage home to the detriment of India's unity. The 16th of May Plan envisaging “Sections” and “Groups” of Provinces with residual powers in their possession was more than a half-way house to “Pakistan.” And we now understand fully the reason why the Muslim League was so adamant in its attitude to retain the “Section” and “Group” proposals of the Cabinet Delegation's Plan. Lord Pethick Lawrence and his three colleagues of the Delegation who appended their signatures to it—Sir Stafford Cripps, Mr. Albert Alexander and Lord Arobibald Wavell—betrayed into the hands of the Muslim League the key to the fort of Indian unity, and there are cynics amongst us who think that all the elaborate negotiations held with India's party leaders, all the

show of persuasion of the Muslim League leader was part of a camouflage. The division of India had been decided almost by the time the members of the Cabinet Delegation met any of the Indian leaders, the first of whom, Mahatma Gandhi, met the Secretary of State on April 1, 1946. In the last volume (*2nd Volume, 1946*), of the *Annual Register* we asked the question whether or not the leaders of the Congress knew of the fall design indicated in the Memorandum on States' Treaties and Paramountcy brought to the knowledge of the Nawab of Bhopal on the 2nd April or a little later? Our curiosity remains unsatisfied even now. But from this analysis of the developments narrated above, we are convinced that British policy decided to break up the unity of administration which they had helped to forge before they withdrew their irresponsible authority from over this country, and we writhed in suspense, as we witnessed the rear-guard actions of Indian Nationalism against forces of disruption represented by the British authorities and their creature and creation—the All-India Muslim League. The first indication of this determination was given in the words quoted from the States' Memorandum. And during the whole period of May 16, 1946 to February 20, 1947, we felt ourselves to be witnesses to the evolving process of a tragedy which depicted the disruption of the historic continuity of our country and people. On the latter date, Mr. Attlee, the Prime Minister of Britain made a declaration in the House of Commons that by the end of June, 1948, British power would be withdrawn from India (*See pages 142-43*). Even this declaration did not remove from our mind the apprehension that had been created by the prospect of the two States to be carved out of India's territory to satisfy the conceit and greed of a predominant section of the Muslim community in our midst. It rather strengthened the apprehension. We saw confirmation of our belief that the British Government had accepted the logic of their "divide and rule" policy, the consequences of this technique of disruption. Slowly the soil of India had been prepared since the Morley-Minto days when the separation between Hindu and Muslim in India had been given statutory recognition in the Reform Act associated with their names. There are students of affairs who push it to Lord Mayo's days when "separate" consideration was promised to Muslim education. We are prepared to believe that the upholders of British authority in the sixties of the last century did not realize the full implications of this action of theirs. But the interpreter of events with the knowledge of facts of the last 90 years can have but one opinion that a natural piety bound the Mayo technique with the Attlee announcement, to that part of it to which we draw the attention of our readers. The talk of "Succession Government or Governments" and of its significance is linked up with the policy indicated in the words quoted below. Feeling sure that the constitution of the future Indian State could not be drawn up by the Constituent Assembly sitting at New Delhi since December 9, 1946, from which Muslim League representatives had studiously and arrogantly kept themselves aloof, before the time mentioned in the Para 7 of the Attlee Statement, that is, June, 1948.

His Majesty's Government will have to consider to whom the powers of the Central Government in British India should be handed over on due date—whether as a whole to some form of Central Government or in some areas to the existing Provincial Government, or in such other way as may seem most reasonable and in the best interests of the Indian people."

Even a cursory reading of the above will show that there is hardly any difference between the purpose of the May 12 (1946) policy first of all disclosed to the leaders of the Princely Order and the pose of deliberation featured in the Attlee statement as to whom, to which responsible authority in India, should the power of the State be transferred, whether "as a whole to some form of Central Government" or in some areas to "the existing Provincial Governments"—existing in June, 1948. We have in a previous part of this study expressed our opinion that Mr. Mohammad Ali Jinnah had knowledge from the Nawab of Bhopal of the British Government's flirtation with the idea of "Succession Governments" to be put in place of the one unified Government exercising authority over the whole of India. The Attlee Government's statement of February 20, 1947, showed that from flirtation they had determined to proceed to consummation. We are upheld in this opinion by what the London *Times* said on the occasion in noticing the reactions to this declaration.

"Muslim separatism is deriving encouragement from the language of the White Paper."

"It is claimed that the British Government have shown their willingness, implicitly at least, to negotiate agreements with the Congress Party for the future administration of the Hindu majority areas, and with the Muslim League for the Muslim majority area."

The London paper would have borne witness to the whole truth if it had said that the May 12, 1946 Memorandum on States' Rights and Paramountcy had encouraged the same mood in the Muslim League. That its implications had not been brought out at that time was due to the fact that the British Cabinet Delegation had succeeded in diverting India's public attention to their plan of May 16 (1946). The leadership of the Congress did not evidently realize the dangerous possibilities of this Memorandum and failed to warn their people of these; neither did the Press in India instruct the public on the various uses to which the proposals embodied in this Memorandum could be put for the disruption of the country's unity. The lapse of Paramountcy engaged their attention in a listless way, pressing as it did the Ulsterisation of the country in the form of more than 600 States, Principalities and *Jajirs*. The division of "British India" into two States, the open confession of this step in this Memorandum came to be ignored in the excitement created by the May 16 statement. Why was this indifference developed, we do not know. We should have liked to know whether or not the negotiators on behalf of the Indian National Congress did take care to tackle the Cabinet Delegation's members with regard to the use and purpose of the words occurring in that Memorandum, and whether they were satisfied with any explanation that might have been put forth. We have again gone through the files of the newspapers reporting the events of those hectic and anxious days;

February 20, 1948
statement—"encouragement"
of Muslim separatism

The long story of
Muslim League
intransigence

we have re-read the correspondence that passed between members of the Delegation and leaders of the Congress. And we do not find therein the indication of any anxiety created by the prospect of more than one "Succession Government" in India on the retirement of British power. Either it was regarded as a lapse to which every Secretariat is prone to descend or after the Delegation's self-accusing explanation published on May 22 (1946), the curtain was dropped on it as an innocent episode. Whatever be the fact behind this matter, the Attlee declaration of February 20, 1947, did add to the strength of Muslim separatism. The leadership of the Muslim League had almost an assurance from the British Cabinet Delegation that sooner or later, sooner than later, their demand for a separate State would be conceded. And whatever be the show of argumentation and persuasion, if they could hold fast to their separatist claims to the last, Congress patience would give way, and the British Government would be able to maintain and establish before world opinion its *bona-fide* with regard to political developments in India. The disruptionist policy worked according to this plan.

We have here an explanation why the leadership of the Muslim League could recover so soon after the March 15 (1946) announcement of Mr. Cabinet Delegation's plan contained seeds of "Pakistan" Attlee wherein he had spoken of not allowing "a minority to place a veto on the advance of the majority." We can recall the out-burst of Muslim League anger that greeted this part of the British Prime Minister's statement, and we remember that Muslim League denunciation was loud and strong at this betrayal of a "minority" which had been sustained in its position by successive British Governments. But with the arrival of the Cabinet Delegation, a curtain fell over all ebullitions of discontent, and the Cabinet Delegation's Memorandum of May 12 (1946) helped to restore the ruffled feelings of the Muslim League veto-holders. In the light of later developments, we are inclined to think that Mr. Mohammad Ali Jinnah's angry letter to Lord Wavell, the resolution of non-co-operation with the Cabinet Delegation's plans of May 16, 1946 and June 16, 1946 which have come to be known as long-term and short-term plans—were all parts of a put-up affair manufactured by the British engineers for the benefit of their proteges of the All-India Muslim League. We have no other explanation than this to the limitless patience of the British bureaucracy in face of the Muslim League denunciations. When the Muslim League nominees entered the Interim Government and failed to carry out the conditions of this entrance—one of which was participation in the work of the Constituent Assembly—the Governor-General Lord Wavell and the British Government in London did not take any effective steps to warn them of the consequences of their continued non-co-operation. And, when the Working Committee of the Muslim League passed a 3000-word resolution (pages 147-51) refusing to take part in the Constituent Assembly's work, Lord Wavell and his superiors in London could but look helplessly on. Even the London *Times* was constrained to expose the contradictions inherent in this tactics of delay and procrastination. True to the British pose of neutrality in quarrels between Indians, the London paper led out even-handed criticism as between the

Congress and the Muslim League. We propose, non-the-less, to make room for the summary of this article sent out from London on the 13th February, 1947. It reflected the sentiment of a cross section of British opinion, not sorry that the logical consequence of quarrels in India would be disrupting her economy, not happy that the administrative unity that they had helped to forge should be ending in a manner which fixed on them a part of the stigma.

Criticising the resolution passed at Karachi by the Working Committee of the Muslim League as a tactical error, the *Times* says that "it was only to be expected that it would react upon the position of the League's representatives in the Interim Government."

"In place of the Interim Government, which worked as a team united by a sense for common purpose and by loyalty to its Vice-President, there has come into existence an uneasy association of two incompatible elements. Pandit Nehru and his supporters in their less considered utterances have laid the blame for this—as for so much else that is wrong in India—upon the conveniently broad shoulders of the British without pausing to reflect that a cabinet representing major Indian communities is an indispensable part of the general scheme they have undertaken to apply. No one has ever claimed that it would be easy to work such a device, but worked it must be, if India is to hold together until the process of formulating a union, a group and a provincial constitution is complete.

"There is obvious contradiction," the *Times* continues, "upon which the Congress Party has been quick to seize, between the Muslim League's retention of Cabinet posts and its continued refusal to associate itself with the Constituent Assembly. Pandit Nehru and his eight colleagues, nominated by the Congress Party, wrote to the Viceroy last week, pointing out that the League's boycott of the Constituent Assembly was inconsistent with the presence of the League nominees in the Interim Government. This step had probably been under contemplation for some time. It was undoubtedly precipitated by the refusal of the two Muslim League Ministers, who sit in the Lower House, to support the Government on an important division. The question at issue was a delicate one, of punitive action on the North-West Frontier, but the attempt to deal with it upon purely communal lines was unfair to the Congress Party which is as anxious as any one to treat the tribesmen liberally.

"Behaviour of the two Ministers was, in fact, indefensible.

"Pandit Nehru's challenge has now been taken up by the League nominees in the Cabinet who have refused in strongest terms to contemplate resignation and have carried war into the opposite camp by a detailed polemical statement designed to show that the Congress Party itself has never honestly accepted the White Paper plan and is thus debarred from questioning the propriety of the conduct of the League.

"These exchanges are essentially tactical. The Congress Party hopes to convince public opinion, both in its own and in this country, that it is the only organisation capable of sustaining the burden of responsibility which Britain is handing over. The League aims at holding out until it can extort terms, whether from the Congress Party or from the British or from both, which will enable it to claim complete parity with the Congress Party in prestige, if not in resources.

"In the meantime," the paper writes, "it accuses the Congress Party, not without justice, of claiming to monopolise power and of utilising the Constituent Assembly as an instrument of its policy.

Of the two contestants the Congress Party shows greater sense of realism. The League's Karachi attack on the Cabinet Mission's plan and on the very existence of the Constituent Assembly was tactical error in spite of undoubted provocation amply furnished by the Congress Party.

"It has received its proper answer in the definite agreement since concluded between the Negotiating Committee of the Constituent Assembly and the Chamber of Princes, which places the future operations of the Assembly and indeed the future of the Mission's plan, beyond reasonable doubt.

"The Muslim League members are still in the Cabinet. It is for the advantage of all India that they should remain there. It is also as a symbol of the party that the League may yet play in building up the new constitution. At the moment, each side clamours for British intervention to demolish the position of the other.

"But this country has made its policy plain in the Cabinet Mission Plan and in the statement of December 6 following the London conference. The rest is for Indians themselves.

This article sums up the nature of the controversy between Indian Nationalism and Muslim separatism, the British trying to maintain an uneasy balance in the transaction. It brings to a focus the last stages of the development which yielded to Muslim League hands from the ruling authorities the rich harvest of their demands for a separate State for themselves. The Cabinet Delegation had prepared the ground for it when it considered the *pros* and *cons* of the "Pakistan" demand in their statement of May 16, 1946. From a study of the population figures of "British India", appended to Para 6 of their plan, the Delegation was led to think that

"the setting up of a separate sovereign State of Pakistan on the lines claimed by the Muslim League, would not solve the communal minority problem nor can we see any justification for including in a sovereign Pakistan those districts of the Punjab and of Bengal and Assam in which the population is predominantly non-Muslim. Every argument that can be used in favour of Pakistan, can equally in our view be used in favour of the exclusion of the non-Muslim areas from Pakistan....."

The members of the Delegation must have been asked that if these be their true intentions, why did they go out of their way to

Genesis of the
"Section" &
"Group" idea

suggest the technique of "Grouping" which left no choice to non-Muslim areas in Bengal, Assam and the Punjab but agree to be dictated to by Muslim League chauvinists? We remember to have read somewhere in the correspondence between the Congress President, Moulana Abul Kalam Azad, and members of the Cabinet Delegation that the reasons for this "Grouping" were "well-known," without indicating their nature. From this reticence we were led to conclude that the Cabinet Delegation had tried to do a little horse-dealing, trying to sell non-Muslim League areas to Mr. Mohammad Ali Jinnah in exchange for his approval of a tenuous Federation to remain satisfied with the duties and responsibilities of Defence, Foreign Affairs and Communications. We would further like to know who suggested this "Grouping" and "Sectioning" arrangement, and why? It may quite be that the Delegation or its Secretariat improvised both these arrangements from the regional planning that Prof. Coupland had been suggesting. One curious fact to be noticed in connection with all discussions on India's constitutional advance is that with all the show of consulting Indian opinion and the pose of being guided by it in arriving at ultimate decisions, the final shape of things is given by British busy-bodies. This happened when the Montagu-Chelmsford reform-scheme was being hammered into shape and Lionel Curtis erupted into our midst with his "diarchy"; and we would not be far wrong if we suggest that the Cabinet Delegation's plan was the product of cross-breeding between the Coupland plan and a brain wave of one of the members of the Delegation or of any one of their Secretariat members. Whatever be the parentage of the "Section" and "Group" technique of the 16th May (1946) plan, a consideration of all the factors of the situation lead but to one conclusion that with all Lord Pethick Lawrence's claim on the Delegation's behalf of an "open mind" made at the

Press Conference addressed by him on March 25 (1946), their plans remain a standing proof of the closed mind of the British bureaucracy. And, as it is useless to further pursue the controversy, we do not propose to elaborate an indictment of the Cabinet Delegation that they had been working at a plan that disrupted India's unity. We have often wondered now that British "control" have vanished from India and a legacy of resentment has been left us by the British disruptionists whether they have ever weighed the gain or loss to themselves of this transaction. Perhaps, they had no choice in the matter; the history of their regime of exploitation of our weaknesses and social maladjustments could not but have this consequence. They fulfilled to the letter Rabindra Nath Tagore's estimate of the results of British rule in India when he said in his last testament on his 81st birth-day, 14th April (1941):

The wheels of fate will some day compel the English to give up their Indian Empire. But what kind of India will they leave behind, what stark misery! When the stream of their century's administration runs dry at last, what a waste of mud and filth they will leave behind them!

The poet did not refer only to the material poverty that overtook the country with the consolidation of British power in India; all through his life he had been more conscious of the spiritual *malaise* that followed therefrom, of the betrayal of hopes that "springs of civilization would issue out of the heart of Europe", Britain being the instrument of this great work. We know that Mr. Clement Attlee, Prime Minister of Britain, in closing the debate on the February 20 (1947) statement of policy challenged by the Opposition who stigmatized the Labour Government decision to quit by the end of June, 1948, as "Operation Scuttle", repudiated the idea and took pride in sending Lord Mountbatten on a "mission of fulfilment" and not on a mission of "betrayal". This claim opened out a vista of discussion and appraisal of the good and evil of the British regime in India. That will have to wait a more equable occasion when the present controversy will have settled down, and the Indian and the Briton had reached some sort of a philosophic attitude towards each other. The time for that is not yet when we are smitten with the consequences of a major operation on our body politic, entailing the death of thousands, the dishonour of many more thousands, and destruction of wealth which when properly assessed would be shown to have reached a sum nearing the expenses of the Second World War of the 20th century incurred by Britain. This destruction was effected in course of months since August 16, 1946. All this was traceable to the technique of division adopted by British authorities who since 1940 appeared to have been conscious that the solution of India's political problem could not be reached except by the use of some such cruel operation. Sir Stafford Cripps described in course of this particular debate this evolution of British policy with reference to constitutional advance in India. From the summary of his speech as published in this volume of the *Annual Register*, we find that he omitted the Linlithgow declaration of August 8, 1940, wherein a positive statement had been made that the British Government could not contemplate

Can be traced to
the Morley-
Minto days

the transference of their present responsibilities for the peace and welfare of India to any system of Government whose authority is directly denied by large and powerful elements in India's national life." The *New Statesman & Nation*, the London Socialist Weekly, interpreted this as constituting "a formidable right to veto the will of democracy" handed over to minority interests in India. It went further; the declaration repeated "what was said with fatal results to Ulster" when Lord Randolph Churehill, the father of the then Prime Minister of Britain, Mr. Winston Churchill, had excited Ulster to the verge of revolt by sending out the slogan—"Ulster will fight and Ulster will be right." Something like the same spirit was lashed up in India, and the accentuation of communal bickerings as between Hindu and Muslim, as between Caste Hindu and "Scheduled" Caste Hindu reached a new crescendo of virulence. The leader of the Muslim League, Mr. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, began to call upon his community to revise their ideas of history of the period when kings of Muslim birth ruled at and from Delhi; "the history of the last 12 hundred years has failed to achieve unity and has witnessed, during the ages, India always divided into Hindu India and Muslim India." This excursion into history was taken in course of his speech as President of the 27th annual session of the All-India Muslim League held at Lahore during 22nd to 27th March, 1940, when the demand was made to constitute the North-West and Eastern "Zones" of India into "Independent States"—"autonomous and sovereign." The inspiration of this cry can be traced further back to the Morley-Minto days. Replying to the Aga Khan Deputation (October, 1906), the then Governor-General of India, Lord Minto wrote the charter of separatism in our country's constitutional history.

"I am as firmly convinced as I believe you to be that any electoral representation in India would be doomed to mischievous failure which aimed at granting a personal enfranchisement regardless of the beliefs and traditions of the communities composing the population of India."

"Honest" John Morley, hard put to it to find justification for the introduction of "separate electorates" into the Indian constitution, found a brief ready made by the scholars and legal experts of the India Office engaged in framing his India Bill which declared that

"The difference between Mohammadanism and Hinduism is not a mere difference of articles of religious faith or dogma. It is a difference in life, in tradition, in history, in all the social things and articles of belief that constitute a community."

The Labour Government under Mr. Attlee must have accepted this interpretation of Indian history when they planned their own scheme of withdrawal from India based on a division of the country. Sir Stafford Cripps in his speech in the House of Commons on the 5th March, 1947, must have been under its influence when he consoled the leaders of India in their difficult predicament—"enmeshed and entangled in the skein of their own historic development." It would be as charitable to hold that the British Labour Ministers would be feeling themselves to be helpless victims of history acting under the compulsion of an India—"divided by a thousand years' gulf which yawns between Muslims and Hindus"; to quote Mr. Winston Churchill's

Motive behind the Cripps Mission —germs of separate State

purple words. But it would be unhistorical to skip over the British period of 190 years during which the "gulf" has been broadened by British engineers. A part of it was indicated by Sir Stafford Cripps which should be summarized for the information of all times. This part starts with his abortive mission to India in the spring of 1942 when the Rising Sun of Japan was flying over almost all the possessions of Western Powers in the Pacific and Indian Oceans. A graphic account of this debacle was given by Mr. Churchill on the 6th March, 1947, and we make no apology in quoting it below :

The violent eruption of Japan in East Asia, the withdrawal of the United States fleet to the American coast, the sinking of the *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse*, the surrender of Singapore, and many other circumstances left us with no assured means of defending India from invasion by the Japanese. We had lost command of the Bay of Bengal, and indeed, to a large extent of the Indian Ocean. Whether the Provinces of Madras and Bengal would be pillaged and razed by the Japanese at that time seemed to hang in the balance." (P. 171)

Faced by this emergency, the Churchill Government made a gesture. "The problem naturally arose with poignant force how best to rally all the Indian elements to the defence of their native land." And the plan put forward in this behalf was "substantially" this :

"The British Government undertook to accept and implement an agreed constitution for an Indian Union, which should be a Dominion, framed by an elected Constituent Assembly and affording representation to the Princes. This undertaking was subject to the right of the non-acceding Provinces to receive separate treatment....." (ib.)

In these words we have the germs of the February 20 (1947) and June 3, (1947) declarations of British policy with regard to India. For six long years the forces of Nationalism had been fighting the forces of separatism, the alien State throwing its whole weight on the side of the latter. Sir Stafford Cripps acknowledged "the possibility of a division of India"; this was "put forward publicly by the British Government", and the "proper protection of the minorities was made a condition of transfer of power." The words of the February 20 (1947) declaration were thus on all fours with the declaration brought by him to India in March, 1942; the former indicated the possibility of the handing by the British Government of authority to the existing Provincial Governments, while the later said :

"The British Government undertake to accept and implement forthwith a constitution so framed (that is, by the Constituent Assembly) subject only to (1) The right of any Province of British India which is not prepared to accept the new constitution to retain the present constitutional position, provision being made for its subsequent accession of it so desired. With such non-acceding Provinces as so desire, the British Government will be prepared to agree upon a new constitution giving them the same full status as the Indian Union....." (P. 160-61).

The difference between the Attlee plan and the Cripps plan was that while the latter retained some power of say to the British Government in the internal affairs of India, of "British India", the former removed the possibility of such interference. There was another difference; while the latter made some provision for accession to the Indian Union on a future occasion, the former looked forward to a permanent separation. Another distinction must be noted between the two. The Cripps plan contained a "reservation,"—the signa-

ture of a treaty between the constitution-making body of the Indian Union and Britain before the handing over of authority while the Attlee plan made the transfer absolute as soon as the inauguration of the two Dominions—Indian Union and Pakistan—took place. But the similarity between the two plans overshadowing everything else, lay in the fact that India—British India—could not be expected to retain intact the structure of her administrative unity. Thus did it come about that Indian Nationalism basing its aspirations on an India—one and indivisible—had to buy political freedom by sacrificing the historic continuity, of its life. For this sacrifice the internal maladjustments of our country were primarily responsible, though a share of it, big or small, must be laid at the door of British policy.

The sharing of the blame between the two parties has been the centre of all the arguments between Indian Nationalism and British Imperialism. And as judgment against one or the other

Why did Britain withdraw authority from India— British view	cannot erase the past mischief, we do not propose to pursue the matter further. It is quite possible that the future relation between the two countries will be
--	---

affected by the memory of this cruel blow to Indian Nationalism. But that will depend on other factors also—only a few of which are at present discernible. It will take long to forget Britain's contribution towards the disintegration of India. But independent States cannot afford to nurse past wrongs and injustices. The latest instance of this spirit of accommodation was presented by the Non-aggression Pact between Germany and the Soviet Union which by assuring the former of the latter's neutrality hastened the outbreak of the second World War of the 20th century. During the first World War Britain and Japan had been allies but during the second they were enemies. These two instances illustrate the instability of relations between States. Keeping in mind this factor in international relations we need not be dogmatic about the future alignment of the States in India set up on August 15, 1947, and Britain. It has been asserted that the manner of Britain's withdrawal of her authority over India will be helping to wipe out the evils done by her in India. And many have been the interpretations to explain the cause or causes of this momentous step. Sir Stafford Cripps in course of the debate on the February 20 (1947) statement held on March 5 in the House of Commons repeated almost the language of the Secretary of State for India, Lord Pethic Lawrence, used in the House of Lords on February 25, (1947). Men on the spot in India had drawn attention to the fact that with a depleted Indian Civil and Police Services looking to London for guidance and for "their future advancement, livelihood and pensions," with a British army stationed in India weaker in its strength, there was ever the possibility of British administration breaking down; it could not be maintained with some semblance of efficiency beyond 1948. As the Labour Government viewed the matter, there were "fundamentally two alternatives"—the first was the "attempt to strengthen British control in India on the basis of an expanded *personnel* in the Secretary of States' Services and considerable reinforcement of British troops." Such a policy "would entail a definite decision that we should remain in India for 15 to 20 years, because for any substantially

shorter period we would not be able to re-organize the services on a stable and sound basis." The other alternative was to persuade Indians to come together while at the same time warning them that there was a limit of time "beyond which this agreement would not be safe for the interests of India." The time-limit was 1948 and the Government took the view that

"the fixing of a definite term, during which they (Indian leaders) either must come to an agreement to set up an united independent Government for all-India or else break up the country into smaller and weaker units, should provide the strongest inducement to them to sink the differences and to act together."

The supporters of the Labour Government started to claim that the fixing of June, 1948, sixteen months hence, would impart such a shock to the parties in India that they would hasten to make up their differences. They missed the point, however, that the threat of disruption would not have any terrors for the Muslim League who had been demanding such a step, and who since May 12, 1946 when the plan of "Succession Government or Governments" found a place in a responsible British document, has been encouraged to hold fast to their claim. The Attlee plan of February 20 (1947) was welcome to them as the main victory won, and rather than offering an inducement to agree acted as the strongest argument to persist in disagreement. It would be doing injustice to the intelligence of British politicians to think that they were not aware of such a possibility. Aware or unaware, the fact must be taken into account that the Labour Government felt itself unequal to carrying on in face of the disorganisation created in India by the British policy of "divide and rule." They understood the meaning of the demonstrations held in India in support of the I. N. A.—Indian National Army—personnel being brought to trial by British administrators in British courts and under British laws as "traitors" and "rebels." This Army had been formed under the dynamic leadership of Subhas Chandra Bose to drive British authority from India, and even in the failure of this attempt, the people of India saw a great promise of success in a future fight with British imperialism. It was this hope that invested the life of Subhas Chandra Bose with a halo of glory imperishable in India's history. We have it from responsible Indian public men that the trial of the I. N. A. personnel shook the morale of the Indian contingents of the British army giving notice to the British authorities that the loyalty of the Indian contingents could no longer be relied upon in the exercise of their irresponsible power over India. The revolt of the Indian ratings in the Navy was another signal of the danger ahead. These developments amongst many others must have weighed with the Labour Government in arriving at their decision that they should quit India. The *New York Herald-Tribune* brought the reasons out behind the Attlee decision :

"The British decision to leave India may bring the British more profit than they would win if they could scrape up power to remain for a time. Their tenure there, it must be granted, would be short under almost any conditions that can now be foreseen. By retiring with grace and with expressions of goodwill they may preserve the bulk of their economic interests for a long period, provided Indians can create a government stable enough to maintain peace and order.

But the strongest argument in support of the February 20 (1947) decision was Britain's weaker position as a great Power in the international set-up resulting from the burning of her resources in course of two World Wars. Mr. Ernest Bevin, Britain's Foreign Minister, let the secret out, perhaps unconsciously, when he said in course of a speech delivered on the occasion of a dinner in London held in honour of Mr. Asaf Ali, India's Ambassador to the United States. He disclaimed any personal responsibility for the Indian policy adopted and followed by the Labour Government; he only helped to "hold the ring" for his colleague, the Secretary of State for India. And in this duty of watchfulness in face of America's "financial imperialism" and "Communist imperialism", he often had to be anxious about the changing face of things in Africa and Asia, in the basin of the Indian Ocean over which Britain's naval power did not have its former strength; he often stood before the map and projected on his mind's eye how India could be made strong, capable of being the guardian of peace over this region of the earth. And, he seemed to suggest that as it was not possible for India under British control to develop the required strength to fill this "power vacuum", it was best for all concerned that Britain's hold over India should go. This idea can be analysed further.

Britain's Foreign Minister suggests another reason — "power vacuum" in Asia

The two World Wars have demonstrated that the Mediterranean Sea could not be depended upon as the "life-line" of Britain to her Eastern possessions, to her Dominions in the East—Australia and New Zealand. Even before the second World War students of military affairs in Britain had begun to present the thesis that the Mediterranean should be written off as a prime factor in global strategy, that alternative routes should be searched and developed through the heart of Africa away from threats by competitors of Britain issuing from the continent of Europe. Captain Liddel Hart was one of the most consistent of this school of strategists. He has told us that he was asked by the War Minister in the Chamberlain Cabinet, Hore Belisha, to prepare such an alternative scheme, and he did submit it to him. The almost complete bottling up of the Mediterranean during World War II proved the correctness of his thesis. The following telegram sent by *Reuter's* News Agency from London on the 20th June, 1948, confirms this reading of the mind of Britain's War and Foreign offices, as well as the compulsion of economic factors.

"British Imperialism now requires a new basis in place of her vanished Indian empire, and the scientific exploitation of Africa takes the place of that of India as the primary problem, says Mr. F. A. Ridley, the Socialist philosopher writing in the "Socialist Leader," the weekly paper of the Independent Labour Party.

"Already the loss of India plus Britain's weakening grip on the world's market is leading to an internal crisis in Britain itself," says Mr. Ridley. "Now that India has gone, Britain will have to find the necessary 'bread' for its metropolitan slaves—the British workers."

We have often wondered whether or not the British Government consulted the United States before arriving at their decision of "Quit India" as it would be bringing about a revolutionary change in the balance of power in world affairs, specially in Asia and Africa where the great Republic had developed vast interests—financial and

U. S. A's interest in India's political future

strategic. It was incumbent on them to consult the "Britains beyond the Seas"—the British Dominions spread over the three Oceans—Canada, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand. The new alignment of forces that would follow the withdrawal of British power from over India and Burma needed this consultation, as India had been a base of British power on two Oceans—Indian and the Pacific; she had been the recruiting ground of fighting forces that were always rushed into danger spots in the areas round about the Mediterranean, across the Indian Ocean, north and south. The sending by Lord Curzon of Indian contingents to South Africa during the Boer War was a case in point. Apart from this, the second World War had demonstrated the value of India as "an arsenal" of democracy in the East. Nature by placing her on the perimeter of the Indian Ocean, at almost the centre of the area spreading from South Africa to the East Indies, appeared to have decreed a distinctive role for her in the affairs of East Africa, Western Asia, and Southern Asia. During the British regime she had played this part in no small measure. Therefore, it was incumbent on the British Government to consult the Dominions to understand and appreciate their reactions to the proposed step announced on February 20, 1947, as it might have far-reaching effects on their defence arrangements, deprived as they might be of the advantages of an India with all her sources walking out of the British Commonwealth of Nations. Serious must have been the thoughts that were exchanged between the British Government at London and the Dominion Governments discussing specially the new military strategy on the part of the Commonwealth which had grown used to relying on India's man-power and economic resources. We have a certain feeling that almost the same consideration was shown to the U. S. Administration which had got entangled into British affairs by partnership in the common fight against Germany and Japan. We know that Mr. Attlee's predecessor in office, Mr. Winston Churchill, would not allow the then U. S. A. President, Franklin Roosevelt, to take any interest in Indian affairs: he used to resent any suggestions that he should make it up with the leaders of Indian Nationalists. But 1944 was quite different from 1947. Not only had Winston Churchill been driven out of office, and Mr. Attlee set up in his place of authority and dignity; the first two years of peace have exposed the financial and economic weaknesses of Britain whose economy was buttressed, so to say, by advances from the almost illimitable resources of the United States. This dependence and expectation of further help from that source placed an unwritten obligation on the Government of Britain to consult President Truman and his Administration before they could liquidate their imperial responsibilities to India. Not only would there be strategic repercussions of this fateful step on U. S. A. military arrangements in the Middle and Near East, in the Far-East, but there would also be repercussions on her economy. These basic facts of the situation must explain the following items in the news sent by the *Associated Press of America* on the 26th of February, 1947, a week after the Attlee announcement. Our readers must read between the lines the indications of our interpretation set forth above. Mr. Attlee could not have

made his declaration if the Dominion and the United States Governments had raised any objection to the step he proposed to take. When, and if ever, the letters exchanged between the ruling authorities of these countries on this matter, come to be published, we will come to know the considerations that decided the "Quit India" announcement. Till then we must be satisfied with the part-truth as wired by the U. S. A. News Agency.

Washington, Feb. 26.—U.S. Secretary of State General George C. Marshall said yesterday that the United States profoundly hoped the Indian political leaders would set aside their differences so that India can become completely independent by June, 1948.

General Marshall told a press conference that the United States fully supports Britain's efforts to free India on a constitutional basis that would lead to the establishment of a federal union.

In a statement the Secretary of State observed that relations between the United States and India have assumed a new significance since the arrival here of Indian Ambassador-designate, Mr. Asaf Ali.

Drawing attention to the statement by the British Prime Minister, Mr. Clement Attlee, Mr. Marshall said: "This Government fully appreciates the grave character of the British decision to set a definite and early date for the completion of transferring power to responsible Indian hands. It profoundly hopes that the Indian political leadership will accept this clear-cut challenge and will proceed to break the impasse between the Congress and the Muslim League. The Indian internal crisis threatens to prevent India from making its rightful and honourable contribution to the maintenance of internal peace and prosperity.

Mr. Marshall continued: "An India torn by civil strife would not only find it difficult to make this positive and greatly needed contribution but might conceivably become a source of new international tension in a world only now beginning to grope its way back to peace."

The Secretary of State pointed out that in recent official statements the United States had made clear its interest in India's peaceful transition to full self-government. He added that the United States had also welcomed the "persistent and sincere efforts" of the British Government to bring together the major Indian political parties.

The United States, Mr. Marshall declared, continues to believe that the British plan offers a 'just basis for co-operation.'

"It would be difficult to exaggerate the magnitude of the task faced by the Indian leaders and of the heavy responsibilities that rest upon them as they endeavour to bring freedom, political stability and economic progress to such a large segment of the human race.

The many considerations advanced by the United States Foreign Secretary for reconciliation of differences in India placed

Mr. Marshall's on Indian leadership the responsibility for bringing statement ignores it about. We have heard British public men and South Asian publicists saying that their Government had done complications their best for peaceful transfer of State power to

responsible Indian hands, and that it was now the turn of Indians to contribute their own share of thought, of the spirit of accommodation and sacrifice of non-essentials at the altar of their common good. This is truism in human relations—individual and corporate—which human history has ever failed to act up to. In the context of the controversy we have been dealing with, the crucial problem that has been missed by our non-Indian friends and mentors revolves round the fact that two rights—the demands of unity and of "self-determination"—have been fighting for their individuality and their needs. Indian Nationalism since the middle of the 19th century has been building all its hopes for better and more dignified life on the conception of India—one, whole and indivisible. Muslims when they were supplying Emperors and Governors to Delhi and the Provinces

were never heard to have insisted upon self-determination; their rulers were seen consciously or unconsciously working towards unity. With the loss of their control over the State in India, they forgot this past. And the British authorities encouraged this mood of theirs with a view to protect and defend their own particular interests against the oncoming of Indian Nationalism. This in a nutshell is the history of Muslim communalism in India. The Foreign Secretary of the United States could not be expected to appreciate this element in the Indian situation. If he had exercised a little of his historic imagination he would have easily found resemblance between the United States of 1860 and the India of 1947. He knows more than we can claim to do how his country's Government had met the challenge to its unity and integrity. Here in India the Government was a saboteur itself, and against the combined attack of the Anglo-Muslim alliance, Indian Nationalism went down. Mr. George Marshall could not be expected to put himself in our shoes, and, therefore, could he play the mentor to us so easily. But we cannot make a grievance of it, specially when we have to remember that his country, a newcomer to world leadership, has elected to be guided by British policy just as during the third decade of the 19th century she had followed the lead given by George Canning, Britain's Foreign Minister, in declaring a "Monroe Doctrine" for the Americas, warning every non-American Power against interference with the hemisphere's internal affairs. An instance of such borrowing intruded upon India's attention when Mr. John Dulles, a member of the U. S. A. delegation to the United Nations Organisation, who in the Election Year in the United States has developed into the adviser and "expert" in foreign affairs to President Truman's rival, Mr. John Dewey, went out of his way to declare that "in India Soviet Communism exercises a strong influence through the Interim Hindu Government." The offence was given by the use of the "Hindu" in this connection. And this could be given because Mr. Dulles had taken on trust what Winston Churchill and his followers had been saying in their speeches in the two Houses of the British Parliament, in their writings to the Press. Recalling this history, immediate and remote, we were not much impressed by Mr. Marshall's words of advice. And we would prefer more to know whether he understood the significance of his own words which expressed the hope that India could make "positive and greatly needed contribution" towards easing the international tension. The British plans, embodied in the 1946 statement of policy to be found in the Cabinet Delegation's findings, in Mr. Attlee's statement of February 20 (1947), were all based on the idea that the structure of the State in India could not be kept intact, that the sovereignty over the country must be distributed between Hindu majority and Muslim majority areas. The London *Times*' interpretation of the Attlee statement throws light on the mind of Britain's ruling classes, old and new. And we are forced to the conclusion that Mr. Marshall in issuing the statement, summarized above, did not apply his mind to understanding the many complications that would arise if a disrupted India is sent adrift on the sea of international maladjustments specially in South Asia spreading from Arabia to the islands of Indonesia in the Pacific Ocean.

It is necessary for us to analyse certain of these in the light of a war-shattered China and a defeated Japan with whose people the second World War of the 20th century has established new relations of responsibility for the United States. With the withdrawal of British control from India and Burma, with the shattering of Japan's ambitions, a vacuum has been created in this region of Asia that will remain a danger to peace. For about a century and a half Britain had been a stabilizing factor in this wide area. Since the beginning of the 20th century Japan had been playing the same role in East Asia; such was at least the hope of United States' diplomats and policy-makers. The two Powers that can at present fill up that vacuum are the Soviet Union and the United States. Whether or not they will be able to do so in peace raises a question-mark that is more full of fear than of hope. Other countries that could be hoped to make a "positive" contribution towards Asian stability was India with her immense man-power and her leadership in world thought; China has been endowed with the same qualities. But the malice of British imperialism has disrupted the possibilities of such a hope in the case of India, and China, locked up in a civil war, cannot be expected in the near future to play her destined part in the comity of modern nations. Mr. Marshall ignored these fearful portents when he discussed with American publicists the points of the Attlee statement. There was no indication that he appreciated the evil that a divided India may be driven to work in the economy of Asia. Military and political leaders of Britain had a far stronger grasp of the problem that will be created with the retirement of their country from hegemony over India and Burma. And what they did, they did with eyes open, driven thereto by a sense of helplessness induced by losses, material and mental. These losses were incurred in two World Wars caused by fear and jealousy of Britain's monopoly over world affairs and her attempt to maintain it against all odds. Even the most die-hard up-holders of British domination, men like Winston Churchill and Leopold Amery, have been driven to accept the inevitability of the "liquidation" of their imperial glory; in their despair and resentment they cannot think of leaving other substitutes of Asian stability. So they co-operated in weakening India, in weakening her power as a stabilizing element in Asia, in South Asia at least. This is what we mean by the use of the words—"British malice"—in connection with the claim made that the Attlee plan offered a "just basis for co-operation" between the Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League, to use Mr. Marshall's words of commendation. But this argument apart, what is of more importance to the abiding interests of peace in Asia, of world peace, is the fact that India, her economy disrupted, has been left by British policy to depend on other Powers, unequal to resisting their pull. This creates a vacuum in Asia which British strategists have started to talk about with a show of unconcern and detachment. They have been trying to explain things by the use of geo-politics, of the influence of "the land mass of India," or, alternately, of the land mass of Burma, Siam, Cochinchina being essential for "paramountcy in this area." Major-General J. B. Hartwell, C. B., D. E. O., is the rising prophet. He is of opinion

that the latter "land mass" should be under "one general control" without caring to indicate who is to exercise this "control." Though he writes in the August-September (1946) Double Number of the *Eastern World* monthly of London, he has deduced his conclusions from the creation of the "power vacuum" precipitated by the "withdrawal of the British from the Indian sub-continent and Burma." Therefore his interpretation is apposite to a discussion of the consequences of the last acts of British imperialism in this region of Asia. The quotation made below from the article is rather long, but bearing as it does on the problem of India's comparative weakness in the new set-up in Asia, we propose to share it with our readers with a view to enable them to understand the difficulties that await them on the threshold of their freedom. The prognostications made therein may not happen in the manner foretold. But we must know what others see in us, tossed on dangers and difficulties of a yet uncertain world. Here is Major-General Hartwell's reading of the situation as it confronts us.

"At present all South-East Asia is in a state of flux and is suffering from, or it would appear in part almost striving to attain, a state of political disintegration which sooner or later will make the intervention of a major Power absolutely certain. In case however, this view is questioned, let us examine the possibilities of the constituent countries of S. E. Asia either separately in some form of federation, putting the S. E. Asian house in order sufficiently to stand on its own foundations.

Turn again to India. Without strong sea power India cannot carry out her past role of the dominating strategical and political influence in this area except by the closest economic, political and military co-operation with the other countries concerned. The chances of this seem infinitesimal. The Burman dislikes and distrusts the Indian, and the same applies to the Malaya, who already seems to be looking towards Java for his future even while the Dutch East Indies question is so very much in the melting-pot. Again, the Chinese of Malaya, forming about half, and that the richest and the most influential of her population, look north to China rather than south or west. Malaya, therefore, would be a house divided. Siam and Indo-China are at present whole-heartedly independent-minded, and both Chinese and French susceptibilities are involved. Apart from all this India is looking inward rather than outward, and any attention she can pay to possible developments outside her borders must surely be directed west and north where the preliminary moves towards any Russian advance into the S. E. Asian area, which would absorb India, must take place.

The whole tendency of the other geographic "land mass", mentioned above, is towards an extreme 'Balkanisation' and it will never cogitate of its own volition to play India's, which was in fact Britain's, past role in S. E. Asia. One must conclude, therefore, that within a predictable time, the S. E. Asian "power vacuum" cannot be filled from within the area itself.

It seems certain in consequence, that there will ensue a struggle, not necessarily leading to war, in the near future for 'power' control in the S. E. Asia, from which India as an active factor may be eliminated."

This analysis of the situation may have substance in it or may not have, but the fact that stares us in the face puts an added responsibility on India's rulers for the defence of her newly-won freedom and the consolidation of her power so that in her neighbourhood anarchy may not raise its head. For, it will be to her supreme interest that her neighbours, east and west and north, are assured security so that they may not become centres of disintegration inviting the intervention of any major Power as prophesied by Major-

Reasons for
British decision
to divide India

General Hartwell. The setting-up of "Pakistan" may mean this or may not. But there is no denying that this parting gift of British Imperialism has weakened India's power for good, for playing the role that geography and history have prepared her for. But in these matters of high policy lamentations are of no avail. We have to accept it that Anglo-"Pakistan" alliance will for long remain as a thorn on India's side, that these two disrupters of India's unity will try their best to disturb her equanimity so that she may not devote her attention to constructive activities for re-building her economy shattered by one hundred and ninety years of exploitation. This is a possibility of which we must be ever watchful. In estimating the motives that led Britain to work towards the disruption of India's unity, it is not yet possible to get hold of all the truth or truths behind these. We have often asked ourselves what will Britain be gaining by this tactics of hers, how will a weak India serve her particular interests, why should she have thought that India divided will offer greater insurance to her position as a great Power than if she parted from her as a friend. Considerations like these must have been considered by the leaders of Britain, non-official and official—leaders of capital, industry and trade, heads of Administrative Departments, chiefs of Britain's armed forces—her army, navy and air-force—diplomats etc, etc. They must have come to the conclusion that the division of India was necessary; the Dominions and the United States must have for their own reasons agreed with this decision. What these reasons were we may not know now. The Dominions and the United States must have reasoned that British Imperialism has been a liability, that for its defence two World Wars had been fought and won. Counting the loss they must have realized that the liability out-weighed the profits, that their own loss, financial and in man-power, need not have been incurred. The Dominions might have thought that they no longer needed the protection of the British Navy, that the United States would be a better defender of their interests than Britain, shaky in her own position. The United States might have thought that two World Wars had demonstrated her strength and confirmed her in the leadership of the Anglo-Saxon world, and that it would not be a bad thing altogether that the stigma attached to her as a defender of British Imperialism should be effaced, and she be allowed to make a gesture of good will to victims of British domination. Winston Churchill has declared on more than one occasion that 20 to 30 thousand British forces would have been enough to retain British *Raj* over India, to re-establish Britain's effective authority over India. In the ultimate analysis this argument of the gun, might be the last resort of States. But no body blurts it out as crudely as Britain's war-time leader, the organiser of her victory in the second World War. Sifting all the considerations adduced above, a student of affairs is left no other alternative than to conclude that the policy of States is subject to the logic of their own past. In the case of Britain it has been found that since the sixties of the 19th century, British policy had been pandering to the forces of disintegration in India, and in the middle of the 20th century these have been realising the compound interest of that policy. Any idealism or wisdom that might

have lingered in British life was unavailing to halt the downward pace.

Mahatma Gandhi might have said that the manner of Britain's quitting India had redeemed her honour. But this praise could only be offered if it be thought that State policy is generally immoral or a-moral, that transfer of power to a dependent people must entail some loss, and the manner of British transfer was characterized by the least possible violence. In other countries bloodshed has been more wide-spread and prolonged. But even this consolation is denied to us who have seen in Calcutta, Noakhali, Bihar, in the N. W. Frontier Province, in the Punjab the break-out of anarchy even when British Raj was on the saddle. And after what happened in August, 1947, in West Punjab, East Punjab, N. W. Frontier Province, in Sind and Delhi Province, we cannot say that a war would have caused more blood-shed, more destruction of wealth, more dishonour to women. It is possible to argue that the madness that clouded the Indian sky affected Indians only; that the propagators of hate were Indians and the victims were Indians; that the British were almost disinterested spectators of the holocaust. We would have been glad if we could accept this plea. But when it is recalled that alien State policy did play a part in intensifying communal hatred in India, British *alibi* is unsustainable, and the certificate given by Gandhiji to British bureaucrats in India has to be challenged. The utmost that we are prepared to say in their favour is that they were helpless victims of their own *Karma*, their own past activities in India, of their *divide and rule* policy. And in this plea they will have historic precedents to support them as there has never been a case in human history where a people having the misfortune of ruling over an alien people have been able to escape the fatality of this policy. And even the best amongst us have got into the habit of regarding the State as beyond good and evil where the canons of our work-a-day morality are inapplicable or it would be foolish to apply. This cynicism acts as a protective coloration to our habits of thought and life, and has, thus, acquired some sort of a prescriptive right. The British in India were no worse than others in their position in the past or at present. They can throw out the challenge, as they have been always doing, that he that is without sin, he only is entitled to throw the stone of denunciation at us. There will be few to accept this challenge. This being still an arguable point, we leave it to historians to debate it. And the publicist in India would be doing well if he forgets the British episode in its material poverty, and concentrates attention on the present and the future when so much of salvage work has to be gone through to build on a clean ground the structure of life true to the ideals that have sustained them in their fight against their own inner maladjustments, against the injustices of the alien State.

We have tried to bring out certain of the influences, Indian and foreign, that have twisted human relations in India. We have sought

Delhi Secretariat full of "cells" of Muslim League saboteurs

to get behind the scene, and understand the motives that lay behind British action. We have shown that Muslim League leadership had the easiest of the job in reaching their objective, as it knew that the British were half-way with them even when the Cabinet Delegation had argued against their case. It would be necessary now to understand and explain the reasons that impelled the leadership of Indian Nationalism represented in the Indian National Congress, to submit to combined Anglo-Muslim attacks. With the entrance of the Muslim League nominees into the Interim Government, the joint responsibility of its members that the Congress nominees had been able to build up began to be challenged and set at naught by the former. Lord Wavell who appeared to have been taken in by the Muslim League leader by a promise of honest co-operation with the work of the Interim Government and with the Constituent Assembly, appeared to be in no mood of discouraging these Muslim League tactics. The Vice-President of his "Executive Council", Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, was found driven to charge him with participation in a work of sabotage; in course of a speech delivered on the occasion of the Lucknow session of the Congress, in its Subjects Committee, on November 21 (1946) he said: "He is gradually removing the wheels of the car," that "there is a mental alliance between the League and senior British officials." Muslim League nominees were, thus, enabled to disturb the *personnel* of their offices by importing officers into the New Delhi Secretariat sympathetic to the Muslim League; they strengthened their hold on the Administration by putting into "key positions" in their own Departments Muslim officers. The special representative of the Calcutta English-language daily, *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, sent a message to his paper sometime during the second week of May, 1947, that the member in charge of Communications, Sardar Abdur Rab Nishtar, had been breaking the record of his Muslim League colleagues in this line. A summary of his despatch will throw light on the sinister possibilities of these particular activities.

My reading of the situation, based on talks with those who may be credited with possessing inside information about the trend of political developments, is that Delhi may soon be the centre of "direct action" on the lines of what was recently witnessed in the Punjab and the North-West Frontier Province.

And to be forearmed for a contingency like that the Communications Department of the Government of India has lost no time in completely Muslimising all important posts in the higher cadre of the Delhi telephone system by replacing the European, Hindu and Sikh officers with Muslims.

The changes so far effected are as follows: Col. W. E. Hardwood, District Manager, Delhi Telephone District—replaced by Muhammad Hussain on April 29; P. Srinivasan, Administrative Officer—replaced by Ghulam Abbas (transfer to take effect from 31st May); Chanan Singh, Assistant Engineer, Trunk Exchange—replaced by Abdul Latif on April 19; R. B. Malhotra, Engineer, City Exchange—replaced by Khalil Ahmed, transfer to take effect from May 31; R. P. Ghose, Engineer, Avenue Exchange—replaced by Aziz Ahamed on April 29.

A mere glance at this list will show that all strategic and key posts have been placed in the charge of Muslim officers so that in case of an emergency like what the Punjab and the North-West Frontier have recently passed through communications by means of telephone between the different parts of Delhi itself and also between Delhi and other parts of India through the trunk exchange may be absolutely under their control.

The consequences of activities like these were brought home to all when the Muslim League leadership sent out the word that the Coalition Ministry in the Punjab wherein every party other than the Muslim League was represented, should be broken by a "Direct action" and a League Ministry set up. During the anarchy let loose in March, 1947, the capital city India was cut off from all danger-spots. Lord Wavell and his superiors in

London must have been apprised of Sardar Nishtar's goings-on. We have not heard that they did anything to indicate that they wholly disapproved of these tactics. Nationalist public men and publicists were, therefore, not far wrong in endorsing Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's indictment quoted above. And the idea was wide-spread during the time following the February 20 announcement that the Nationalist leaders of India, represented in the Interim Government, were being forced to yield inch by inch their positions in defence of India's unity. A coherent picture of the personal and impersonal influences that were engaged in this betrayal of India has not yet appeared. Hints and suggestions have been plenty and to spare. But these were not helpful at the time. Sardar Vallabhbhai, the Indian Union's Home Minister, has lifted a part of the veil in course of a speech delivered by him at Nagpur in the second week of November, 1948. It will help our readers to realize the difficulties he and his colleagues had been working under. Addressing representatives of the Chattisgarh States since "merged" with the Central Provinces & Berar, he declared that there were British bureaucrats in every department of the State who were found to be mortgaging India's interests in course of their routine duties. In proof of this indictment he related how when he was entrusted with the States' portfolio in addition to that of Home Affairs, he found that the Political Department in league with certain Princes, was busy hatching "a conspiracy to break up the unity of India." The Bastar State affairs gave him a clue to their nefarious activities. We summarize his speech below to explain the purpose at their back. The State has immense natural resources; these were on the point of being mortgaged to the Nizam State (Hyderabad) on a long lease. He put his foot down on these efforts. The Political Department at first tried to withhold the relevant papers; ultimately these came. Then the Political Department put in the plea that as they were under the law guardians of the minor Prince of Bastar, they were competent to enter into the contract for lease. They were, however, bluntly told that "as they were going away", they should "not bother about their wards." Experiences like these forced on him the realization of the urgency of a decision.

"It was then that I was made fully conscious of the extent to which our interests were being prejudiced in every way by the machinations of the Political Department, and came to the conclusion that the sooner we were rid of these the better for us."

"I came to the conclusion that the best course was to hasten the departure of these foreigners even at the cost of *the partition of the country*. (*The italics are ours*). It was also then that I felt that there was one way to make the country safe and strong, and that was the unification of *the rest of India*. (*The italics are ours*.)

In course of his speech at the Banaras Hindu University's special

Convocation conferring on him a honorary doctorate on November 25 (1948), Sardar Patel referred to the matter again in these words.

"I felt that if we did not accept partition, India would be split into many bits and would be completely ruined. My experience of office for one year convinced me that the way we have been proceeding would lead us to disaster. We would not have had one 'Pakistan' but several. We would have "Pakistan" cells in every office."

This is the version of a man who as a leader of the Congress and as Home Member in Lord Wavell's Executive Council had the fullest opportunity to appreciate the difficulties created by British policy in the way of India's attaining the goal of her political aspirations. And he has frankly told us his feeling of urgency in coming to a decision which under the Attlee declaration was leading to a division of our country. He and his colleagues in the leadership of the Congress could not postpone the decision when Lord Mountbatten was sent out to succeed Lord Wavell and arrange for the transfer of power to responsible Indian leaders. They saw that in the words of the Attlee declaration there was the distinct promise to disruptionists that the British Government would not have objection to transferring their authority to more than one Government. And when Congress leaders sat round the table with Lord Mountbatten and noticed, in Muslim League circles a note of triumph, they had no other alternative than their attempt to salvage as much of India's territory as was possible from the clutches of Muslim League fanaticism. Sardar Patel's speeches struck the note of urgency that they felt in March, 1947. And it is necessary to always remember this fact. The Anglo-Muslim coterie exploited this anxiety of theirs. This we know from a syndicated article appearing in English-language dailies in India summarizing what Lord Ismay, Lord Mountbatten's Chief of Staff, told a "lunch-time" meeting of the London Royal Empire Society. There is nothing particularly new in the speech, so far as we get it in the summary published in the article of Dr. Sacchidananda Sinha of Patna. The speech contained a rehash of the story that the Congress and the Muslim League were as apart as ever. Lord Ismay said that while in London he had felt that the date fixed, June, 1948, was "far too early", when he reached Delhi he found that it was "too late." The Administration was creaking; "the communal bitterness was far more intense both at headquarters in Delhi and in the Provinces than anything I could have imagined."

".....I do not suppose that in the history of the world there has ever been a Coalition so determined not to co-operate with each other. They were all unanimous that this system could not continue much longer, without the greatest injury to the country as a whole."

With the characteristic British pose of impartiality, Lord Ismay could not apportion credit or blame to any of the parties forming the "Coalition." And as realists he and his chief accepted the situation as it was and bent all their energies to end the deadlock by dividing the country. Lord Ismay quoted Mr. Jinnah as saying that "a truncated 'Pakistan' was better than "no Pakistan." This confession was something like half the battle won so far as the British carvers were concerned. And as the Congress leaders

Prospect of power
to Provincial
Governments
gave a hint to
League leadership

accepted the defeat of their fight for unity, Lord Mountbatten had a clear sky to steer by. The Indian and British version we know. But we do not know the Muslim League version of their choice of a "moth-eaten Pakistan." Hard bargainer that Mr. Mohammad Ali Jinnah had been, he must have felt that British patience might give out and his apple-cart over-turned. And his confession must have been hastened by the fact that the failure of their attempt to capture the Ministry in the Punjab had a lesson of its own, and as their patron Lord Wavell had been recalled in disgrace, "dismissed" was the word used by Winston Churchill, the time for a come-down could not any longer be delayed. The purpose behind this mood of compromise should however be analysed. The Attlee declaration had spoken of power being transferred to provincial Governments in case there happened to be no agreement between the upholders of unity as against "self-determination". This gave Mr. Jinnah a hint of his Party's line of action—to get control over as many Provincial Ministries as was possible under the circumstances during the 18 months that remained before the British "Quit". In Bengal there had been for about 14 months a Muslim League Ministry under Mr. Huseyn Saheed Suhrawardy, famous or notorious for the abominations released over the Province's life by the "Direct Action" stunt proposed in the Muslim League Central Council resolution passed on July 29, 1946. Muslim League gangsters under League leaders started to loot, burn, stab and kidnap Hindu women on 16th August 1946. The reaction to this outburst on the part of Calcutta's Hindu majority, the generally peaceful, "mild Hindu" was terrible. They retaliated, and only the presence of the military in the streets of Calcutta under command of British officers saved the Muslim minority from extinction and the city from mutual murder. This defeat in the field of their own choice forced the Muslim League to stage a rehabilitation of their own moral and that of their dupes. Noakhali, an eastern district of Bengal, was chosen for their new trial of strength, it being an area where Muslims had a majority of 80 per cent. Noakhali Muslims have been known for their devotion to Islam in all its rigidity. Their socio-religious leaders had for a long time, since the beginning of this century, been trained in the academies of Islamic conservatism like Deobund and Azamgarh in the United Provinces. These academies had been nurseries of Muslim dreams of a come-back to the rulership of India that had slipped out of the hands of puppet Emperors of Delhi claiming their descent from Babar, the founder of the Mughal dynasty. Muslim League leaders in Bengal tried to retrieve its position from the vantage-ground of Noakhali. They found in Noakhali Muslims, resident in Calcutta, fit instrument for implementing their nefarious policy. At the Docks and Port of Calcutta these Noakhali Muslims were found in strength as also in Calcutta's Fire Brigade. These men had specialized training which enabled them to organize and lead the mischief-makers. Hell was let loose over certain areas of Noakhali and Tipperah, a contiguous district. There was selective murder of the earning members of Hindu families; 50 thousand Hindus were perverted from the faith of their fathers; the burning of Hindu houses was not as extensive, because these were hoped to come into Muslim possession as the Hindus

fled in panic ; burning of these were done with the help of stirrup pumps which had plenty of petrol, a rationed article under Government control wholly. Noakhali led to Bihar where Muslims were massacred in their thousands, Muslim property was looted and burnt, Muslim women were dishonoured. This pattern of conduct, introduced into our country by Muslim League ideology and practice, confronted Lord Wavell during the autumn of 1946 and forced upon the Labour Government the decision of February, 1947. With the Ministry of Bengal and Sind under Muslim League control, the war for Pakistan was but half won. The control over the Punjab, the N. W. Frontier Province and Assam became from now on the target of attack. In the Punjab there was a Coalition Ministry of all parties minus the Muslim League. In the N. W. Frontier Province and Assam Congress Ministries held power. And it became the Muslim League's policy to dislodge these, and put themselves into their place so that when the British transferred authority not later than June, 1948, the Muslim League Ministries could be recognized as "Succession Governments," a promise of which was embodied in the Attlee declaration. And, in the name of "Civil Liberty" the Muslim League started a war of nerves on these three Ministries.

Scenes reminiscent of Noakhali-Tipperah were enacted in the Punjab, and the Ministry under Malik Khizr Hyat Khan were borne to the ground by sheer anarchy. This Ministry of the Unionist Party consisting of a few Muslims, socially related to the Chief Minister, and a few Hindu and Christian members could only be formed because of Congress and Sikh support, the latter divided almost equally between the Nationalist Sikh Party and the Akali Party. All these parties supplied Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries ; the Unionists though numerically the weakest were represented in strength in the Ministry in proportion that bore no relation to their number. The anarchy released by the Muslim League over the Punjab wore down the nerves of the Unionist Muslim members of the Ministry, and in a moment of weakness the Chief Minister was persuaded to resign without consultation with his Congress and Sikh colleagues, as told us by Lala Bhim Sen Sacchar, Finance Minister in this Ministry. Loud and persistent was the criticism in those days of the dubious attitude of the Governor, Sir Evan Jenkins, who was charged with using his influence on the side of the Muslim League party, the single strongest party in the Punjab Legislative Assembly. Be that as it may, the sinister campaign started by the Muslim League to dislodge the Ministry was responsible for the murder of Hindus and Sikhs numbering 2,049 and 1,108 seriously wounded up to the mid-day of March 19, 1947, as the Chief Secretary Mr. Macdonald announced. In the light of his remarks that "the figures from Rawalpindi and Attock districts are not reliable, and it is feared that when full figures are ascertained they will be formidable," these numbers must be an under-estimate. The nature of this lawlessness and butchery can be understood from what appeared in the *Tribune* of Lahore on the strength of a Special Representative's letter despatched on March 30. Mr. Justice Teja Singh of the Lahore High Court on lost 80 relatives—his own and his wife's side, the remnants being "just a few minor girls left to

the care of God." This record in the Rawalpindi district was matched by what happened in the district of Multan contiguous to the N.-W. Frontier Province where an identical campaign was being carried on under the benevolently neutral eyes of the Governor. The *Civil and Military Gazette* of Lahore, an upholder of "British Raj" in its crudest arrogance, was constrained to acknowledge it, through its special correspondent, that "Sir Olaf Caroe was alleged to have sent for his Ministers on or about March 11 and advised them to join the Muslim League in which case he would give them all support." Because of the military implications of this anarchy, even conservative British papers were found to suggest that Muslim League agitators in this province were *agent provocateurs*. Colin Reed, the London *Daily Telegraph's* correspondent writing from Peshawar, had the following significant paragraph :

"Agent provocateurs from other Provinces have been stirring up Muslim feelings here by displaying photographs of skulls and torn fragments of the Quoran from Bihar."

In the eastern extremity of India, Assam came under the same malignant attentions of the Muslim League trying to exploit an agrarian grievance to serve political purpose. To explain the genesis of this problem, our readers will have to be taken back to about 25 years and more. Land-hungry Muslims, specially from the district of Mymensingh belonging to the Province of Bengal, led by men of means in search of more land, had begun to migrate to Assam, to the Brahmaputra Valley of the Province, on the quest for fresh fields and pastures anew. The Assam Administration encouraged these "colonists" who had not yet cut off all relation with their "home" district, the more prosperous of them specially. When Montagu's "Diarchy" arrived, and Assamese-speaking public men had opportunity to look around with inner knowledge of the tendency of things, they did not like it, for two reasons. First, these immigrants were Bengalees of whom the people of the Brahmaputra Valley had developed an innate dread. Second, these new-comers would be encroaching on their own resources which had been reserved by Nature for the people of the Brahmaputra Valley alone. Many of the British administrators had by now begun to sympathize with these fears and aspirations. So a *Line System* was introduced limiting the immigrants' land-hunger, confining their activities to certain specified areas of lower Assam. But the immigrants represented an aggressive force against which the indigenous people could not put up a fight; their negative attitude was a handicap and they were driven to depend on a defensive tactics which was more often than not ineffective. There were also Muslims in the area whose ancestors had trickled there during the last two centuries beginning with Mir Jumla's abortive attack on Assam's freedom. These people could not be discriminated against as they had become racy of the soil of the Brahmaputra Valley. But their leaders were naturally sympathetic to brother Muslims trying to better themselves, who, they hoped, would in time become as good as themselves as citizens of Assam. Sir Muhammad Saadullah represented these Assam Muslims at their best. And during this time as "Executive Councillor" under the Minto-

Purpose of
Muslim League
attack on
Assam's auto-
nomy

Morley constitutional changes, as a "Minister" under the Montagu dispensation, he helped the Muslim immigrants, even straining the law for this purpose. Muslim officers in the Assam Administration entered into the spirit of this game, and were found co-operating with Sir Mubammad to advance special Muslim interests. For, the Minto-Morley and the Montagu-Chelmsford Acts had given statutory recognition to Muslim separatism, and the Muslims of India had started to think that they were a separate people, though the vast majority of them had Hindu blood in their veins. The Samuel Hoare Act of 1935 worsened conditions which were reflected in the activities of responsible Muslims. They began to popularise the idea amongst their co-religionists that they were a separate "nation" entitled to have a separate State the dimension of which must coincide with areas where they were a majority or where they could convert themselves into a majority in course of a few years. This was how Assam, the Brahmaputra Valley, came into the picture of Muslim League ambitions. This Province was divided into two sharply demarcated areas separated by the range of hills through which passed the Assam Bengal Railway. The southern portion watered by the river Surma was known as the Surma Valley, the northern portion took its name from that of the great river Brahmaputra which had a place in the *Mahabharata*, the great epic depicting the times of the Kurukshetra battle which was fought about 3,200 years back, if not more. The former was almost wholly Bengalee-speaking, the majority being Muslims. The latter was a medley of peoples of many races, hill people being more than one third of the population. The politically conscious and dominant classes were the minority of 25 lakhs (two and half millions) Assamese-speaking people. In this set-up, Sir Mohammad Saadulla could easily exploit the fear of the Bengalee felt by the Assamese to consolidate his own position, to advance the ambitions of the Muslim League. The unvarying support given him by the British bureaucracy in Assam and the white-skinned "Planter Raj" of the Province also accounted for his influence over the Assam Administration. He was a Muslim Leaguer neither by inclination nor by conviction, but because by 1940 Assam had come to be included in the "Muslim Zone" of the Muslim League geo-politics. So we find him encouraging sentiments that expressed Muslim League ambitions. He was found present at an "extraordinary general meeting" of the Assam Islam Mission Society held on the 10th March, 1940, where the Secretary, teacher of a school at Shillong, uttered the following words hot with material greed over which the venter of Islam threw a colouration of respectability:

"I will not dabble in politics. But I sincerely believe that this Islam Mission.....can do openly, peacefully and lawfully what others of our Muslim organisations cannot do in a similar way. The Islam Mission can turn a minority, in course of a few years, into an overwhelming majority, and easily solve the baffling problem of Assam politics today—I mean, the notorious Line System."

This story will enable our readers to understand why Mr. Mahammad Ali Jinnah was so adamant in his support to the "Grouping" arrangement

The firing out of which put Assam and Bengal in a single Group threaten-
Civil Liberties cam- ing Assam's autonomy to the profit of the Muslim
paign by Muslim League and their supporters and dupes. And when the
League. 20th February (1947) declaration held the prospect of
dividing the country and of the British Government transferring
their authority to Provincial Governments, Muslim League leadership
made a determined attempt to turn the Province of Assam into their
special reserve by pouring into the Province Muslims from Bengal.
And as the Ministry in Assam was dominated over by Assamese-
speaking people, afraid of the Bengalee and afraid of the Muslim,
Mr. Gopinath Bardoloi, the Chief Minister, could not afford to be as
accommodating as his opposite number in the Punjab. He clamped
down an order prohibiting Muslim League's "fifth-column" activities
in the shape of inflammable speeches and inflammatory writings. And
the Muslim League stalwarts turned themselves over-night into defend-
ers of "civil liberties!" But their campaign fizzled out in Assam as
well as in the N. W. Frontier Province both under Congress Minis-
tries. In the Punjab the weakness of a Muslim Chief Minister,
Malik Khizir Hyat Khan, did not enable the Ministry to stand up to
this attempt at sabotage. And though the British Governor responsible
for law and order in the Province—the two gods at the altar of the
British bureaucracy had ever been paying homage—did not put the
Muslim League Party into power, the attempt was worth making in
view of the fact that the "Civil Liberties" campaign demonstrated the capa-
city of the Muslim League to shake the Administration which could
be regarded as a proof of their capacity to maintain and re-build it. The
following extracts cabled from London on April 12 (1947) from an
article in the *Times* had many hints and suggestions that supported
this interpretation of ours. And as the Hindu and the Sikh had suffered
the most in the Punjab in life, limb, honour and wealth, the Muslim League
had no reason to regret their excursion into gangsterism. This appre-
ciation in the columns of the London *Times* of the Indian situation as
it obtained at the time when the new Governor-General was busy
with intense negotiations with Indian leaders throws light on the issues
which could not any longer be left un-resolved.

"The Muslim League attempt to seize power in the Punjab, admittedly the
nodal point of Pakistan, has so far broken down in the face of Hindu and Sikh
opposition. If persisted in, it seems likely to reinforce the growing demand for
the division of the Province into Muslim and non-Muslim areas."

"Those who still hope to preserve the unity of the Punjab are now discuss-
ing the possibility of zonal autonomy. The scheme though only a halfway house
to real partition, would effectively frustrate League aspirations by depriving the
Muslim population of any real grievance, except that they would be unable to rule
over Hindus and Sikhs.

"It would be a mistake to infer that this plan has been devised merely to
disconcert the manoeuvres of the League. It is in fact related to a wider project,
long discussed, of adjusting purely arbitrary boundaries of the existing Provinces,
fixed either by historic accident or British convenience, to the requirements of a
Federal system based on differences of race and culture, but it has come into new
prominence as the result of Mr. Jinnah's insistence on Pakistan and if applied
also to Bengal, would deprive Pakistan of its principal attraction.

"While there is no disposition in political circles to demand any precipitate
action there is the growing expectation that Lord Mountbatten will soon be in a
position to propose some novel solution for the constitutional and communal dead-
lock which still impedes India's advance to full independence."

"In so far as this expectation, natural as it is obscure, the responsibility, now placed squarely upon Indian shoulders by the British decision to transfer power by June 1948, may hinder rather than help the Viceroy in difficulties of the transitional period. But it has at least the advantage of affording to all parties an opportunity for serious reflection on the present state of the country."

"The Congress party have accepted the Cabinet Mission's plan and its interpretation by the British Government last December. They would be well advised to re-affirm its acceptance in emphatic and unambiguous terms in return for which they would be entitled to the assurance that the Muslim League will respect the position of the Sikhs in Punjab and the Hindu majority in Assam, when the Constituent Assembly splits into its provincial groups."

"The recent revival of the partition scheme for the Punjab and Bengal may provide them with the means to strike a bargain with the League upon both matters; if they can do so, the Cabinet Plan will once more become the accepted working design for a new India."

We have made an attempt to make the history of Muslim League disruptionism as complete as possible, British contribution to the Indian States' strengthening of this spirit playing no less an important part in it. We will leave the appreciation of this factor by saying that if there had been no Muslim League in India to help prolong British tenure, one would have been manufactured by British skill—an instrument of disruption of the peoples' united front directed against alien usurpation. This is not a surmise. The British did it, and the Indian States came in handy for the purpose. And their action in the line was exposed in the Cabinet Delegation's Memorandum of May 12, 1946, declaring that with their departure would lapse "Paramountcy"—the relation that bound these more than 560 States, Principalities and *Jajirs* to the Government in India and the authority over which the Governor-General of India exercised as Viceroy, representing the Crown of Britain. In the ultimate analysis this dual role of a British politician generally staying only for five years in India has been a constitutional fiction. Abstruse have been the reasonings trying to uphold this fiction; constitutional "experts" have tried to sustain it or reason it out. But it has been doing duty for about 150 years, and the lapse of "Paramountcy" will have the following consequences, as detailed in the last paragraph of that Memorandum.

".....as a logical consequence and in view of the desires expressed to them on behalf of the Indian States, His Majesty's Government will cease to exercise the powers of Paramountcy. This means that the rights of the States which flow from their relation to the Crown will no longer exist and that all the rights surrendered by the Paramount Power will return to the States. Political arrangements between the States on the one side and the British Crown and British India on the other will thus be brought to an end. The void will have to be filled either by the States entering into a Federal relationship with the Succession Government or Governments in British India, or failing this, entering into particular political arrangements with it or them."

Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, a member of the Congress Committee and a leader of States Peoples' Movement for democratic freedom, was the first to smell a rat in this British plan. If it be given shape to, there will be in India not only one "Pakistan" but any number or more than 560 "sthans" asserting their right to separate existence. From British experience it may be that they will constitute Ulsterization; from European experience—Balkanization. We may not speculate on the purpose behind this move of the British Government on the eve of their retirement from India. We know what the plea will be that

will be advanced on their behalf—the States, their Princes and peoples are not chattels that can be auctioned; the least that Britain could do for them was to restore their freedom to them at the end of 150 years. But there were sections of Britain's old ruling classes who appeared to be perturbed over the betrayal by Britain of her undertakings, written on parchment, over the fate of 90 millions of dusky people. "Leftist" writers in Britain have got into the habit of calling these remnants of a vanished age—"Blimps"—the stiff, up-standing military man or diplomat who have the guts to disapprove of their age and ignore its existence by retiring to the Suburbia that skirts London. This class showed a certain amount of renewed activity when Lord Mountbatten had brought about his *coup* in getting Congress and Muslim League leaders to put their signatures to his division of India plan. One of them, Sir William Barton, advertised as "a well-known" "writer on Indian affairs, threw off his chest the doubts and resentments of his class on the hospitable columns of the London *Spectator* of the last week of June, 1948. We propose to share this dissertation with our readers.

"From the point of view of the princes the position created by the recent *démarche* of His Majesty's Government is serious. In the declaration of policy of May, 22 last year, they were told definitely that the Military protection would be withdrawn. In other words, Britain repudiates her treaty obligations without the slightest hint that any return would be made in respect of the territories ceded to her for the maintenance of the necessary military forces."

"It is next to impossible that the States would be in a position to conclude agreements with the Congress in the next two months or so. They should be given time to work out their considerations, a process in which His Majesty's Government might give a helping hand. Too much insistence has been placed on the isolation of States from the sea-board. Kathiwar, Barde, Rajputana and the Sikh States, and most of the Gujrat States should be served by the Kathiwar ports and so would not be dependent economically on Hindustan.

"This being so if agreement with Congress were impossible, a group might, if the Congress decided on independence, join Pakistan. Geographically there would be no difficulty about such an agreement; or they might claim Dominion Status. Could His Majesty's Government refuse?

"With unity, the States would be able to obtain reasonable terms especially now that partition has weakened the position of the Congress. The League will almost certainly stay in the Commonwealth, an added inducement to Rajputana States and Kashmir to conclude agreement with it. The Congress may, in such conditions, decide to follow the League's move. By doing so it would inspire confidence in the States generally; it would give them what they desire—a guarantee against external aggression.

"The Confederation of the States, particularly the smaller ones, would, if successful, revolutionise the situation. The fact that His Majesty's Government has offered no assistance to the States in establishing their relations with the New India has left them to make their own terms as best they may.

This section of British opinion thinking loudly its inner thoughts gave a clue to the popularity of certain proposals that were being canvassed. "Dominion Status" for the States individually where possible or in "Confederations" where necessary was one of these. Sir William Barton trotted out this idea; others may have had this in mind and passed it less publicly to the Princely Order. Some of the Princes appeared to have responded to the lure of this prospect, their advisers—Dewans and Prime Ministers—gave serious thought to it. The names of Travancore, Mysore, Bhopal, Hyderabad, Kashmir recur

Mr. Jinnah's
interpretation
of the States'
Memorandum

again and again in the Indian Press in connection with discussion of the Mountbatten plan. The leader of the Muslim League, Mr. Mohammad Ali Jinnah, felt impelled to contribute the interpretation of his party or "nation" to the States' Memorandum of the Cabinet Delegation of the year before which remained intact under the June 3 (1947) settlement. As a lawyer of eminence his interpretation had a value of its own, but in actual practice it has since been proved that even in "Pakistan" the States falling within its territory did not enjoy any of the rights and privileges of "full sovereign status" that Mr. Jinnah had decreed for them in course of his statement sent out on June 17, 1948. We will not speculate on the motive behind Mr. Jinnah's interpretation; we will only note that the realist in him for once did yield to the idealist coming out in this statement issued when the fight for the Muslim "nation's" self-determination had been won through the intervention of "The Third Party." If Mr. Jinnah's idealism was sincere, he could not have disapproved so violently of the "Pathanistan" ideal which Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan, leader of the *Khudai Khitmatgar* (Servant of God) organisation in the N.-W. Frontier Province and a leader of the Indian National Congress during the pre-partition days, has been sponsoring openly since June 3, 1948—as a unit of the "Pakistan" State holding relations on the same terms and conditions so generously acknowledged in Mr. Jinnah's statement on the future of the States in India and "Pakistan." We print it below.

"There is a great deal of controversy going on with regard to the Indian States and I am, therefore, obliged to state the position of the All-India Muslim League so that there should be no misunderstanding as to what the Muslim League stands for and what our policy is with regard to the Indian States.

"Constitutionally and legally, the Indian States will be independent sovereign States on the termination of Paramountcy and they will be free to decide for themselves to adopt any course they like; it is open to them to join the Hinduistan Constituent Assembly or the Pakistan Constituent Assembly or decide to remain independent. In the last case they enter into such agreements or relationships with Hindustan or Pakistan as they may choose.

"The policy of the All-India Muslim League has been clear from the very beginning; we do not wish to interfere with the internal affairs of any State; for, that is a matter primarily to be resolved between the rulers and the people of the States. Such States as wish to enter the Pakistan Constituent Assembly of their free will and desire to discuss or negotiate with us, we all find us ready and willing to do so. If they wish to remain independent and wish to negotiate or adjust any political or any other relationship such as commercial or economic relations with Pakistan we shall be glad to discuss with them and come to settlements which will be in the interest of both.

"The British Government have made it clear that Paramountcy will not be transferred to any Government or Governments or authority that may be set up in British India and that itself shows that Paramountcy cannot be transferred but is going to terminate. On its termination the full sovereign status of the Indian States emerges."

The subject of the future of the States loomed large when the time for final decision could not be postponed. We know for a fact

Majority of States
Join Constituent
Assembly

that the rulers and the advisers of certain major States were being lured by interpretations like those of Mr. Jinnah. The majority of them, however, appeared to have decided their course of action by the time this decision was taken. Some of their representatives had already taken part in the discussions of the Constituent Assembly,

sitting at New Delhi since December 9, 1946. A section of the Princely order represented by the Nawab of Bhopal appeared to be holding out for better terms than their general acceptance of the Cabinet Delegations plan held hopes of. Defence, Foreign Affairs and Communications were the three subjects only on which they were prepared to derogate from their "sovereignty." The resolution passed by the Standing Committee of the Chamber of Princes on January 29, 1947, indicated their attitude in this matter of "accession", as was expressed in the following words. "Every State shall continue to retain its sovereignty and all rights and powers other than those that have been expressly delegated by it. There can be no question of any powers being vested or inherent or implied in the Union in respect of the States unless specifically agreed to by them." The "Objectives" resolution passed on January 21, 1947, by the Constituent Assembly at the instance of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Vice-President of Lord Wavell's Executive Council, declaring that the constitution of India would be framed on the basis that the State would be "an independent sovereign Republic" appeared to have scared some of them away, and the 29th January resolution of theirs was intended to be a challenge to the Constituent Assembly. But all of them did not succumb to this fear of an uncertain future when the rising tide of democracy appeared to be so threatening to privileged and vested interests. Therefore did we find Sir Brojendralal Mitter, Dewan of Baroda State, one of the most progressive amongst Indian States built under the inspiring leadership of the late Sayajirao Gaekwad, grand-father of the present Maharaja, breaking away from the evil influence of the Chamber of Princes, and preparing the ground for joining the Constituent Assembly. An item of news sent out from Bombay on April 11, 1947, showed that other Princes were lining themselves up on the side of unity. His Highness the Maharaja of Bikaner appeared to be the leader and representative of this group; he announced that "Baroda, Udaipur, Jaipur, Patiala, Rewa, and Bikaner had decided to send representatives to the Constituent Assembly to take part in framing a constitution under which all of them, Prince or peasant, will have to live and work in a free India." A May 14 news-item said that 35 of the Central India States, except Bhopal and Indore, had decided to enter the Constituent Assembly, and a New Delhi news sent out on June 26, 1947, announced that despite the antagonistic attitude of some prominent Indian States like Travancore and Hyderabad, no less than 40 Indian States, besides representatives of 400 "residuary group States" are expected to attend the forthcoming session of the Constituent Assembly when it meets on July 14, 1947. The number of people on whose behalf these States' representatives were coming forward to take part in a common task was estimated to be 44 millions out of the 93 millions belonging to the whole body of States. It can, therefore, be claimed that the difficulty intended to be raised by the interpretation of "full sovereign status" of Indian States, said to be implicit in the Cabinet Delegation's Memorandum on States' Treaties and Paramountcy published on May 22, 1946, had been laid to rest by the time the decision on the partition of India was taken. The last word on the subject so far as Britain and her Government were concerned was uttered by Lord Mount-

batten when addressing a Press Conference at New Delhi in the morning of June 4, he said on a different context.

"The Indian States cannot enter separately as Dominions." If any of the Indian States came to him for having special treaty—economic or military—with His Majesty's Government, he would transmit such a request to the proper quarters, but the question has not so far arisen."

There can be no negotiation between "His Majesty's Government and the States.... We are coming out of all our commitments. In the process of quitting power in India we must try and approach it in as legally correct a manner as possible."

We do not know when, on what particular day of what month, the leaders of the Congress and the Muslim League agreed to accept the deed of disruption. The signatures must have come afterwards. It appears that by the end of the third week of April (1947) after the full-month talk, initiated by Lord Mountbatten, the main lines of the policy had been settled. The London Socialist weekly—*New Statesman & Nation*—in its issue of April 24 indicated these in an article. The Special Correspondent of the *Lahore Tribune* threw more light on the details of the affair in his despatch of April 27. Both we reproduce below.

"What he (Lord Mountbatten) has achieved, as reports from India indicate, is to make them more sharply aware of the realities of the immediate future. Hence the recognition by the Congress that some form of Pakistan will have to be offered to the Muslim League by June, 1948. Pt. Nebru has already come out with a blunt statement that the Muslim League can have their Pakistan, provided that they do not take more than they are strictly entitled to on the population basis. This means partition of the Punjab and Bengal, with loss of Calcutta to the Muslims. It is a reasonably fair offer, because nothing more than Muslim majority areas can be claimed 'democratically.'—*New Statesman & Nation* (London).

"Firstly, truncated Pakistan in the event of Mr. Jinnah insisting on a separate sovereign State, Mr. Jinnah is insisting thereon and, hence, he would have his Pakistan.

Secondly, partition of the Punjab and Bengal—East Bengal getting Sylhet from Assam—partition on voluntary basis, but, if a mutual agreement is not possible, plebiscite and boundary commission.

Thirdly, plebiscite in the Frontier Province to ascertain whether that Province wants to join the Pakistan.

Fourthly, soon after the new announcement of an award, Muslim Provinces, however, would form, if they so choose, a Centre of their own, and have a separate Cabinet for the co-ordination of common subjects.

Fifthly, the Constituent Assembly would be declared sovereign and the constitution evolved would apply to Hindustan areas and the Union centre of such States and units as have joined the Constituent Assembly.

The details regarding partition, whether it be of property or population of the two, remains to be settled. The outlines of the tentative plan of Lord Mountbatten would be announced before the end of May."—(Delhi Special correspondent of *Lahore Tribune*).

By this time the battle for Indian unity had been lost. Curiously enough, on April 30, Mr. Jinnah characterized the demand for the division of the Punjab and Bengal as "a sinister move, actuated by spite and bitterness." But, it was queer that Mr. Jinnah would

Partition of the Punjab, Bengal and Assam

so soon be forgetting that in the Cabinet Delegation's plan and statement the possibility of such a fragmentation had been discussed and almost accepted. In the paragraph of clause 6 of their statement of 16th May (1946) appeared the following words :

".....nor can we see any justification for including within a sovereign 'Pakistan' those districts of the Punjab, and of Bengal and Assam in which the population is predominantly non-Muslim. Every argument that can be used in favour of 'Pakistan' can equally, in our view, be used in favour of the exclusion of non-Muslim areas from 'Pakistan.'"

Why should this reasoning have been lost on the leadership of the Muslim League, we shall never know. But the fact remains that Mr. Jinnah's outcry and Babu Rajendra Prasad's cruel reply the world would not be taken in by this outcry raised by Mr. Jinnah. For years since March, 1940, public men and publicists in India have been trying to get inside the mind of the Muslims of India that the fragmentation of India on the lines of the Muslim League's definition of "Pakistan", embodied in their Lahore resolution passed in the last week of March, 1940, would demand the bisection of the Punjab and perhaps, the trisection of Bengal. In the frenzy of their partisan folly they would not pay heed to this note of warning. Perhaps, they counted on the support of British imperialists to help them grab as much territory as was decently possible. And that modicum of decency Britain had to maintain in order to save face in international society. Therefore was the counter-reasoning offered in the quotation made above. But Mr. Jinnah would not understand this. And Babu Rajendra Prasad who appeared to have forgotten the art of anger, even he was found rubbing it in into the Muslim League leader's ruffled nerves in course of a statement of that date. "If division has to come, and Mr. Jinnah insists that it should come, then it should be as complete and thorough-going as possible..." Mr. Jinnah appeared to have come to realize only too late that the consequence of the division of the two Provinces

".....will be, logically, that all other Provinces will have to be cut up in a similar way which will be dangerous, as to embark on this line will lead to the breaking up of the various Provinces and create a far more dangerous situation in the future than at present. If such a process were to be adopted it will strike at the root of the administrative, economic and political life of the Provinces, which have for nearly a century been developed and built up on that basis and have grown and are functioning under the present constitution as autonomous Provinces.

The reply of Babu Rajendra Prasad to this plea was clear and cruel.

"He speaks of the administrative, economic and political life of the Provinces being disrupted by their division. He forgets that he is responsible for disrupting these and many more valuable ties which have been forged in the course of centuries by seeking to divide India. If exchange of population has to take place, its magnitude will be reduced immensely if the Provinces are divided, and the distance to be travelled by the exchanged population of these Provinces will also be considerably cut down.

To this point in Mr. Jinnah's statement attention should be drawn as it presaged the out-lines of a policy which had been growing in the League leader's mind since October, 1946, when the Bihar disaster occurred in reaction to events in Noakhali-Tipperah during the earlier part of that month. He had broached the proposal that

Exchange of population—logical culmination of "Pakistan"

there should be exchange of population, arranged by the Government or Governments concerned, as it had been demonstrated once more that the Hindu and the Muslim in India could not bear one another's presence, could not look with patience at the smoke rising from one another's oven, to quote an expressive idiom used by a 19th.

century Muslim preceptor. With "Pakistan" assured, Mr. Jinnah's mind began to move in its accustomed groove; he revived his proposal, trying to accustom the minorities in the two States yet-to-be-born, to the idea of migration. The dire prospect held forth by this proposal could not have been realized by even the soberest of Indian politicians engaged in carving out their country. And Mr. Jinnah's 30th April statement did not receive the attention that was its due. Even he could not have realized the full implications of his own proposal—the logical culmination of his "Pakistan". He appeared to have begun to entertain fears that the setting up of two States would be dangerous to their respective minorities. And as a remedy or preventive measure, he stressed the opinion.

"It is obvious that if the Hindu minorities in Pakistan wish to emigrate and go to their homeland of Hindustan they will be at liberty to do so, and *vice versa* those Muslims who wish to emigrate from Hindustan can do so and go to Pakistan, and, sooner or later, exchange of population will have to take place and the Constituent Assemblies of Pakistan and Hindustan can take up the matter and, subsequently, respective Governments in Pakistan and Hindustan can effectively carry out the exchange of population, wherever it may be necessary and feasible."

Babu Rajendra Prasad on behalf of his own State-to-be accepted on the same day the proposal in all sincerity. But for all concerned neither the proposer nor the seconder had the opportunity to press on their proposal to its logical end. And the authorities, yet under British control, did not face the situation or prepare themselves to face it with the promptitude imperatively necessary. As a result, on and from June 4 to November 30, 1947, communal frenzy and ferocity had their full sway in the Punjab and in its eastern neighbourhood—Delhi Province, the Jat and Sikh States of what is known today as the East Punjab Province. What Mr. Jinnah had proposed but failed to dispose of, his Muslim "nation" started to do in their own natural way. That example was infectious, and the Hindu "nation" and the Sikh "nation" of Mr. Jinnah's definition showed that they could borrow and better in the borrowing. The Government under Lord Mountbatten could only look helplessly on this anarchy; the violence of the people getting the better of the organized violence of the Government; the people demonstrated once again that they were the masters, that it was their privilege and pastime to indulge in anarchy to teach the Government its subordinate position in the scheme of things. The pride of leadership lay humbled in the dust; the might of the State had no reply to the people's unconscious urge to assert its will, though in the doing of it *Vox Populi* (the Voice of the People) became *Vox Diaboli* (the Voice of the Devil).

We are however, anticipating events. To return to April 30, 1947. By that date we saw Muslim League leadership reconciled to "a truncated, mutilated, moth-eaten Pakistan" (Mr. Jinnah's own words), though making verbal protests against this dispensation of fate. The month of May was wholly engaged in giving shape, definite and concrete, to the scheme of partition. Correspondents of foreign newspapers in India started with vigour a campaign of publicizing men and matters Indian, probing into the minds of the leaders of public opinion as to their reactions to the shape of things implicit

Gandhi engaged during this time in building up a bridge of reconciliation

in British policy. The first to be tackled in this behalf was Mahatma Gandhi. On May 5, a New Delhi despatch described what he had said to Doon Campbell, Benter's special correspondent. It is surprising that this lover of unity and decency should have been subjected to this scrutiny even when all the world knew that this life during the recent months had been standing out as a shining protest against disruptionism. For about six months since November, 1946, he had been concentrating his old energies on building a bridge between the Hindu and the Muslim in Noakhali broken by Muslim fanaticism, roused by the hate campaign of the Muslim League. He had been going from village to village trying to recall the majority, the Muslims, to their duties and responsibilities as neighbours: he had been trying to recall Hindus to their dignity as human beings now lost owing to fear and distrust of their neighbours. His trek reminded one of the spiritual ministrations of founders of religions—carrying the glad tidings of great joy of human brotherhood and peace. Since the introduction of railway and steamer services into India about a hundred years back, there has been nothing like this that a leader of men should be moving on foot from village to village with a view to succour the distressed, to put courage into hearts that were afraid, to put hope into hearts that had lost hopes, to shame the evil-doer by refusing to use the machinery of law for rousing his conscience—the sure guarantee of right conduct. Gandhiji had been declaring off and on that Noakhali represented to him a laboratory for finding a remedy for the inter-communal distrust that threatened civilized life in India, that if he succeeded in Noakhali, he will have demonstrated to the erring people that friendliness and heart-unity were possible between followers of different creeds and faiths. When the same fanaticism made Muslims of Bihar its victims, the old man turned his steps to the disrupted areas of that Province trying to rouse the conscience of Biharee Hindus to the shame of their conduct, to its danger and unwisdom. And when the same thing burst out in the Punjab in March, 1947, he could advance the hope that his work in Noakhali and Bihar would recall the Muslims of the Punjab to sanity. Foreign newspaper men knew this story as well as or better than the majority in India or outside. Doon Campbell's questions and answers thereto by Gandhiji did not, however, tell us anything new.

Question: Is the communal division of India inevitable? Will such division solve the communal problem?

Answer: Personally, I have always said, "No" and I say 'no' even now to both these questions.

Question: Do you subscribe to the opinion that Britain will be morally obliged to stay on in India if outstanding Hindu-Muslim differences have not been resolved by June, 1948?

Answer: This is a question that has never been put to me before. It would be a good thing if the British were to go to-day—the 13 remaining months mean mischief to India.

Gandhiji added: "I do not question the nobility of the British declaration. I do not question the sincerity of the Viceroy,.... It is not possible for India to take her mind off that state all of a sudden. I have never appreciated the argument that the British want so many months to get ready to leave.

We have not defeated the British by force of arms. It has been a victory for India of moral force. Assuming, of course, that every word of what has been said is meant to be carried out then the British decision will go down in history as the noblest act of the British nation. That being so, the 13 months' stay of

the British power and British arms are really a hindrance rather than a help, because everybody looks for help to the great military machine they have brought into being.

That happened in Bengal, Bihar, the Punjab, the North-west Frontier Province. The Hindus and Muslims said in turn: 'Let us have the British troops.' It is a humiliating spectacle. I have said so often before but it does not suffer in value through repetition because every time I repeat it, it gains force.

The British will have to take the risk of leaving India to chaos or anarchy. This is so because there has been no home rule—it has been imposed on the people, and when you voluntarily remove that rule there might be no rule in the initial stage. It might have come about if we had gained victory by force of arms. The communal feuds you see here are, in my opinion, partly due to the presence of the British. If the British were not here we would still go through fire no doubt, but that fire would purify us."

Our readers will have noticed that Gandhiji was profuse in his praise of the British decision to quit India as "the noblest act of Gandhiji's the British nation"; and he expected that the insistence on Britons would try to deserve it; he said that "honesty" and he was "assuming" that "a complete withdrawal immediate withdrawal would take place with complete honesty behind it—with no mental reservation of any kind whatever." This insistence on "complete honesty" was significant from more points than one; his reference to "the 13 months remaining"—May, 1947 to June, 1948—as affording British disharda opportunity to work "mischief" was the fruit of experience of about two centuries of British policy of making promises to ears and breaking these to the heart. When he uttered his complimentary words he must have been aware that the battle for India's unity, symbol of the composite Nationalism of India, had been all but lost, and his urgent request that the "Third Party"—the source of many mischiefs—should withdraw its authority from India even long before the time fixed by them, must have been inspired by the feeling that their further presence in the country would be undesirable and dangerous.

The next person to be tackled by Doon Campbell was the Muslim League's Qaid-e-Azam. Here the interviewer and the inter-
A thousand-mile viewed appeared to have been freer in giving
corridor through rein to their feelings. In the presence of Gandhiji,
"Hindustan" Reuter's "special correspondent" appeared to have
demanded been ill at ease. But in the Qaid-e-Azam's expansive
presence he was in his element, and Mr. Jinnah was more commu-
nicative than was usually the case with him. The high-light of the
interview, and the spirit of mischief implicit in the situation, was
supplied by the question

"Will you demand a corridor through Hindustan connecting the Eastern and Western Pakistan?"

Mr. Jinnah's reply was a suspiciously cryptic "Yes". We have often wondered since then what lay behind Mr. Jinnah's prompt reply. The Muslim League's Qaid-e-Azam often prided himself on being a realist and a logical man; Doon Campbell could be presumed to be an intelligent newspaper-man. Could none of them realize that a corridor, about 1,000 miles long, would divide India again and put within her borders a foreign territory that would further cripple her strength for defence and offence? Could such a possibility be tolerated? These questions have only to be put to be brushed aside as foolish and malicious.

After May 21 (1947), the day on which the British correspondent put his own leg into his mouth, the question was never revived; its absurdity must have been realized by all concerned. But it exposed the dirty game which the ruling classes of Britain were still prepared to play.

Mr. Mohammad Ali Jinnah had held a threat that he would "fight every inch" against the proposal for the partition of the Punjab, Bengal and Assam. He did not make good this threat, however. A

Idea of an undivided Bengal in a divided India!

letter published in the *Nation* of Calcutta soon after his death on September 11, 1948, lifted part of the veil over his tactics. It was published on the morning of 13th September (1948). The letter had been written to

Mr. Jinnah; it referred to certain discussions that Shri Sarat Chandra Basu had with the Muslim League's Qaid-e-Azam; it appeared to suggest that the idea of un-divided Bengal had been favoured in that quarter. But as the announcement of June 3, 1947, had been already made, the letter written on June 9, 1947 could only suggest that the Muslim League members of the Bengal Assembly could, with the help of certain Hindu members, over-turn the arrangement already announced with reference to Bengal, and Mr. Jinnah was asked to instruct his followers in this behalf. As Mr. Jinnah did not evidently do anything to help on the line suggested—because there was no reply to this letter—we can take it that the matter fizzled out. We have been assured by friends who were in the know of things that Mr. Jinnah had gone so far as to suggest that he would not oppose the idea of an un-divided Bengal even remaining unattached to "Pakistan" and to the Indian Union. It was well-known that Gandhiji had been sympathetic to this idea, and only high pressure from the Congress High Command, represented by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, and Babu Rajendra Prasad, forced him to resile from his position. Before we can go further into this matter, we reproduce Shri Sarat Chandra Basu's letter and the *Nation* editor's *Foot-note* so that our readers may be in a position to understand the implications of this move.

I have to thank you most sincerely for your courtesy and cordiality towards me and for the consideration you gave to my suggestions. Bengal is passing through the greatest crisis in her history; but she can yet be saved. She can be saved if you kindly give the following instructions to Muslim members of the Bengal Legislative Assembly:

(1) At the meeting to be held of all members of the Legislative Assembly (other than Europeans) at which a decision will be taken on the issue as to which Constituent Assembly the Province as a whole would join if it were subsequently decided by the two parts to remain united, to vote neither for the Hindusthan Constituent Assembly nor for the Pakistan Constituent Assembly, and to make it clear by a statement in the Assembly or in the Press or otherwise that they are solidly in favour of Bengal having a Constituent Assembly of her own.

(2) At the meetings of the members of the two parts of the Legislative Assembly sitting separately and empowered to vote whether or not the Province should be partitioned, to vote solidly against partition.

The request I am making to you is in accordance with the views you expressed to me when we met. But it seems to me that if you merely express your views to your members and not give them specific instructions as to how to vote, the situation cannot be saved. I hope you will do all in your power to enable Bengal to remain united and to make her a free and independent State.

If Muslim members of the Bengal Legislative Assembly vote solidly as suggest-

ed in Paragraph (1) and (2) above, I think Lord Mountbatten will be compelled to convene another meeting of all members of the Assembly (other than Europeans) at which a decision can be taken on the issue as to whether the Province as a whole desires to have a Constituent Assembly of her own.

I shall be coming to Delhi again on the 13th or 14th and shall call on you on the 14th or 15th.

An editorial elucidation.

The above letter was sent to Qaid-e-Azam by special messenger by Air and delivered into his hands. Further conversations with the Qaid-e-Azam had to be dropped as the Congress Command turned down Mr. Sarat Bose's scheme for a united and independent Bengal, and, thereafter, Gandhiji said in one of his prayer speeches that he has been "taken to task for supporting Sarat Babu's move."

Nation, Calcutta, September 13, 1948.

The friends to whom we have already referred indicated the reasons which Mr. Jinnah had elaborated in support of the plan of

Contradiction
between a religious
"nation" idea &
the undivided
Punjab & Bengal
idea

an un-divided Bengal. Bengalees, Hindu and Muslim, were regarded as "one people" in spite of their separate religions. Gandhiji could well accept such a thesis, dis-believer as he always has been of "nations" bred out of different religions. But an intense believer in the "two-nations" theory born out of two religions—Hinduism and Islam---as Mr. Jinnah had been, it was not easy to appreciate his change of front in the matter of Bengal while disapproving the idea of a "Pathanistan" Province in the North West Frontier areas of India. These contradictions were never brought on the public forum to be discussed and the light of reason thrown over them. Perhaps, the times were unpropitious for a such a leisurely discussion; the frenzy of "Pakistan" robbed the people of their capacity to think deeply and not in response to such thought unravelling the reason and the unreason in the motives lying hidden under the cleverness of political manipulators. Whatever be the fact, the fight for unity in India had been lost, and any attempt to buttress up "regional self-determination" in face of the Mountbatten plan was pre-determined to failure, Mr. Mohammad Ali Jinnah had gone too far in his pursuit of the "religious nation" State to be able to persuade himself and his followers that persons professing different religions could live inside a single State—all equal citizens. This would be making nonsense of the whole conception of "Pakistan" where the Muslims, simply because they happened to return a larger number of persons on the occasion of a census, should be masters of the situation; others, men and women of other faiths, should agree to live under this dispensation of inferiority, of inferior status as citizens. Perhaps, Mr. Jinnah was moved to support the idea by the thought that as Muslims happened to be a majority in un-divided Bengal, they would be able to maintain by the superiority of their numbers supremacy over the Province's life, the "separate electorates" device helping them to retain control over the machinery of the State. A section of Bengal public opinion represented in the Hindu Mahasabha sensed the mischief implicit in the Attlee plan of February 20; and even before it was made public, the executive of the Bengal branch of the Hindu-Mahasabha canvassed the idea that the predominantly Hindu area of Bengal should be separated from the predominantly Muslim area and form a unit of the free State of India. They succeeded in drawing to their support a powerful section of Congress members who mobilized in its

support almost the whole body of politically-conscious people in the Province. This transformation became possible because people had seen what Muslim League people in command of influence over the Bengal Administration even while a British Governor had been in control could do to Hindu life, honour and property. After that experience, it became almost an impossible task for any body in Bengal to persuade Bengalee Hindus to trust their fortunes into the hands of a Muslim-dominated State. The failure of Shri Sarat Chandra Basu's attempt to halt the disruption of Bengalee life had received commendation from Gandhiji. But even he could not expect to work miracles; an un-divided Bengal would have been a miracle in the then temper of the country, as would have been an un-divided Punjab. In the latter's case, however, no such attempt was thought of, much less talked of. The Sikhs had declared that they would not tolerate Muslim hegemony over their life whatever the risk and loss; the Hindus, dominated over by the Arya Samaj, fell into line with the Sikhs, and the die was cast for the partition of the Punjab, Mr. Mohammad Ali Jinnah's lamentations on their behalf notwithstanding.

We have lingered rather long over dreary ending of the British rule in India. It was implicit in the unnatural relation between these two peoples. The British came as aliens; remained for 190 years as aliens; in their pride, and ignorance bred in this pride, they could not accept India as their mother country as their predecessors of cultures and creeds other than Indians had done. It has been said that their pride of colour had been at the root of mischief and had kept on poisoning their relations. Whatever be the truth in this analysis, 1947 of the Christian era wrote *finis* to an episode in India's history.

We do not feel that either Attlee or Mountbatten were individually responsible for the partition of India. A long line of their predecessors laid the lines of a policy that could have no other consequence; the special British contribution had consisted in exploiting the discordances in Indian social life. The British are "quit" today. But their last act should be a flaming warning to our people. The good and the evil that they have left behind will not cease to influence our conduct. The education and training to which we had been subjected created certain habits of thought and patterns of life that are more alien than Indian; under the imposition of a new technique of production of wealth and its distribution British example disrupted our social and economic values. We have to recreate out of the debris a new society that would satisfy the modern conscience, enable the least amongst us to attain a dignity that fulfilled the promise that made to human beings when Indian sages and saints had hailed them as "children of immortality". This is the task that waits the India of Ram Mohan Roy, of Rabindra Nath Tagore, of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi.—(Specially contributed by Shri Suresh Chandra Deb).

The Indian National Congress

Proceedings of the Working Committee

Delhi—January 4, 5 & 7, 1947

A meeting of the Working Committee was held at Delhi on January 4, 5 and 7, 1947. Acharya Kripalani presided. The members present were Jawaharlal Nehru, Vallabhbhai Patel, Rajendra Prasad, Sarojini Naidu, Rajgopalachariar, Kamaladevi, Sardar Pratap Singh, Shankarrao Deo and Jugal Kishore.

MINUTES

The minutes of the proceedings of the last meeting of the Working Committee held at Delhi on December 8-22, 1946 were placed before the Committee and confirmed.

DRAFT RESOLUTION FOR A. I. C. C.

The Committee passed the following draft resolution for the A. I. C. C. :

(For text of the resolution see A. I. C. C. proceedings).

The Committee passed the following resolution about the Independence Day to be observed on January 26, 1947.

INDEPENDENCE DAY

The next Independence Day is taking place at a moment critical in India's history when the country is on the verge of the independence we have struggled for and yet many obstructions remain and a sense of conflict and struggle pervades the country. The occasion requires a solemn rededication to the cause of freedom with a full realisation of the grave issues that confront the country. The Working Committee are of opinion that on this occasion the day should be observed with all solemnity and in furtherance of national and constructive activities and the pledge taken individually or in groups, without any speeches being delivered. Processions and public meetings should not be held for this purpose. The Committee advises Congressmen and Congress Committees accordingly.

The following pledge should be taken :

INDEPENDENCE PLEDGE FOR 26TH JANUARY, 1947

We believe that it is an inalienable right of the Indian people, as of any other people, to have freedom and enjoy the fruits of their toil and have the necessities of life, so that they may have full opportunities of growth. We believe also that if any Government deprives a people of these rights and oppresses them, the people have a further right to alter it or to abolish it. The British Government in India has not only deprived the Indian people of their freedom but has based itself on the exploitation of the masses, and has ruined India economically, politically, culturally and spiritually. We believe, therefore, that India must sever the British connection and attain Purna Swaraj or Complete Independence.

We recognise that the most effective way of gaining our freedom is not through violence. India has gained strength and self-reliance and marched a long way to Swaraj following peaceful and legitimate methods, and it is by adhering to these methods that our country will attain independence.

We pledge ourselves anew to the Independence of India and solemnly resolve to carry out non-violently the struggle for freedom till Purna Swaraj is attained.

We believe that non-violent action in general and preparation for non-violent direct action in particular, require successful working of the constructive programme kept before the country by Gandhiji and accepted by the Congress and in particular of Khadi, communal harmony and removal of untouchability. We shall seek every opportunity of spreading goodwill among fellowmen without distinction of caste or creed. We shall endeavour to raise from ignorance and poverty those who have been neglected and to advance in every way the interests of those who are considered to be backward and suppressed. We know that though we are out to destroy the imperialistic system, we have no quarrel with Englishmen, whether officials or non-officials. We know that distinction between the caste Hindus and Harijans must be abolished, and Hindus have to forget these distinctions in their daily conduct. Such distinctions are a bar to non-violent conduct. Though our religious faith may be different, in our mutual relations we will act as children of mother India, bound by common nationality and common political and economic interest.

Charkha and Khadi are an integral part of our constructive programme, for the resuscitation of the seven hundred thousand villages of India and for the

removal of the grinding poverty of the masses. We shall, therefore, use for our personal requirements nothing but Khadi, and so far as possible, products of village handicrafts only and endeavour to make others do likewise. We shall also try to work to the best of our ability some item or items of the constructive programme.

We pay our grateful homage to thousands of our comrades who faced grave hardships, suffered humiliations and sacrificed their life and property in the struggle for freedom. Their sacrifice will always remind us of the duty never to rest until we have attained our goal.

This day we pledge ourselves again to a disciplined observance of Congress principles and policies and to keep in readiness to respond to the call of the Congress to carry on, if and whenever called upon, the struggle for the Independence of India.

Proceedings of the All-India Congress Committee

Delhi—January 5 & 6, 1947

An emergent meeting of the All-India Congress Committee was held at New Delhi in the Constitution House, Curzon Road on January 5 and 6, 1947 to consider the situation arising out of the British Government's statement of December 6, 1946. 231 members were present.

MINUTES

The minutes of the last two meetings of the A. I. C. C. held at Meerut on November 21 and November 25 respectively were placed by the General Secretary of the A. I. C. C. before the Committee and confirmed.

The Congress President, Acharya Kripalani, in his opening speech narrated the sequence of events necessitating a meeting of the A. I. C. C.

THE A. I. C. C. ACCEPT GROUPING PLAN

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru moved the draft resolution recommended by the Working Committee. It was seconded by Shri Shankarrao Don.

The President received notice of 15 amendments to the resolution which were duly moved. About 20 speakers gave notice of their intention to speak. The debate on the resolution lasted for four hours on the 5th inst., and for three hours from 9 to 12 on the 6th morning.

The following amendment moved by Shri Purabottam Das Tandon was put to vote and negatived, 54 members of the A. I. C. C. voting for it and 102 against it. The text of the amendment was as follows:—

1. Take out paragraphs 2 and 4.
2. From paragraph 3 take out the sixth sentence beginning with "The A. I. C. C. realises" and ending with "statement of December 6, 1947" and in the last sentence after the words "the Congress" add "therefore, does not accept the interpretation put upon the British Cabinet Mission's statement of May 16, 1946 by the British Government in their statement of December 6, 1946."

The amendment moved by Khan Abdu Samad Khan that Baluchistan be added to 'Assam and the North West Frontier Province' in the third Paragraph of the resolution was accepted by the mover of the resolution.

Of the remaining amendments some were withdrawn by their movers and the rest were put to vote and rejected by an overwhelming majority.

The resolution in the amended form was put to vote and passed, 99 voting for it and 52 voting against it.

The following is the text of the resolution :

The A. I. C. C. having considered the events that have taken place in the country since the Meerut Session of the Congress in November last, the statement issued by the British Government on December 6, 1946, and the statement of the Working Committee of December 22, 1946, advises Congressmen as follows:—

The A. I. C. C. endorses the statement of the Working Committee of December 22, 1946, and expresses its agreement with the views contained therein.

While the Congress has always been agreeable to making a reference to the Federal Court on the question of interpretation in dispute such a reference has become purposeless and undesirable owing to recent announcements made on behalf of the British Government. A reference could only be made on an agreed basis, the parties concerned agreeing to abide by the decision given.

The A. I. C. C. is firmly of opinion that the constitution for a free and independent India should be framed by the people of India on the basis of as wide an agreement as possible. There must be no interference whatsoever by any external

authority, and no compulsion of any province or part of a province by another province. The A. I. C. C. realises and appreciates the difficulties placed in the way of some provinces, notably Assam, the N. W. F. P. and Baluchistan and the Sikhs in the Punjab, by the British Cabinet's scheme of May 16, 1946, and more especially by the interpretation put upon it by the British Government in their statement of December 6, 1946. The Congress cannot be a party to any such compulsion or imposition against the will of the people concerned, a principle which the British Government have themselves recognised.

The A. I. C. C. is anxious that the Constituent Assembly should proceed with the work of framing a constitution for free India with the goodwill of all parties concerned and, with a view to removing the difficulties that have arisen owing to varying interpretations, agree to advise action in accordance with the interpretation of the British Government in regard to the procedure to be followed in the sections. It must be clearly understood, however, that this must not involve any compulsion of a province and that the rights of the Sikhs in the Punjab should not be jeopardised. In the event of any attempt at such compulsion, a province or part of a province has the right to take such action as may be deemed necessary in order to give effect to the wishes of the people concerned. The future course of action will depend upon the developments that take place and the A. I. C. C. therefore directs the Working Committee to advise upon it, whenever circumstances so require, keeping in view the basic principle of provincial autonomy.

The main speeches when the debate was resumed on the morning of the 6th January were by Mr. *Jai Prakash Narain* and *Pandit Nehru*. The Congress President, *Acharya Kripalani*, explained that Mr. *Jai Prakash Narain* was opposing the resolution of the Working Committee though he was still a member of the Working Committee. Mr. *J. P. Narain* had expressed his intention to resign but his resignation had not so far been accepted. *Acharya Kripalani* said that as a special case Mr. *Jai Prakash* had been allowed to speak in opposition to the resolution.

Mr. *Jai Prakash Narain* said that the speech by *Pandit Nehru* raised false hopes. He declared that instead of negotiating with the British Government the Congress should mobilize the new strength which the country had achieved. It was a mistake on the part of the Congress to have entered the Interim Government. By passing the resolution the Congress Committee would commit another mistake. The Congress was forsaking its principles by accepting the British Government's Statement of December 6. It was wrong to think that the British were quitting India. He wanted to tell the Constituent Assembly that the country's freedom could be won only by revolutionary methods.

He urged that they should proceed cautiously. If this were not done the Congress Socialists might have to part company with them. Mr. *Narain* said in conclusion that he supported *Babu Purnshottamdas Tandon's* amendment.

Winding up the debate, *Pandit Nehru* said that the problem could be approached in two ways. One was to make the British quit first and sit down together to solve their problems. The second was that suggested by the resolution. He argued with Mr. *Jai Prakash Narain* that the Congress could create an upheaval in the country and thereby gain its objective. But there were internal weaknesses which should be remedied first. Their struggle need not necessarily take the form of a conflict with authority; it could take some other shape. That was why the Congress wanted to consolidate its own position.

Referring to the amendment moved by Mr. *R. K. Sidhwa* (Sind) urging that in all future disputes as to the interpretation of the State Paper of May 16, the Constituent Assembly alone should have the right to interpret, *Pandit Nehru* explained the Congress position. He said that the Congress had always been prepared to refer disputes to some impartial outside authority such as the International Court of Justice or the Federal Court. But the Statement of December 6 had suggested that the Congress had already agreed to refer such disputes to the Federal Court alone. This, he said, was wrong and in view of the situation created by the British Government's statement they were not prepared to give any assurance about the procedure to be adopted in such cases. Things had been distorted and misinterpreted. They would decide on the merits of each question as it arose.

Pandit Nehru asked the members to look to the positive aspects of the problem and see how the position of the provinces could be strengthened. There were dangers in the procedure suggested by the British Government. *Pandit Nehru*, however, declared that the interests of Assam would not be sacrificed.

Others who took part in the debate were Mr. *Chaitram Gidwani*, Rev. *Nichols Roy*, Dr. *Pattabhi Sitaramaya*, Mr. *Asaf Ali* and Mr. *Baidyanath Mukherjee*,

Before declaring the session closed, Acharya Kripalani congratulated the members on having accepted the resolution. Referring to Dr. Pattabhi's demand that there should be an end to further interpretations by the British Government, Mr. Kripalani said that the Working Committee should give no such assurance. So far as Britain was concerned he could tell them that there would be no end to their troubles. Imperialism died hard and they should be prepared for continued interference and this had to be overcome. There was also the trouble from the Muslim League. He hoped that this moderate and modest resolution would bring the Muslim League into the Constituent Assembly.

The A. I. C. C. concluded its session at a quarter to one.

Congress President's Statements

On Police Firing on Calcutta Students

Acharya Kripalani, the Congress President, issued the following statements:—

I am pained and shocked at the recent police firing in Calcutta on student demonstrations on the Viet Nam Day. I know that the restrictions on public meetings and demonstrations imposed by the Provincial Government have been necessitated by the communal situation. All parties are interested that as long as the communal situation remains disturbed these restrictions might remain. If they are necessary, it becomes the duty of every citizen to respect them. In this connection it is significant that the Working Committee decided that on such an important occasion as the observance of the Independence Day, there should be no big meetings or demonstrations. What applied to the Independence Day should also apply to other demonstrations. The organisers of the student demonstrations on the Viet Nam Day were not, therefore, well advised to organise demonstrations without the permission of the authorities. This fact, however, does not make it any the less wrong and cruel on the part of the police to fire on peaceful student demonstrators. After all there was nothing communal about the demonstrations. Nor had they anything to do with internal politics. They were meant to show Indian solidarity with the cause of an Asiatic people struggling against European Imperialism. All parties in India are united on this international issue.

Even if the students were guilty of a breach of the law, the breach was merely technical. The demonstration was admittedly peaceful. The students' objective was to march to the University grounds and protest against the conduct of the French and express sympathy with the cause of Viet Nam independence. There was, therefore, no legal, much less moral, justification for the police firing.

The Bengal Government, whatever its composition, is not a foreign government interested in crushing the enthusiasm and exuberance of youth. The students, however wayward, are an asset of the nation. A wise Government will handle their susceptibilities with sympathy and understanding and not leave it to the police to ride roughshod over them and shoot down students as if they were criminals. I hope the Bengal Government will inquire into this outrage and take adequate steps to prevent the recurrence of such police high-handedness and make due amends to the innocent victims of this tragedy.

I would take this opportunity to impress upon Congressmen and Congress organisations to guard themselves against the temptation to violate restrictions that are imposed by the disturbed communal situation.

(2)

Two days back I had occasion to issue a statement on the recent police firing on student demonstrations in Calcutta on the Viet Nam Day. In that statement while condemning the police firing I had deplored the decision of the students to stage demonstrations in defiance of a ban imposed by the Government in order to prevent a recurrence of communal disturbances.

Since then I find that similar demonstrations and consequent police firings have been repeated elsewhere. As a believer in non-violence I am against all violence specially of the kind that results in the loss of human life. Therefore, this news of police firing in several places has pained me grievously. I wish to warn with all the emphasis I can command, Congressmen, Congress organisations and the students who have always been loyal to the Congress, that by organising such demonstrations they do no service to the cause or the causes they hold dear, but merely play into the hands of mischievously anti-social elements whose interest it is to create disorder and to fan communal passions.

The Working Committee has directed Congressmen to forego demonstrations and public speeches even on such an important occasion as the Independence Day. This decision should apply with greater force to demonstrations on other occasions.

In many places the Provincial Governments have imposed bans on demonstrations in the interest of communal peace. It should be our duty to cooperate with such measures as are necessitated by public interest.

There is no virtue in defying the law for the sake of appearing heroic. Even where a law or ban is arbitrary and injurious to public good, no useful purpose is served by sporadic and disorderly defiance of it. Civil disobedience has no meaning if it is not well organised, disciplined and non-violent. The Congress has never encouraged sporadic action. Friends may rest assured that whenever a legitimate occasion for starting satyagraha arises, as in the past, so now, the Congress will give the word of command.

I would, therefore, urge upon the public, more particularly upon Congressmen, to participate only in such demonstrations of a political nature as are organised by or are held under the auspices of authoritative Congress organisations in their provinces. In no case should any prohibitive orders be violated without the permission of the Working Committee.

I would also suggest to the Provincial Governments to institute an impartial enquiry into the incidents that have already taken place.

(3)

I have read in the press about the banning of the students' conference, proposed to be held at Trivandrum, by the Travancore State authorities. The students and their leaders, who tried to hold a public meeting to protest against the ban on their conference have been arrested and are awaiting trial. Whatever justification there may have been for banning political meetings in the State, and we are not unfamiliar with the fanciful reasons that weigh with the State authorities to ban all sorts of meetings, there seems to be no justification for prohibiting the meeting of the students' conference. Students' approach to politics is more or less of an academic and theoretical character. But they have problems of their own on which they alone can formulate their views and mobilise public opinion. The wearer knows where the shoe pinches. It is, therefore, impolitic to treat the students' conferences on the same footing as political meetings or conferences. I know this year's president of the Students' Congress, Shri Ravindra Varma. He is a sober constructive worker. He is not likely to have resorted to direct action without the gravest provocation. Nor is Shri Asoka Mehta, a tried leader, likely to take hasty action. We elders, when in authority, may not forget our younger days and our exuberance of spirit. It has done us or the country no harm. But to curb the spirit of youth and the free expression of their ideas by repressive political action is to suppress the civic sense of the future citizens of India and to accustom them to submit to arbitrary political authority. This is what the British Imperialism has been doing all these years. It has done no good to the country. The Travancore authorities will, therefore be well advised to release the students arrested and their leaders and allow them to hold their conference and peace.

Proceedings of the Working Committee

Delhi—March 6, 7, & 8, 1947

A meeting of the Working Committee was held on March 6, 7, & 8, 1947 at Delhi. Acharya Kripalani presided. The members present were Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Vallabhbhai Patel, Rajendra Prasad, Khan Abdul Gaffar Khan, Sarojini Naidu, C. Rajagopalachari, Rafi Ahmed Kidwai, Profulla Chandra Ghosh, Sardar Pratap Singh, Shankarrao Deo and Jugal Kishore. Pattabhi Sitaramayya and Jairamdas Daulatram were present by special invitation.

MINUTES

The minutes of the proceedings of the last meeting of the Working Committee held at Delhi on January 4-7, 1947 were placed before the Committee and confirmed.

The Committee passed the following resolutions :

PRIME MINISTER ATTLEE'S DECLARATION OF FEBRUARY 20, 1947

The Working Committee welcome the declaration made on behalf of the British Government of their definite intention to transfer power finally by a date not later than June 1948 and to take steps to that end in advance.

The transfer of power, in order to be smooth, should be preceded by the recognition in practice of the Interim Government as a Dominion Government with effective control over the services and administration, and the Viceroy and Governor-General functioning as the constitutional head of the Government. The Central Government must necessarily function as a Cabinet with full authority and

responsibility. Any other arrangement is incompatible with good government and is peculiarly dangerous during a transitional period full of political and economic crises.

The Congress has already expressed its acceptance of the British Cabinet Mission's scheme of May 16th, 1946, and has further accepted the interpretations put upon it by the British Cabinet on December 6, 1946. In accordance therewith, the Constituent Assembly has been functioning and has appointed various committees to carry on its work. It has become all the more essential now to expedite this work so that the constitution for an Indian Union and its constituent should be finally prepared and given effect to well within the stated period to facilitate the final transfer of power.

The Working Committee welcome the decision of a number of States to join the Constituent Assembly and trust that all the States and their peoples will be effectively represented in this task of making a constitution for an Indian Union. The Committee invite afresh the representatives of the Muslim League, who have been elected to the Constituent Assembly, to join in this historic undertaking.

The work of the Constituent Assembly is essentially voluntary. The Working Committee have frequently stated that there can or should be no compulsion in the making of a constitution for India. It is the fear of compulsion or coercion that has given rise to distrust and suspicion and conflict. If this fear goes, as it must, it will be easy to determine India's future so as to safeguard the rights of all communities and give equal opportunities to all. It has been made clear that the constitution framed by the Constituent Assembly will apply only to those areas which accept it. It must also be understood that any province or part of a province which accepts the constitution and desires to join the Union cannot be prevented from doing so. Thus there must be no compulsion either way, and the people will themselves decide their future. This peaceful and co-operative method is the only way to make democratic decisions with the maximum of consent.

In this hour when final decisions have to be taken, and the future of India has to be shaped by Indian minds and hands, the Working Committee earnestly call upon all parties and groups, and all Indians generally, to discard violent and coercive methods, and co-operate peacefully and democratically in the making of a constitution. The time for decision has come and no one can stop it or stand by and remain unaffected. The end of an era is at hand and a new age will soon begin. Let this dawn of the new age be ushered in bravely, leaving hates and discords in the dead past.

INVITATION TO MUSLIM LEAGUE TO MEET CONGRESS REPRESENTATIVES

In view of new developments which are leading to a swift transfer of power in India, it has become incumbent on the people of India to prepare themselves jointly and co-operatively for this change, so that this may be effected peacefully and to the advantage of all. The Working Committee, therefore, invite the All India Muslim League to nominate representatives to meet representatives of the Congress in order to consider the situation that has arisen and to devise means to meet it.

The Working Committee will keep in close touch with the representatives of the Sikhs and other groups concerned, with a view to cooperating with them in the steps that may have to be taken and in safeguarding their interests.

PUNJAB

During the past seven months India has witnessed many horrors and tragedies which have been enacted in the attempt to gain political ends by brutal violence, murder and coercion. These attempts have failed, as all such attempts must fail, and have only led to greater violence and carnage.

The Punjab, which had thus far escaped this contagion, became six weeks ago the scene of an agitation, supported by some people in high authority, to coerce and break a popular ministry which could not be attacked by constitutional methods. A measure of success attended this, and an attempt was made to form a ministry dominated by the group that had led the agitation. This was bitterly resented and has resulted in increased and wide-spread violence. There has been an orgy of murder and arson and Amritsar and Multan have been scenes of horror and devastation.

These tragic events have demonstrated that there can be no settlement of the problem in the Punjab by violence and coercion, and that no arrangement based on coercion can last. Therefore it is necessary to find a way out which involves the least amount of compulsion. This would necessitate a division of the Punjab into

two provinces, so that the predominantly Muslim Part may be separated from the predominantly non-muslim part.

The Working Committee commend this solution, which should work to the advantage of all the communities concerned, and lessen friction and fear and suspicion of each other. The Committee earnestly appeal to the people of the Punjab to put an end to the killing and brutality that are going on, and to face the tragic situation, determined to find a solution which does not involve compulsion of any major group and which will effectively remove the causes of friction.

CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAMME

The Working Committee generally approve of the resolution regarding Constructive Programme passed unanimously at the Conference of Presidents and Secretaries of the Provincial Congress Committees and representatives of the All-India Village Industries Association, the Charkha Sangh and the Talimi Sangh held at Allahabad, and direct the General Secretaries to give effect to it in such manner as the Constructive Programme Committee hereby appointed may advise.

Further, with a view to guide and advise the Congress Committees and the public to carry out specially the following items—of Khadi, Village Industries, Basic Education, Harijan Work, Literacy and Hindustani Prachar—the Working Committee appoint a Constructive Programme Committee consisting of the following persons :

Shri Shankarrao Deo
Shri Profulla Chandra Ghose
Shri Jugal Kishore
Shri Jairamdas Doulatram
Shri R. R. Diwakar.

Shrimati Sucheta Kripalani and

One representative each of the Charkha Sangha, All India Village Industries Association and Talimi Sangh, namely:

Shri J. O. Kumarappa
Shri Jaju and
Shri Aryanayakam

and suggest that each member of this Constructive Programme Committee, other than the representatives of the above Constructive Work Organisations, should be in charge of such items of the Programme as the Constructive Committee may decide to allocate.

The Working Committee direct the Constructive Programme Committee to submit to the Working Committee every quarter a report of its activities and of the progress of the Constructive Programme.

The Committee further direct all Congress Organisations to extend their fullest co-operation to the Constructive Programme Committee in implementing the Programme which the Constructive Programme Committee may lay down from time to time.

CONGRESS SEVA DAL

The Working Committee direct all Provincial Congress Committees to take immediate steps to reorganise their Volunteer Organisations on the basis of the Constitution and rules approved by the Working Committee.

To enable the A. I. C. C. office to actively help the Provincial Congress Committees in organising Congress Seva Dals and in providing necessary training to the volunteers the Working Committee hereby appoint Major General Shah Nawaz Khan to be in charge of this work.

The following Constitution and Rules of the Congress Seva Dal were approved by the Working Committee.

The name of the Congress Volunteer Organisation will be "CONGRESS SEVA DAL."

The objects of the Congress Seva Dal shall be :

(1) to instil the qualities of self discipline, self sacrifice, self reliance, simplicity, service, tolerance and aptitude for corporate and co-operative work and life in youths so that

(a) they may be trained for organised and disciplined national service according to the policy and objects of the Congress, and

(b) become ideal citizens of a Free India ;

(2) to promote national unity by rendering service through Constructive programmes to all persons irrespective of caste and creed ;

(3) to improve the health and physique of the Indian people through physical culture and training; and

(4) in times of emergency to act as a peace and relief brigade and undertake to protect the life, honour and property of the people.

The Working Committee will put one of its members or any other person in charge of the work of organising Seva Dals in the country.

The member or person will have a Board of five qualified persons to advise him in his work.

The member or any other person in charge will do the work of co-ordinating, supervising and guiding the Provincial Seva Dal Organisation. He will also help the Provinces to evolve and work out all measures which are and will be found common to all Provincial Dals, such as the training of Volunteers, the technique of organisations, the drafting of the Volunteers' pledge, the procedure regarding Flag Salutation, the question of a common Uniform and such other objects.

The P. C. C. shall appoint every year or at the end of every defined period, as may be provided in the rules, a Provincial Board which will be in sole charge and be responsible for the Volunteer Organisation and movement in the Province. The G. O. C. of the P. O. S. Dal will be an ex-officio member of this Board.

One of the Secretaries of the P. O. C. will act as the Secretary of the Board.

The P. V. B. will appoint a G. O. C. for the Provincial Congress Seva Dal with the approval of the member or person in charge of All India Volunteer work, and whose appointment will be for a period of three years.

The Congress Seva Dal will compose of three sections: Children, Boys and Girls and adults.

The Volunteer Organisation shall hold aloof from party politics within the Congress, and no officers will be entitled to hold any elective post in Congress Organisation, but they are free to exercise their right of vote. This rule may be relaxed in the case of the primary village committees at the discretion of the Provincial G. O. C.

Volunteers must not expect any payment. Their work will be honorary, but whole time officers and inspectors may be paid.

No Congressman shall organise or join any Volunteer Dal other than the Congress Seva Dal.

The Provincial Volunteer Board shall frame rules for carrying out the Volunteer work in the Province not inconsistent with the rules framed by the Working Committee in this behalf.

The Provincial Volunteer Board is authorised to raise funds to meet the necessary expenses with the consent of the P. C. C.

MINISTERIAL CRISIS IN MADRAS

The Committee heard a deputation from Madras in connection with the ministerial crisis in the Madras Province and passed a resolution requesting and authorising the Congress President to proceed to Madras and take all necessary steps to resolve the present deadlock according to democratic procedure. In doing so he will have full authority to take such steps as he may deem fit.

Proceedings of the Working Committee

Delhi—May 1st, 2nd and 4th 1947

A meeting of the Working Committee was held on 1st, 2nd and 4th May, 1947 at Delhi. Acharya Kripalani presided. The members present were Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Vallabhbhai Patel, Rajendra Prasad, Sarojini Naidu, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, Rajagopalachari, Profulla Chandra Ghosh, Sardar Pratap Singh, Shankarrao Deo and Jugal Kishore.

Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya and Jaihindas Donlatram were present by special invitation.

The minutes of the last meeting of the Working Committee held at Delhi on March 6, 7 and 8 were placed before the Committee and confirmed.

The Working Committee considered the general political situation in the country but passed no resolution.

Deputations from Punjab and Bengal were received in connection with the partition of Punjab and Bengal in the event of Pakistan coming into being in some form.

ABOLITION OF ZAMINDARI

The question of issuing directives to the Congress Ministries on the question of Abolition of Zamindari was considered and the following decision was taken:—

“The Working Committee next considered the question whether any direction

is to be issued to the Provincial Governments who were introducing bills for the abolition of Zamindari and who had sent the reports about the steps the Provincial Governments were taking regarding this question.

The Committee was of opinion that the Working Committee is not in a position to issue any direction at present but the Committee desired that the Provincial Governments should proceed expeditiously with the legislation and continue to send reports to the All-India Congress Committee Office. The President in consultation with other members of the Working Committee and such other experts whom he may choose to consult may issue such direction as he may consider necessary."

RESIGNATION

The resignation of Major General Shah Nawaz Khan from the office of the person in charge of the Congress Sevak Dal was placed before the Committee. The Committee accepted the resignation.

HINDUSTAN MAZDOOR SEVAK SANGH

The letter of Shri G. L. Nanda and the following resolution passed by the Council of Hindustan Majdoor Sevak Sangh were placed before the Working Committee:—

"The Constitution of the Sangh be revised to introduce the principle of election in the case of local and provincial branches, which have been functioning regularly for a period of not less than two years. Every member who has signed the pledge of the Sangh can be a voter in the primary election. The Central Board and the Working Committee will also be constituted by election."

It was resolved that the resolution should be sent to the members of the Committee appointed by the Working Committee by its resolution dated 13th August, 1946 and they be asked whether now after this resolution of the Hindustan Mazdoor Sevak Sangh they will recommend to the Working Committee to give effect to its resolution on recognition being given to the Hindustan Mazdoor Sevak Sangh.

Proceedings of the Working Committee

Delhi—May 31—June 5, 1947

A meeting of the Working Committee was held at Delhi from May 31 to June 5, 1947. Acharya Kripalani presided. The following members were present. Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Vallabhbhai Patel, Rajendra Prasad, Sarojini Naidu, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, Rajagopalachariar, Kamaladevi Chattopadhyaya, Rafi Ahmad Kidwai, Profulla Chandra Ghosh, Sardar Pratap Singh, Shankarrao Deo and Jugal Kishore.

Pattabhi Sitaramayya, Jairamdas Daulatram, Jaiprakash Narain, Dr. Khan Sahib, Rao Sahib Patwardhan, Ram Manohar Lohia, Surendra Mohan Ghosh, Sardar Baldeo Singh, Jagjwan Ram, Dr. Mathai and Shri Bhabha were present at some sittings of the Committee by special invitation. Gandhiji was present during most of the sittings.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the last meeting of the Working Committee held at Delhi from 1st to 4th May, 1947 were placed before the Committee and confirmed.

POLITICAL SITUATION

The Committee considered the political situation in the country. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru gave a brief account of the political negotiations with the Viceroy since the last meeting of the Working Committee.

The Working Committee at its meeting on 2nd June considered H. M. G.'s Statement which the Viceroy at a Conference with Leaders in the morning handed to the Congress President for being placed before the Working Committee for consideration. The Working Committee after careful consideration of the statement sent a reply to the Viceroy.

THE A. I. C. C. MEETING

The Committee decided to call an urgent meeting of the A. I. C. C. in Delhi on the 14th and 15th June to consider H. M. G.'s latest Statement of June 3.

THE CONGRESS CONSTITUTION

At the suggestion of the President, the Working Committee decided that in view of the developing political situation the consideration of the draft Constitution of the Congress by the A. I. C. C. should be postponed and that the A. I. C. C. office should adopt such of the rules proposed in the interim report of the

draft Committee as would be necessary to maintain a stricter discipline in the Congress and root out corrupt practices.

HINDUSTAN MAZDOOR SEVAK SANGH

The Working Committee considered the letter of Shri G. L. Nanda and passed the following resolution:—

"As the Constitution of the Hindustan Mazdoor Sevak Sangh has been democratised, the Working Committee decides that its previous resolution of August 1946 be now given effect to."

Proceedings of the Working Committee

Delhi—June 12, 13 and 16, 1947

A meeting of the Working Committee was held at Delhi on June 12, 13 and 16, 1947. Acharya Kripalani presided. The members present were Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Vallabhbhai Patel, Rajendra Prasad, Khan Abdul Ghafoor Khan, Sarojini Naidu, Rajagopalachariar, Profulla Chandra Ghosh, Kamaladevi, Rafi Ahmed Kidwai, Sardar Pratap Singh, Sankarrao Deo and Jugal Kishora. Gandhiji was present at the meeting. The special invitees present were Pattabhi Sitaramayya, Jairamdas Daulatram and Ram Manohar Lohia.

MINUTES

The Minutes of the proceedings of the last meeting of the Working Committee held at Delhi on 31st May to 5th June, 1947 were placed before the Committee and confirmed.

DRAFT RESOLUTIONS

The committee passed the following draft resolutions for the A. I. C. C.

REFERENDUM IN THE N. W. F. P.

The Committee discussed the situation in the Frontier Province arising out of the proposed referendum to be held in the province according to the statement of June 3.

PARTITION OF PUNJAB AND BENGAL

The Committee discussed questions arising out of the partition of Bengal and Punjab.

Proceedings of the All India Congress Committee

Delhi—June 14 and 15, 1947

An emergent meeting of the All India Congress Committee was held at New Delhi in the Constitution House, Curzon Road on June 14 and 15, 1947 at 2-30 p.m. to consider the British Government's Statement of June 3, 1947. 216 members were present. Acharya Kripalani presided.

The Congress President, Acharya Kripalani, in his opening speech gave a review of the events leading up to and culminating in the I. A. C. C. meeting.

The Resolution on the Statement of June 3

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant moved the draft resolution recommended by the Working Committee. It was seconded by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad.

The president received notice of 13 amendments to the resolution. He ruled out of order 8 amendments which he considered as direct opposition of the resolution. The rest of the amendments were allowed to be moved. Over 30 members gave notice of their intention to speak on the resolution. The debate on the resolution lasted till 9 p. m. on the 14th and from 2-30 p. m. to 5 p. m. the following day. Gandhiji at the request of the Congress President also spoke on the resolution.

At the conclusion of the debate the amendments and the resolution were put to vote. The amendments were either withdrawn or lost. The main resolution was passed, 153 voting for it and 29 against it. Some members of the A. I. C. C. kept neutral.

The following is the text of the resolution passed by the A.I.C.C.:—

The A. I. C. C. has given careful consideration to the course of events since its last meeting in January last and, in particular, to the Statements made on behalf of the British Government on February 20, 1947, and June 3, 1947. The Committee approves and endorses the resolutions passed by the Working Committee during this period.

The Committee welcomes the decision of the British Government to transfer power completely to the Indian people by next August.

The Congress accepted the British Cabinet Mission's Statement of May 16, 1946, as well as the subsequent interpretation thereof dated December 6, 1946, and has been acting in accordance with it in the Constituent Assembly which was constituted in terms of the Cabinet Mission's Plan. That Assembly has been functioning for over six months and has not only declared its objectives to be the establishment of an Independent Sovereign Republic of India and a just social and economic order, but has also made considerable progress in framing the constitution for the free Indian Union on the basis of fundamental rights guaranteeing freedom and equality of opportunity to all Indians.

In view, however, of the refusal of the Muslim League to accept the Plan of May 16, and to participate in the Constituent Assembly, and further in view of the policy of the Congress that "it cannot think in terms of compelling the people in any territorial unit to remain in an Indian Union against their declared and established will," the A. I. C. C. accepts the proposals embodied in the announcement of June 3, which have laid down a procedure for ascertaining the will of the people concerned.

The Congress has consistently upheld that the unity of India must be maintained. Ever since its inception, more than 60 years ago, the National Congress has laboured for the realization of a free and united India, and millions of our people have suffered in this great cause. Not only the labours and sacrifices of the past two generations but the long course of India's history and tradition bear witness to this essential unity. Geography and the mountains and the seas fashioned India as she is and no human agency can change that shape or come in the way of her final destiny. Economic circumstances and the insistent demands of international affairs make the unity of India still more necessary. The picture of India we have learnt to cherish will remain in our minds and hearts. The A. I. C. C. earnestly trusts that when present passions have subsided, India's problems will be viewed in their proper perspective and the false doctrine of two nations in India will be discredited and discarded by all.

The proposals of June 3, 1947, are likely to lead to the secession of some parts of the country from India. However much this may be regretted, the A. I. C. C. accepts this possibility, in the circumstances now prevailing.

Though freedom is at hand, the times are difficult, and the situation in India demands vigilance and a united front of all those who care for the independence of India. At this time of crisis and change, when unpatriotic and anti-social forces are trying to injure the cause of India and her people, the A. I. C. C. appeals to and demands of every Congressman and the people generally, to forget their petty differences and disputes and to stand by vigilant, disciplined and prepared to serve the cause of India's freedom and defend it with all their strength from all who may seek to do it injury.

The Indian States

The Resolution on the Indian States recommended by the Working Committee was then moved by *Dr. Pattabhi Sitarmayya* and seconded by *Shri Shankarrao Deo*.

The *President* received notice of 8 amendments of which one was declared out of order. The rest of the amendments were moved and after an hour's discussion on the resolution they were put to vote. Most of the amendments were withdrawn. Those put to vote were lost. The main resolution was passed unanimously.

The following is the text of the resolution:—

"The A. I. C. C. welcomes the association of many Indian States in the work of the Constituent Assembly. The Committee hopes that the remaining States will also cooperate in this building up of the constitutional structure of free India in which the State units will be equal and autonomous sharers with the other units of the Federation.

2. The position of the States in the constitutional changes that are taking place was defined in the Memorandum presented by the Cabinet Mission on the 12th May 1946 and the Statement of the 18th May 1946. The recent Statement of the 3rd June 1947 has not added to these in any way. The position according to these papers was that the Indian Union would consist of the Provinces and the States, that paramountcy would lapse on the transfer of power, and that in the event of any State not entering into a federal relationship with the Union, it will enter into other political arrangement with it. In the Memorandum it was further stated that the British Government had been informed by the Indian States that desired in their own interests and in the interests of India as a whole, both to

make their contribution to the framing of a constitutional structure and to take their due place in it when it is completed. A hope was also expressed that the various State Governments which had not already done so would take active steps to place themselves in close and constant touch with public opinion in their States by means of representative institutions. It was suggested that existing arrangements as between the States and the Government of India should continue in regard to matters of common concern until new agreements were completed.

3. While recognizing that some progress has been made in some States towards representative institutions, the A. I. C. O. regrets that during this past critical year, since the Memorandum of the Cabinet Mission, this progress has been very limited both in its extent and quality. In view of the basic changes that are going to take place in India within the next two months, resulting from the complete transfer of power to Indian hands, it is of vital importance that progress leading to responsible government should take place rapidly in the States. The A. I. C. O. trusts that all States will initiate these changes so as to keep in line with the fast changing situation in India and at the same time produce contentment and self-reliance in their people.

4. The Committee does not agree with the theory of paramountcy as enunciated and interpreted by the British Government; but even if that is accepted, the consequences that flow from the lapse of that paramountcy are limited in extent. The privileges and obligations as well as the subsisting rights as between the States and the government of India cannot be adversely affected by the lapse of paramountcy. These rights and obligations have to be considered separately and renewed or changed by mutual agreement. The relationship between the Government of India and the States would not be exhausted by lapse of paramountcy. The lapse does not lead to the independence of the States.

5. Both from the point of view of the spirit underlying the Memorandum of 13th May 1946 and the Statement of 16th May 1946, as well as the acknowledged rights of the people all over the world today, it is clear that the people of the States must have a dominating voice in any decisions regarding them. Sovereignty, it is admitted, resides in the people, and if paramountcy lapses, resulting in the ending of the relationship of the States to the Crown, the inherent rights of the people are not affected thereby for the worse.

6. The arrangements made under paramountcy in the past dealt, *inter alia*, with the security of India as a whole. In the interest of that security, various arrangements were agreed to limiting the power of the State authorities and at the same time granting them protection. The question of the security of Indian as well as other matters are as important today as at any time previously and cannot be ignored in deciding the future of the State.

7. The A. I. C. O. cannot admit the right of any State in India to declare its independence and to live in isolation from the rest of India. That would be a denial of the course of Indian history and of the objectives of the Indian people today.

8. The A. I. C. O. trusts that the Rulers of the States will appreciate fully the situation as it exists today and will be in full cooperation with their people as well as of India as a whole."

CONGRESS PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

The Congress President then addressed the A. I. C. C. The following is the text of the concluding speech of the Congress President.

When I became President of this great organisation Gandhiji in one of his prayer speeches said that it was not only a crown of thorns that I would have to wear but that I would have to lie on a bed of thorns. I did not realize then that it would be literally so. On the 16th October, 1946 my name was announced as the President and on the 17th I had to fly to Noakhali. After that I had to go to Behar and now recently to the Punjab. These visits were a succession of shocks, one greater than the other. It is not only that many innocent lives are lost. Much more than the massacre of the innocent, what has affected me profoundly is the fact that our respective religions are being degraded. Both the communities have vied with each other in the worst orgies of violence, so that in the latest communal frenzy more cruel and heartless things have been done than at any previous time. I have seen a well where women with their children, 107 in all, threw themselves to save their honour. In other place, a place of worship, 20 young women were killed by their menfolk for the same reason. I have seen heaps of bones in a house where 307 persons, mainly women and children, were driven, locked up and then burnt alive by the invading mob.

These ghastly experiences have no doubt affected my approach to the question. Some members have accused us that we have taken this decision out of fear. I must admit the truth of this charge, but not in the sense in which it is made. The fear is not for the lives lost or of the widows' wail or the orphans' cry or of the many houses burnt. The fear is that if we go on like this, retaliating and heaping indignities upon each other, we shall progressively reduce ourselves to a state of cannibalism and worse. In every fresh communal fight the most brutal and degraded acts of the previous fight become the norm. So we keep on degrading each other and all in the name of religion. I am a Hindu and am proud of the fact. But this is because Hinduism for me has stood for toleration, for truth and for non-violence, or at any rate for the clean violence of the brave. If it no more stands for these ideals and if in order to defend it people have to indulge in crimes worse than cannibalism then I must hang down my head in shame. And I may tell you that often I have felt and said that in these days one is ashamed to call oneself an Indian.

I have been with Gandhiji for the last 30 years. I joined him in Champaran. I have never swayed in my loyalty to him. It is not a personal but a political loyalty. Even when I have differed from him I have considered his political instinct to be more correct than my elaborately reasoned attitudes. Today also I feel that he with his supreme fearlessness is correct and my stand is defective. Why then am I not with him? It is because I feel that he has as yet found no way of tackling the problem on a mass basis. When he taught us non-violent non-cooperation he showed us a definite method which we had at least mechanically followed. Today he himself is grouping in the dark. He was in Noakhali. His efforts eased the situation. Now he is in Bihar. The situation is again eased. But this does not solve in any way the flare-up in the Punjab. He says he is solving the problem of Hindu Muslim unity for the whole of India in Bihar. May be. But it is difficult to see how that is being done. There are no definite steps, as in non-violent non-cooperation, that leads to the desired goal.

And then unfortunately for us today though he can enunciate policies they have in the main to be carried out by others and these others are not converted to his way of thinking.

It is under these painful circumstances that I have supported the division of India. You know I belong by family and birth to the Pakistan area. My relatives and friends yet live there. When as back as 1908 I began my political career I never thought that I was working for the liberty of any particular portion of India. It was for the whole of India. Every nook and corner, every stream and mountain of the land is sacred for me. It shall so remain even after this artificial partition that separates brother from brother. Already in my opening speech I have said that in India at least one must not think in communal terms but in terms of Indian citizenship and in this respect I commend Mahatmaji's advice given to us yesterday. If there is to be a united India again his policy alone will work.

The fear has been expressed that this decision does not and cannot stop communal rioting. This fear may be well or ill-founded. For the time being the prophets of evil seem to be in ascendancy. How are then future riots to be tackled? Will the vicious wide revolve, as it has revolved recently, on the basis of retaliation? This question I had already answered in my Presidential address at Meerut. I said then that as the Centre had refused to function the provinces became virtually independent. The Government in Bihar should have given a warning to the Government of Bengal that if the Hindus who were living in Bengal were cruelly treated, the Bihar Government with the best will in the world would not be able to protect the lives of the Muslims resident in Bihar. This would have meant that the issue had been raised to the international plane where organised governments deal with each other. The issue would have been taken out of the hands of the excited mob fury that knows no morality, no law, no restraint. Mob fury is always blind. International violence has at least some system and method about it. I am sure that those who hold the reins of authority after August 16th in India will make it their duty to see that justice is done to the Hindu minorities in Pakistan. If my words could carry weight with the Pakistan section of India I would say: "Let the two Constituent Assemblies appoint a Joint Committee to go into the matter of the minority rights." This may insure us against individuals and excited and fanatical mob from taking the work of vengeance that is outside political moral law, in their own hands.

We have passed just now the resolution on the States. In this connection I would suggest one thing. Let the people of all those States who have not yet sent

their representatives to the Constituent Assembly do so themselves. Wherever Legislative Assemblies exist let these Assemblies as in British India elect their representatives to the Constituent Assembly by single transferable vote. Where no such Assemblies exist other devices may be used to elect representatives. Such representatives have a right to sit in our Constituent Assembly which is a sovereign body. In our Fundamental Rights Committee we have postulated one common citizenship of India. Every State citizen is an Indian Citizen and he has a right to be represented in the Indian Constituent Assembly. No Dewan coming from outside the State can limit this right of the citizen. We need the help and advice of the States people in framing a constitution for India. We are no more bound by the document of May 16. In any case today ours is a sovereign assembly. No court of law here in India or outside has any jurisdiction over our Constituent Assembly. Now that it has met and has made its own rules of procedure it cannot even be dissolved except by its own vote. I do not see why the States People's representatives cannot be allowed in our Constituent Assembly.

In conclusion I would say. Let us not rest content with the freedom that we shall be having shortly. Let us bend all our energies to the goal of unification which we have missed in order to achieve our freedom quickly. This can best be done by making India a strong, happy, democratic and socialist state, where all citizens irrespective of religion or caste, shall have equal opportunities of development. Such an India can win back the seceding children to its lap. In this task we shall need all the devoted service and sacrifice that we have needed in our fight for freedom. Let us abandon all power politics. Let us not give up the glorious tradition of sacrifice, hardship and voluntary poverty which we build up when we courted jail, lathi blows and bullets. Let us again absorb ourselves in this new task which is as important as the achievement of freedom, for the freedom we have achieved cannot be complete without the unity of India. Divided India will be a slave India. Let us therefore get out of this second slavery as quickly as we can. Let all the new opportunities we have got to mould our own destiny be henceforward directed to this supreme goal of Indian Unity. In this task may God help us.

THE CONGRESS CONSTITUTION

The President informed the Committee that, in view of the rapidly developing political situation in the country, the Working Committee considered it desirable that the consideration of the new Constitution prepared by the Constitution Committee appointed by the A. I. C. C. expressed its approval of the decision of the Working Committee.

Details of the A. I. C. C. Proceedings

Mahatma Gandhi's Call to A. I. C. C.

New Delhi—14th. June 1947

The All-India Congress Committee which met in New Delhi on Saturday the 14th. June 1947 discussed for seven hours the Working Committee's resolution on the acceptance of the British Government's plan.

The resolution was moved by Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant and seconded by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. Mahatma Gandhi, in a 40-minute speech, appealed to the House to support the stand taken by the Working Committee as otherwise world opinion would go against them.

Addressing the A. I. C. C. for nearly 40 minutes, *Mahatma Gandhi* advised the House to accept the resolution placed before it. The A. I. C. C. had the right to accept or reject the Working Committee's decision. But on this particular occasion he would ask the A. I. C. C. not to amend the resolution. He conceded the House had the right, but they must remember that the Working Committee as their representative had accepted the plan and it was the duty of the A. I. C. C. to stand by them. His views on the plan were known. The acceptance of the plan did not involve the Congress Working Committee alone. There were two other parties to it, the British Government and the Muslim League. If at this stage the A. I. C. C. rejected the Working Committee's decision, what would the world think of it? All the parties had accepted it and if it would not be proper for the country, then it could reject it. If the A. I. C. C. felt so strongly on this point that this plan would do injury to the Congress to go back on its word plan. The consequence of such a rejection would be the finding of a new set of leaders who could constitute not only the Congress Working Committee but also take charge of the Government. If the opponents of the resolution

could find such a set of leaders, the A.-I.O.C. could then reject the resolution if it so felt. They should not forget, at the same time, that peace in the country was very essential at this juncture.

The Congress was opposed to Pakistan and he was one of those who steadfastly opposed the division of India, continued Gandhi. Yet he had come before the A.-I.O.C. to urge the acceptance of the resolution. Sometimes certain decisions, however unpalatable they might be, had to be taken.

The A.-I.O.C., Gandhiji added, should not accept the resolution out of any moral compulsion, but should do so from conviction and a sense of duty. The A.-I.O.C. could reject the resolution if it could be sure that such a rejection would not lead to turmoil and strife in the country. The members on the Working Committee were old and tried leaders who were responsible for all the achievements of the Congress hitherto and in fact they formed the backbone of the Congress and it would be most unwise, if not impossible, to remove them at the present juncture. "All Congressmen should understand what their duty was at this time and do it silently. Out of mistakes, sometimes good emerged. Lord Ramachandra was exiled because of his father's mistake, but ultimately his exile resulted in the defeat of Ravana, the evil. "I admit that whatever has been accepted is not good. But I am confident good will certainly emerge from it." he said. The A.-I.O.C., he hoped, was capable of extracting good out of this defective plan even as good was extracted from earth.

Appealing for communal unity, Mahatma Gandhi said that the plan put both Hinduism and Islam on trial. Would the Hindus, he asked, prove by their conduct that Mr. Jinnah was wrong? The plan afforded them an opportunity to disprove Mr. Jinnah's theory that the Muslims were a separate nation and were something apart from the Hindus. Even the smallest minority should feel secure and happy in India. A Harijan would not consider India to be truly democratic and free until untouchability was completely eradicated. He would again urge that, by accepting an imperfect plan, they could all the same extract good out of it and make India a land where there was no discrimination and a land where there were no inequalities.

Mahatma Gandhi advised the members to shed all fear. Nothing could go wrong if they were honest, sincere and straight-forward.

Mahatma Gandhi, concluding, made a passing reference to the Indian States. He said he himself was a State subject. In the past there was no difference between British India and the States. When the Congress demanded independence it was not merely for British India but also for the people of the Indian States. Now some of the Princes were claiming independence for themselves when Paramountcy lapsed. This was wholly wrong and unjust. He would again tell the Princes that they had been dependent upon the British Government and they derived no benefits from them. It was amazing that they were reconciled to be under British tutelage but they could not remain in a Union run by millions of free people. Whether the Princes liked it or not, independence was coming, he said.

Acharya Kripalani's Address

Addressing the A. I. O. C., *Acharya Kripalani*, the President said in the course of his speech, "Whatever the provocation and whatever the measures we may be obliged to adopt, we must not slip from our tradition of wholesome nationalism into the blind alley of communal fanaticism. Because some of our people have lost their senses, we must not on that account lose ours. If we do that, then we shall have justified Mr. Jinnah's preposterous theory that we are two nations and not one. One evil breeds another. The claim of the people in some Muslim majority areas to separate and sovereign statehood has led to similar claims by some rulers of the States. These are preposterous claims to which we can never agree. The Congress has conceded the right of self-determination to the people of a territory and not to their arbitrary rulers who in no way represent the will of their people. As a matter of fact, it is against the wishes of their people and in the hope of perpetuating their autocracy with the help of foreign intrigues and arms that some rulers anxious to declare their sovereign independence taking advantage of the British Government's statement that the British Paramountcy will lapse after August. We cannot accept and will not accept the interpretation that with the lapse of British Paramountcy, the States that were always part of India automatically cease to be so. The Princes, if they are wise, will respect the will of their people and will not try to do what even their suzerain in England cannot do. Mahatma Gandhi who is their best friend has already wanted them that if they do not take time by the forelock now, they will cease to be. As

constitutional rulers, respecting the sovereignty of their people, they have a glorious part to play in the destiny of India. As petty tyrants misled by their Dewans, they can only have an inglorious end".

Reviewing the political developments since the A. I. C. C. met some five months ago, the Congress President said that to save the Constituent Assembly, the A. I. C. C. accepted the December 6 statement which was made only to satisfy the Muslim League. Quoting the former Secretary of State, Lord Pethick-Lawrence's speech in the House of Lords on February 25, the Congress President said that it was patent from his speech that the main issue (December 6 Statement), was decided along the lines which the Muslim League had asked them (H. M. G.) to do and there was a response from the Congress. But unfortunately there still remained the refusal of the League to come into the Constituent Assembly.

BRITISH DECISION TO TRANSFER POWER

The British Government, Acharya Kripalani said, instead of asking the League to leave the Interim Government, issued another statement through the Prime Minister on February 20. In that statement while giving the definite date by which the British would quit India, they put a clause as to whom they would hand over power, in words that were bound to lead to conflict. They said that "H. M. G. will have to consider to whom the powers of the Central Government in British India should be handed over, on the due date, whether as a whole to some form of Central Government for British India or, in some areas, to the existing provincial Governments or in such other way as may seem most reasonable and in the best interests of the Indian people".

At that time Acharya Kripalani went on to say, in the whole of India there were only two League Ministries—in Bengal and Sind. The League, therefore, tried to upset Ministries in the Punjab and N. W. F. P., by its "own special brand of non-violent non-co-operation". The result was that the Coalition Ministry had to resign. Even then the League could not form a Ministry of its own and Section 93 was applied. This led to rioting in many parts of the Punjab. "The League could not," he said, "however, by its bullying and coercive agitation turn out the Congress Ministry in the N. W. F. P. All that it could do was to create extensive rioting in which the only sufferers were the Frontier Hindus and Sikhs who had nothing to do with the Congress. The Punjab rioting led the Hindus and Sikhs to make a demand for the partition of the Punjab for administrative purposes. This, it was supposed, would give its own Ministry in the west and the Hindus and Sikhs their own Ministry in the east."

The Working Committee, at their meeting of March 6, formulated and accepted the demand of the administrative division of the Punjab. What applied to distracted and harassed Punjab applied equally to Bengal where the League Ministry's whole effort was to use Government machinery to favour one community against another. It was hoped that if the provinces were divided, communal tension and rioting might possibly disappear.

PARTITION OF PROVINCES

As the League's demand for Pakistan remained, the Hindu and Congress demand for partition of Bengal and the Punjab became more urgent and insistent. The appointment of the new Viceroy also raised hopes that some solution would soon be found by the British Government. As soon as the new Viceroy came he initiated talks with the leaders of the three parties, the Congress, the Sikhs and the League. As a result of these talks he took to England on May 13, proposals that were generally agreed upon by the leaders. These proposals were embodied in the British Government's statement of June 3.

The Congress Working Committee, at their meeting on June 2, considered these proposals and generally accepted them. A letter of acceptance was sent to the Viceroy on behalf of the Committee by the President on June 2.

The A.-I. C. C., he said, had met to-day either to ratify or reject the commitments that had been made by the Working Committee on June 2. Acharya Kripalani explained that the resolution before the House accepted the possibility of certain parts of India seceding from the Indian Union but that, he said, was already implied in the declared policy of the Congress.

"ONLY WAY TO FREEDOM"

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, moving the resolution, accepting H. M. G.'s plan of June 3, said that this was the only way to achieve freedom and liberty for the country. It would assure an Indian Union with a strong Centre, which could ensure progress and help the country take her rightful place in the world. In the

Indian Union, the two-nation theory would not be tolerated and every citizen would have to give absolute and implicit loyalty to the State. Otherwise he would have no place in this country and would become an alien.

The Congress, Pandit Pant said, had made every possible effort to come to an agreement with the Muslim League. Mahatma Gandhi had tried to negotiate with M. Jinnah. The Congress Working Committee, in its March Resolution, invited the League for consultations. The Constituent Assembly, on numerous occasions, had invited the League members to take their place in the Assembly and help in the shaping of the future constitution of the country. But the League had ignored all these appeals.

The Congress had worked hard and sacrificed everything for the sake of unity. But there was a limit beyond which it could not go. The choice today was between accepting the statement of June 3 or committing suicide.

Commending the resolution Pandit Pant said that since the A. I. C. C. last met many eventful developments had taken place. Of these the two most outstanding were H.M.G.'s statement of February 20 and their subsequent statement of June 3. The February 20 statement was the fulfilment of the Congress' demand for the British to quit India. This was also a great landmark in the long history of British rule in India. It was felt, however, that June 1948 was too distant and the statement of June 3 took note of the urgency. The British Government had expressed their determination to remove every vestige of their rule over India by August 15. This was indeed a great victory for the Congress and one for which it had striven long and sacrificed much.

NO COERCION OF UNWILLING AREAS

Pandit Pant went on to say that it was the declared policy of the Congress not to coerce any unwilling areas to join the Union. This position had been made clear as far back as at the time of the Cripps Mission. The Congress did not like partition and, in fact, was always opposed to it. But in their resolution of March 3, they had stated that conditions in the country necessitated an administrative partition of the Punjab.

Detailing the Congress efforts to satisfy the Muslim League, Pandit Pant said that the Congress had accepted the principle of parity suggested by Lord Wavell. Later, the Congress accepted the Cabinet Mission's Plan with its Groupings and Sections and with its weak Centre. In addition, the Congress also conceded to the League a communal veto. In fact, this gave the League a veto on almost all Indian affairs. Nevertheless, the League refused to join the Constituent Assembly. The only result of these concessions was widespread disorder. While he did not blame any one for those disturbances, it was a fact that the League gave effect to their 'Direct Action' programme. In these circumstances, the Congress had to take a decision in consonance with its principles of non-violence and self-determination. The only democratic and practical solution was to accept the Statement of June 3. This would give a strong Indian Union. He wished to make it clear that the use of the words Hindustan and Pakistan was wrong.

All that could happen in accordance with the Statement of June 3 was that certain provinces and parts of provinces could secede and India would remain. Those, who did not want to join the Indian Union in which the rights of individuals and of minorities were guaranteed and where there would be a sovereign Republic, could stay out. But he was sure that such people, among whom were the Dewans of certain States, would regret their decision to stay out.

Concluding, Pandit Pant said that it was better to accept the Statement of June 3 rather than fritter away their energies in trying to keep unwilling people in the Union. He urged Congressmen to bear in mind the directive to the country in the resolution to maintain a vigilant and united front when unpatriotic and anti-social forces were trying to injure India and her people. Congressmen should forget their differences and stand united and disciplined to fight such disruptive forces.

MAULANA AZAD'S SUPPORT

Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, seconding the resolution, disagreed with Pandit Pant that the June 3 Statement was better than the Cabinet Mission's proposals. He had all along held the view that the May 16 Statement was the best solution of our problem. To that view he continued to adhere.

At his very first meeting with Lord Louis Mountbatten, Maulana Azad said he was asked if the country could wait for some time so that an agreement could be arrived at. Maulana Azad told the Viceroy that the situation in the country would brook no delay and the question should be settled either way at once. He did

not think that the present decision was the right decision, but the Congress had no alternative. The choice before the Congress was not which plan to accept and which to reject, but whether the present state of indecision and drift should continue. There was the unfortunate problem of internal disorder and strife and there was the obstinacy of the Muslim League. Taking into consideration all factors, the Congress Working Committee came to the decision that an immediate settlement was urgently required and accepted the June 3 Statement.

It might be argued, Maulana Azad said, that since the Congress had already accepted the State Paper, they should have stuck to it and declined to do anything further. But such a stand would hardly be the correct one in the present circumstances. The Congress stood by the ideal of a United India, but it was also committed to the principle of self determination and was against coercing any unwilling areas to join the Union.

Maulana Azad pointed out that even at this stage, the State Paper had not been shelved. The people of the areas concerned had to decide whether the State Paper proposals should continue or not. If by a majority, they decided not to join the Union, then the Congress could not force them into the Union. Whatever might be the result of the referendum or the decision of the Punjab and Bengal Legislatures, he was sure that those provinces which now sought to cut themselves away from India would, in the very near future, hurry back to the Union. "The division is only of the map of the country and not in the hearts of the people and I am sure it is going to be a short-lived partition", he said. The Maulana was confident India would soon emerge as a powerful and strong nation.

Having accepted a defective plan, it should be our endeavour now to put it into practice in such a way that its defects were minimised. "Our attitude towards our countrymen", he said, "should not undergo any change by reason of the facts that certain parts had elected to secede."

AMENDMENTS MOVED

The House at this stage took up consideration of amendments to the resolution.

The Congress President said that he had received notice of 12 amendments to the resolution. Eight of these were in fact not amendments, but in the nature of separate propositions opposing the resolution. He, therefore, ruled them out of order.

Mr. Rajkumar Choudhury (Noakhali) moved an amendment seeking to add a new paragraph to the main resolution running as follows :

"In view of the desired goal of India's unity, the A.-I. C. C., directs all Congress Committees in the country, including those in the areas to be partitioned, to so frame their policy and programme that the divided India of to-day may become united to-morrow by our mutual treatment of confidence and honourable co-operation."

Mr. Choudhry realised that the Congress Working Committee had accepted H. M. G.'s plan owing to "inevitable circumstances" and possibly because they had no other alternative. "Let us accept what we have got," he added, "but let us direct the Congress Committees inside Hindustan areas and also in the Pakistan areas to try for the re-union of Bengal and the Punjab with a view to achieve the final unity of India." *Mr. Choudhry* appeal to Pandit Nehru, Sardar Patel and Acharya Kripalani to get elected at least one of them, to the Eastern Pakistan Constituent Assembly to ensure confidence among the Hindu minority in the Eastern Pakistan zone. He also made an appeal to the Hindus of the Indian Union to treat the Muslim minorities in their areas fairly and properly. This would be one of the ways of safe-guarding Hindu minorities in Pakistan.

The President announced at this stage that he had received notice of an amendment from *Mr. Sushil Chandra Dev* to the effect that "Sardar Patel should join the Pakistan Constituent Assembly with a view to have an effective hand in framing the future constitution of Pakistan and also to fight the battle with *Mr. Jinnah*."

The President ruled it out of order but announced amidst roaring laughter, "If you can induce Sardar Patel to go to Pakistan and fight with *Mr. Jinnah*, I have no objection."

Mr. Joharilal Jhanjhadi (Ajmer) moved an amendment which while accepting the principle of referendum specified in H. M. G.'s plan sought to reject the method of ascertaining the will of the people through representatives elected by means of separate electorates. He suggested a method of direct adult franchise which alone could elicit the will of the people.

Mr. Abdul Ghani moved an amendment to make it clear that Congress was

accepting the plan "despite the fact that the procedure adopted for ascertaining the will of the people in the Frontier province is deplorable." Mr. Ghani said he was sorry that the Congress had left down the Pathans and Nationalist Muslims who had fought Pakistan. Why was a referendum not demanded in the Punjab and Bengal also? He was prepared for civil war, but not injustice. "Do not give victory to Mr. Jinnah and those who say Hindusthan for Hindus and Pakistan for Muslims. You will create a lot of aliens among you'.

REFERENDUM IN FRONTIER AND BENGAL

Mr. Jagamath Rao (Andhra) moved an amendment to express dissatisfaction at the fact that "the adult population of Bengal, the Punjab, the North-West Frontier and Baluchistan are not given the opportunity to express their opinion freely and directly and even the restricted referendum proposed for the Frontier province and Baluchistan does not include the question of an independent State in favour of which the opinion of the bulk of the people of those provinces has been expressed sufficiently clearly. He, however, desired the Committee to accept the proposals, though reluctantly, "in the hope that the major political parties may yet come to an understanding on these important issues."

The amendment also sought a declaration that the Congress would continue its efforts to bring back the seceding parts into an Indian Republic which would be based on a just social and economic order.

SIND LEADERS' OPPOSITION

Mr. R. K. Sidhwa urged that the A.-I. C. O. should unequivocally repudiate the two-nation theory.

Mr. Chaitram Gidwani, the Sind Congress leader, in a forceful speech asserted that whatever might be the merits of the June 3 Plan—and of course the Indian Union could have a strong Centre for which the Congress had been striving hard—it cut at the very root of the unity of India. Despite the weakness of the May 16 Plan, it at least preserved the unity of India, an ideal which the Congress had cherished all these years. But now that unity had been broken up. Already many of the Princes were claiming absolute sovereignty and there were signs of India being broken into fragments. The unity of India was much more precious than the advantage of a strong Centre. He characterised the resolution as downright surrender to brute forces and violence.

"WILL AMOUNT TO ABJECT SURRENDER"

Mr. Purshottandas Tandon, the principal opponent to the resolution, in an impassioned speech said that the A.-I. C. O. must reject it and that it was not sufficient for acceptance to say that an adverse vote would hurt the prestige of the Working Committee. "The Working Committee is made by you who have been chosen by the people. The Working Committee may make a mistake, but you must give your decision. I appeal to you to perform your duty. Compared to the people and to the country, the Working Committee is a small thing. Acceptance of the resolution will be abject surrender to the British and to the Muslim League. The Working Committee has failed you, but you have the strength of millions behind you and you must reject this resolution."

"The decision of Working Committee was an admission of weakness," Mr. Tandon said. "The reasons which, even on their own admission, had persuaded the Working Committee to propose the resolution were that they were faced with difficulties, difficulties of administration due to the obstructive tactics of the League, to the large-scale disturbances that had taken place in the country and to the fact that no agreement could be reached with the League. But other countries had to encounter similar obstacles on their road to freedom, particularly in the United States. We would have to face many greater difficulties than we had come up hitherto. The Working Committee had accepted the plan in weakness and out of a sense of despair. At the same time, they expressed the hope that they would later unite. That was dishonest. Those who had fought many a battle for India's freedom were not frightened and they must be strong and resist those who were weak and deserved no sympathy. They had resisted the British before and they could do so again."

In support of the resolution, it had been said that the Congress could not go back on its policy of non-coercion. If that was so what would they say to the States, which expressed their intention to remain independent? There would be numerous pockets of Muslims in India who would say they wanted to go to Pakistan. What would they say to them?

Concluding his plea for the rejection of H. M. G.'s plan of June 3, Mr.

Tandon said the Congress had always talked of the people and never of Hindus and Muslims as it was doing to-day. But accepting the offer would not benefit either. Hindus in Pakistan would live in fear and Muslims in India would do the same. The Congress hope of building up a new synthesis of Hindu and Muslim culture would be shattered if the resolution were accepted. He added that he could tolerate the British Raj rather than partition.

MINORITY PROBLEM MADE MORE ACUTE

Maulana Hifzur Rahman, following Mr. Tandon, vehemently opposed the resolution which he characterised as "a communal measure the like of which had never come before the A.-I. C. C. in its whole history." The British had said that they were definitely quitting by June, 1948, and he did not see that there was sufficient hurry to split up the country. By doing so no one would gain. It had been possible for him as a Nationalist Muslim to get favourable decisions for Muslim minorities by appealing to the majority community on grounds of nationalism, but that would not be possible in the future as the resolution would be the death of nationalism. The minority problem would not be solved but made more acute. The only people who would gain would be the British who were determined not to leave the country with any possibility of unity in the future.

Syed Nausher Ali, supporting the resolution, said that it would not be wise to disturb the decision of the Working Committee in view of the fact that no better alternative seemed to be in sight. The Muslim Leaguers wanted Pakistan. They would have their Pakistan now. If they found it to their advantage—he was absolutely certain they would not—and if indeed the two parts of India would be happy and prosperous, the A.-I. C. C. should have no reason to regret its decision. If, on the other hand, as was apprehended and as was more probable it would not be possible for the two parts of India to live in prosperity and peace, then there would be an opportunity for the Congress to try and create an atmosphere in which the two parts might again unite.

NEW ELECTIONS URGED

Shrimathi Ram Dulari said that Pakistan should not have been accepted without a reference to the entire organisation. The proper thing would be, she said, that the present A.-I. C. C. should be dissolved and new elections should be held on the issue of Pakistan.

Mr. Jagat Narain Lal, who moved a resolution for a united India at the Allahabad session of the A.-I. C. C. in 1942, opposed the present resolution. He said there should be no compromise in so far as the unity of India was concerned.

Dr. Kitchlew, President of the Punjab Provincial Congress Committee, said that he and others like him who had spent a whole life-time fighting for nationalism could not now see that very nationalism go to pieces. He characterised the resolution as a surrender. The present conflict was a straight fight between nationalism and communalism and his experience in his own province showed that at least for the moment, communalism had the better of it. This was due to unscrupulous propaganda. He was sure that with a proper mass contact programme, communalism could be defeated. But this work should be undertaken in the true nationalistic spirit.

Mr. Devraj Sethi said that the partition of the Punjab would result in the establishment of landlordism in Western Punjab. He feared that Pakistan would be ruled entirely by the Muslim Leaguers and that the minorities would have a rough deal.

Mahatma Gandhi then addressed the A.-I. C. C. (See page 126).

Mr. Sushil Chandra Dev said that the present resolution was inconsistent with the previous professions of the Congress. It was strange that the Congress had not only agreed to Dominion Status but to a division of the country as well.

SOCIALIST LEADER'S CRITICISM

Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, Socialist leader, speaking on the resolution, advised the A.-I. C. C. to remain neutral. While he agreed that the resolution was bad, they were themselves responsible for the acceptance of the plan of June 3. They could not blame the leaders as they themselves were weak and the leaders were, therefore, forced to accept H.M.G.'s proposals. Therefore, they could not vote against it. On the other hand, as they saw objections to it, they could not support it either.

Continuing, Dr. Lohia said that the Union Jack and all that it stood for should go from every part of the Indian Union after August 15 and there should be no excuse for retaining any vestige of British control after that day.

Some Muslim Leaguers might think, or they might have been told that the Pakistan they had got was merely a beginning. But he wished to make it clear that this decision was final and they could not get anything more. Indian States within India's boundaries could not stay out. If we were independent to-day then there would be only one answer to those of the States who said they would stay independent. We must give them the answer now not by guns or aeroplanes but by asserting that all the communities within the States were sovereign and the people of India would stand by them.

The Indian Union, he wished to make it clear, must not have a religious or communal angle—no matter what news came from neighbouring areas. In the Indian Union, there could be no talk of aliens; all must be Indians. In the Union Government or in the Union Assembly, there would be no place for those who had helped the British power. He also stated that there was no question of the Pakistan Assembly or Pakistan Government meeting in the territory of the Indian Union. Concluding, Dr. Lohia said: "We have to conquer and march forward. Because some parts secede from the parent body, we must not forget that India is one. By this, I mean that all the communities must have a common concept of citizenship."

The Congress President at this stage adjourned the meeting.

Second Day—New Delhi—14th June 1947

PANDIT NEHRU'S SPEECH

The Working Committee's resolution accepting the British plan for transfer of power was ratified on to-day, by the All-India Congress Committee by 157 votes against 29. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, who were the main speakers, commended the resolution to the House.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, in an out-spoken speech at the All-India Congress Committee meeting to-day, referred with bitterness to the partition of the Punjab and Bengal and said: "India's heart has been broken, but her essential unity has not been destroyed. How will you repair the broken heart? It can be only on the basis of a programme for partition."

Pandit Nehru expressed his horror and disgust at the riots in the Punjab, Bengal and elsewhere and said that they were no isolated incidents. They were planned attacks. It seemed the administration had broken down and there was no authority left in the country to enforce order.

How was it, he asked, that the British officers, who coped with the civil disobedience movements in the past, were unable to cope with the present disturbances? Where there were Congress Ministries, disturbances were brought under control, but where the British exercised authority, there was chaos. In the Punjab where there was cent per cent British Rule, Pandit Nehru said, despite the efforts of certain senior officers, murder and arson continued. The trouble was most prevalent where there were British officers in charge and divisions under the control of either Hindu or Muslim officers, were comparatively quiet. The Interim Government was able to do nothing to protect the people.

"DRIFT TOWARDS ANARCHY"

After giving a resume of the events that led to the June 3 Statement, Pandit Nehru said that it would be a futile controversy to go into the merits of Dominion Status versus Independence. The most urgent task at present was to arrest the swift drift towards anarchy and chaos. Disruptive forces were at work and the most important disruptive force was that of the Muslim League. Their first task should be the establishment of a strong Central Government to rule the country firmly and to assure individuals liberty of life. All other questions were of secondary importance.

Asserting that there was no question of any surrender to the Muslim League and that what he and his colleagues has agreed to was that the issue of partition should be referred to the people for a verdict, Pandit Nehru said that there was nothing novel in the plan for partition. The House would remember Mr. C. Rajagopalachari's formula on the basis of which Mahatma Gandhi carried on negotiations with Mr. Jinnah. At that time, he and his colleagues were in Ahmednagar Fort. They discussed the question in prison. While they disagreed with the approach to the whole question, there was no disagreement on the formula.

COERCION NOT POSSIBLE

It must be realised that it was not possible to coerce even with swords un-

willing parts to remain under the Indian domain. Had they been forced to stay in the Union, no progress and planning would be possible. They must take the warning from China. Continued internal strife and turmoil would bring the progress of a nation to a standstill.

In arriving at a decision, they must look at the international context as well. The picture of the world to-day was one of destruction and impoverishment which, by itself, might present an immediate war. But one could never say what would happen in the future.

The Congress, Pandit Nehru declared, could not afford to act in an irresponsible manner by passing high-sounding resolutions. A responsible body must not think in terms of to-day only; for there was a to-morrow and a day after that. It would be ridiculous to suggest that the British should do everything before they quit the country. The June 3 Statement, Pandit Nehru said, could not have come about had there been no agreement. It was not an imposed award. Circumstances were such that the Congress had to agree to it. It was not like one of those old decisions of the British Government which they could accept or reject. The acceptance, for which he was wholly responsible, did not mean that he agreed to every word in the Statement, but he agreed with the fundamental principles therein.

NO "SURRENDER" BY CONGRESS

The riots in Rawalpindi, Multan, Amritsar, Calcutta, Noakhali, Bihar and elsewhere, Pandit Nehru said, presented the situation in a different light. To suggest that the Congress Working Committee took fright and therefore "surrendered" was wrong. But it was correct to say that they were very much disturbed at the prevailing madness. Homesteads were burnt, women and children were murdered. Why, he asked, were all these tragic and brutal things happening? They could have checked them by resorting to the sword and the lathi. But would that solve the problem? Some people from the Punjab had said that the Congress had let them down. What was he to do? Should he send an army? He was sad and bitter and India's heart was broken. The victims in Rawalpindi said that they were being killed in order that the League might rule. The wound, he said, must be healed. With whatever they were able to salvage, they must plan out a programme on the basis of partition.

It was sufficient for the House to compare what happened in Noakhali and Calcutta with what happened in Bihar. By supreme efforts, the Congress was able to control the situation in Bihar, but they could do nothing in the Punjab. Why did such things happen in the Punjab and why was the Khizr Ministry broken and how was it that no one seemed to be capable of controlling the Punjab disturbances? The answer was patent.

PARTITION OF PROVINCES

The Congress Working Committee passed a resolution in favour of the partition of the Punjab into two administrative provinces. Partition was better than murder of innocent citizens. After the resolution was passed, the Committee received numerous complaints from Bengal that Bengal also should be divided. The underlying principle in the case of the Punjab and Bengal was one and the same.

Pandit Nehru refuted the allegation that he and two others decided the fate of millions. The Bengal Provincial Congress Committee and other responsible organisations in the province strongly supported the partition proposal.

MINORITIES IN PAKISTAN

The next question that arose was, having divided the Punjab and Bengal, had the Congress abandoned the Sikhs and the Hindus? An answer should be found. By high-sounding resolutions, the Congress would not be able to help them. Even when the Punjab was one, they were not able to help the people. An answer to this problem would no doubt be found. However, there was no reason why the minorities there should be tyrannised and persecuted. There might be individual cases of rioting, but there was not much room in future for organised attacks on the minorities. He had nothing much to say about Sind and so far as Sylhet was concerned, there was to be a referendum and he could not forecast the result. He was much worried about the N.-W.F.P. If Bengal and the Punjab went out, the Frontier would be isolated. The question was now the subject of consultation between the Committee and the Frontier leaders.

Deploring the disturbances in the country, Pandit Nehru reiterated that

Governmental authority had almost collapsed. The British were no longer interested because they were leaving. This probably explained why some officers asked the victims who came to them for help to go to him (Pandit Nehru) or Sardar Patel for help. They were not desirous of shouldering any further responsibility and many had become callous.

ACCEPTANCE OF DOMINION STATUS

Stating that any controversy over the question of Dominion Status versus Independence was meaningless, Pandit Nehru said that what the Congress demanded was that the Government should function as a Dominion Government and conventions must be established. The acceptance of Dominion Status was without prejudice to the Republic Resolution adopted by the Constituent Assembly. But the composition of the present Government was such that no agreement could work and no convention could be established and the Viceroy, therefore, suggested the June 3 Statement and the Congress accepted it.

Pandit Nehru said that all talk of Pakistan and Hindustan was due to a misunderstanding. Both from the practical and legal point of view, India as an entity continued to exist except that certain provinces and parts of certain provinces now sought to secede. The seceding areas were free to have any relations they liked with foreign Powers. The Government of India was intact and there should be no further confusion of Hindustan and Pakistan and people should not allow such ideas to grow.

NEED FOR STRONG GOVT.

"The present, perhaps," Pandit Nehru said, "is the most difficult period, full of trials and tribulations. To-day, we have to shoulder responsibility. The first thing we have to do is to establish the independence of India firmly and set up a strong Central Government. Having established a strong and stable Government, all other programmes will not create much difficulty. The Congress has a heavy responsibility. You must bend all your energies to strengthen the Congress organisation. We have to face dangers, both external and internal and if we are not strong, we will go down."

Concluding, Pandit Nehru made a passing reference to the Indian States. He said he would have something to say on the subject when the next resolution came up for discussion. However, he was confident that the Congress would be able to deal with and solve the problem of the States. If they proceeded on the right lines, said Pandit Nehru, the seceding provinces would also rejoin the Union.

He asked the A. I. C. C. not to vote for the resolution out of any sympathy for the Working Committee, but they must do so out of conviction.

SARDAR PATEL'S SUPPORT

Following Pandit Nehru, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, in a vigorous speech, extended his full support to H. M. G.'s Statement of June 3. Looking at the Cabinet Mission's proposals to-day in the light of his experience in the Interim Government during the last nine months, he was not at all sorry that the State Paper had gone. Had they accepted the State Paper, the whole of India would have gone the Pakistan way. To-day, they had 75 to 80 per cent of India which they could develop according to their genius and make it strong. The League could develop the rest of the country.

The League Council which met *in camera* evidently nursed the ambition to capture the whole of India after August 15. It was the duty of every Congressman to work unitedly to make India strong, to build up an efficient army and strengthen her economic position.

The House had listened to their leader, Pandit Nehru. Never in the history of the Congress before had the A.-I. C. C. to take a decision on such an important issue. He fully appreciated the apprehensions of his brothers from Sind and the Punjab. Nobody liked the division of India and his heart was heavy. But there were stark realities of which they should take notice of. The choice was whether there should be just one division or many divisions. The fight to-day was not against the British. The British had no desire to stay on in India and if they wished to stay, they desired to do so only with India's consent. They definitely had no desire to govern this country.

The May 16 Plan, Sardar Patel said, no doubt gave them a united India. The Congress agreed to it in spite of its shortcomings. But there was a snag in it. The Plan could not be executed if one or the other party withheld co-operation. Thus the State Paper was in the nature of an imposed award. But the position to-day was different. The Congress must face facts. It could not give

way to emotionalism and sentimentality. They must coolly assess the pros and cons and arrive at a deliberate decision.

Sardar Patel denied that the Working Committee accepted the plan out of fear. They had never known fear. He deeply regretted the many massacres that had happened. In one family of 30, there were only two survivors. Many were maimed and disabled for life. They had gone through all that. But he was afraid of one thing and that was that all their toils and hard work these many years should not go to waste or prove unfruitful. They worked for independence and they should see as large a part of this country as possible become free and strong. Otherwise, there would be neither 'Akhand Hindustan' nor Pakistan. Further, taking any other course other than the one which the Working Committee had suggested, would not only be injurious, but would also make the Congress the laughing stock of the world. Here was a chance for India to attain her independence. Was she going to throw it away? It would be incorrect to say: "First, let the British go away. Then all questions could be solved." How were they to be solved and what would happen afterwards?

His nine months in office, *Sardar Patel* said, had completely disillusioned him of the supposed merits of the State Paper. He had noticed that Muslim officials right from the top down to the chaprasis except for a few honourable exceptions were all for the Muslim League. There should be no mistake about it. Mutual recriminations and allegations were the order of the day.

PAKISTAN ALREADY IN ACTION

The May 16 plan was gone and he was glad. That Plan left much room for conflict and bickerings. The Congress was opposed to Pakistan, but yet the resolution before the House accepted partition. Whether the A. I. C. C. liked it or not, there was already Pakistan in action both in the Punjab and in Bengal. In the circumstances, he would prefer real Pakistan because then they would have some sense of responsibility.

Under the State Paper Plan, the whole of India would have been subjected to an intolerable situation. The communal veto which was given to the League would have arrested our progress at every stage. The majority would have to stand and look on and they would have been unable to do anything in the administration. But now they had a chance. They could eradicate the plague of communalism, weightage, etc., which existed in no other constitution in the world. There would be no more weightage. The League said that they required a corridor and there was an outcry else where. By shouting back, no problem could be solved. What was required was silent and hard work.

Sardar Patel sympathised with the minority in Sind. But mere sympathy without power was no good. They must build up strength.

He would appeal to Congressmen in general to be prepared to shoulder responsibilities. Internal wranglings would only weaken the country.

At first the British said that they would withdraw by June, 1948. It was felt then that the intervening period was too long. Now they were going away on August 15 and even this intervening period was too long. The continuance of the present situation each day injured the country.

"NO ROOM FOR GROUPS WITHIN CONGRESS"

There should be complete unity and there was no room for groups in the Congress, said *Sardar Patel*. He would invite the opposing groups to join them and share the responsibility for the good governance and progress of their country. Always sitting in the opposition and disagreeing led to dangerous habits.

Sardar Patel said that they had now a great opportunity to develop over three-fourths of India. They had not much time to waste. There was food shortage. There was labour unrest. In Multan and Dera Ismail Khan, food and cloth had been burnt and destroyed. He had been told that for another four years, we could not expect any import of textiles and if so even the small ration of 12 yards per head could not be kept up. Conditions were such that everyone should apply himself to his work energetically. He had heard many complaints against the Congress. The criticism should be met.

Freedom was coming, said *Sardar Patel*. Congressmen should work hard to make that freedom a living thing and to make India strong. They might have a five-year plan and work to schedule. They must build up industries. They must build up the army, make it strong and efficient. Indulging in vague criticism of the Congress would serve no purpose. Nor would it do, as was the case with the Communists who alternately backed the British and then the League to

denounce the Congress. The Working Committee had not placed the resolution before the A.-I. C. O. in a lighthearted manner, but did so with a clear conscience. (cheers).

On the question of Indian States, Sardar Patel referred to Travancore and said he would like to know how that State could become a sovereign State. Probably, the statesman who made declarations of independence and sovereignty did not understand the implications of those terms. So long as the Congress continued to have a foothold in Travancore, there was no question of "independence and sovereignty."

Swami Sahajananda, the Bihar Kisan leader, opposing the resolution, said that the Congress had always said that it would not be a party to a division of the country and it would not use force to keep within the Indian Union any unwilling part. The present resolution, however, put a premium on division. The British could do what they liked, but the Congress could not "cut up a living body", for India was not yet dead. There would not be just two parts of India but many more. Since Mr. Churchill had agreed to this Plan and he was no friend of India, there was bound to be something sinister about the Plan.

Mr. Sudhir Chandra Roy, supporting the resolution, said that undoubtedly a united India would have been the best solution. But was that possible when a section of their countrymen was bent upon secession? Speaking as a Bengalee, he preferred the present Plan to the May 16 Statement. The situation in Bengal was such that solution of the problem could not brook any delay. He, therefore, accepted the June 3 Statement.

"SURRENDER TO MR. JINNAH"

Mr. Anwar Harwani opposed the resolution and characterised it as a surrender to Mr. Jinnah's obstinacy. The situation, he said, was identical with the situation of Britain in 1939, when the late Mr. Chamberlain had adopted a policy of appeasement.

Mrs. Aruna Asaf Ali, President of the Delhi Provincial Congress Committee, said that some of those who were vigorously opposing the resolution to-day had on all previous occasions accepted the decisions of the Working Committee. They forgot, however, that the resolution that was before them was the logical consequence of those earlier resolutions to which they had assented. The Socialists, she said, did not oppose the Working Committee's decision just for the sake of opposition, but because they had known that the British were planning to shackle the revolutionary urge in India. The present situation was created as a result of a joint conspiracy between Mr. Jinnah, Mr. Churchill and Mr. Amery. The Congress had expressed its readiness to accept Dominion Status. But this was a far cry from the Congress demand for complete independence for the whole of India. India had been caught in the British trap. She said that she would have agreed to Pakistan if it could solve the present problem. But unfortunately, it did not put an end to communal strife in the country, but on the other hand divided the country into two. She would ask the members to exercise their own judgment.

RESOLUTION CARRIED

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant wound up the debate and the A. I. C. O. carried the resolution of the Working Committee by 157 votes to 29. On the first count, the votes were 153 for and 29 against, but after a re-count, the President, *Acharya Kripalani* announced that the resolution had been carried by 157 votes to 29.

Before the resolution was put to the vote, those amendments that had not been ruled out of order were either lost or withdrawn. The House then adjourned for tea after which the resolution on Indian States was taken up.

Resolution on Indian States

The All-India Congress Committee next unanimously passed the resolution on the Indian States repudiating the right of any Indian State to declare itself independent and to live in isolation from the rest of India.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, speaking on the resolution, declared: "We will not recognise any independence for any State in India. Further, any recognition of such independence by any foreign Power, whichever it may be and wherever it may be, will be considered an unfriendly act."

Pandit Nehru said: "There is a great deal of talk about Independence and Paramountcy, etc. etc. Independence does not depend on a mere declaration by anybody, but on various factors—foreign relations, defence, etc. It depends fundamentally on the acknowledgment by other parties of that independence.

"The Paramountcy of the British Crown arose in India in certain circum-

stances. I need not go into the history of it but it depends on geography, on history and all manner of factors like defence, security, &c. If that Paramountcy of the British Crown is withdrawn, as they say it is going to be withdrawn, what follows?

"So far as we are concerned, we do not agree with the doctrine of Paramountcy as it has been declared, more especially during the last dozen years, by the British Government. You will remember that business of a Crown Representative came into existence only a dozen years ago. Paramountcy has been exercised ever since the British became a leading Power in India, first by the East India Company and then later by the Government of India that succeeded it. No doubt the Crown was behind it. There was no division in the Government of India as between that part which dealt with the Indian States and that part which dealt with the rest. The whole of the Government of India dealt with the Indian States. This distinction came in only a dozen years ago with the Act of 1935.

"When there was some talk of a Federation in India, the Butler Committee and others began to talk of Paramountcy vesting in the Crown, so that it is a new thing. We did not agree with that but I am not going into that question now.

"INHERENT PARAMOUNTCY"

"In so far as Paramountcy may vest in the British Crown, the British Crown ceases to exercise it. It lapses or if you like, it returns to the States. But there is a certain inherent Paramountcy in the Government of India which cannot lapse—an inherent Paramountcy in the Dominion State in India, which must remain because of the very reasons of geography, history, defence, &c. which gave rise to it when the British became the dominant Power in India. If anybody thinks that it lapses, then those very persons will give rise to it again.

"It must exist or the only alternative to it is that the various States in India should, in groups, or otherwise, join the Federation or the Indian Union. Then, of course, there is no question of Paramountcy because presumably they join as autonomous and equal units in that Union and they share equally in the Union Legislature and the Union Executive. Presuming, of course, that those units are proper and economic units, big enough units to be units of the Federation, they have the same position in the Federation, as any other unit like a province. Probably, in the independent Indian Union, there will be no distinction between a Province as such and an Indian State as such. But all will be States of the Union or whatever name may be given to them, so that over all those who are equal members of the Union, no question of Paramountcy arises.

"For those who do not join, the question of Paramountcy inevitably arises because they cannot live in a void.

In the declaration of May 16, it was clearly laid down that the Indian Union would consist of the Provinces and the States. It was not envisaged that any State could be outside the Union, though it is true that a State was given a certain power, if you like a certain freedom, to decide how to come in. But it was not envisaged that it could keep out ultimately. In the memorandum of May 12, it was stated clearly that the States should either join the Indian Union—that was the primary thing—or, if they did not do so, they must come to some other arrangement with the Union. There is no third way out of the situation, the third—meaning independence or special relations with a foreign power.

If a State did not join the Union, its relationship with the Union—and there would have to be some relationship—would be not one of equality but slightly lower. The relationship between the two would be that of a certain suzerain Power exercising a certain measure of Paramountcy and a certain other State having autonomy but within the limitations of Paramountcy and suzerainty.

"We desire no suzerainty or Paramountcy," said Pandit Nehru. "We want freedom for all the people of India. But it may be that for a particular period, the interim period before other arrangements can be made and before some of the States can come into the Union, we may carry on negotiations with them on a more or less standstill basis, all the existing arrangements continuing, because if the arrangements do not continue, then there will be chaos. Of course, they will not continue if the States themselves take up any aggressive attitude going beyond those arrangements."

NO FOREIGN CONTACTS

The other arrangements, Pandit Nehru went on, could not possibly admit of the right of a State to any foreign State or in regard to defence—the right of any

independent authority to do what it would. All that was not because we wished to interfere with the States—of course we wished well of the people of the States—for another and fundamental reason, that these matters affected the security of India. "We cannot permit anything to happen in India in any state which affects fundamentally the security of India, either in relation to defence arrangements or in relation to contacts with foreign Powers. Therefore, I want this not only to be realised by the States, but I want other countries and Powers to realise and appreciate the situation.

"I do not and cannot speak with the authority of the Government at the present moment on this subject. Though I happen to be a member of the Government, I cannot represent that Government on this subject at present. I am quite sure that I do represent the views of the A. I. C. O. in this matter and if I have anything to do with the Government that is likely to come into existence two months hence and which will, I have no doubt, have the power and authority to make this declaration, I should like to say, and I should like other countries to know, that we will not recognise any independence of any State in India. Further any recognition of any such independence by any foreign Power, whichever it may be and wherever it may be, will be considered an unfriendly act.

SECURITY CONSIDERATIONS

The considerations of security and others which the Indian Union must have in every State in India "cannot be overridden by any unilateral declaration of a State and, therefore, any foreign Power which takes an action on the basis of that unilateral declaration will be ignoring our special interests and doing an unfriendly act to us. I am quite sure that any Government of India that comes into existence two months later will feel that way and will act that way.

Earlier, *Pandit Nehru* said that the Congress has made every effort in the last months to come to a friendly settlement with the Princes and establish cordial relations with them. A number of States had joined the Constituent Assembly and he invited others to do so. The Congress had relations with the Rulers of the States and did not want to harm any of them. But it could not give up its fundamental principle that it was for the people of the States to decide the fate of their States.

"The principle of sovereignty of the people had been recognised by the United Nations. Our own delegation to the United Nations stood by the principle of sovereignty of the people when the question of Italian colonies came up. Obviously we could not enunciate one principle for the people of Tripoli and accept another for the people of India or the States" declared *Pandit Nehru*.

INDEPENDENCE CLAIM UNTENABLE

Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, addressing the Committee earlier, said there was no doubt that by the end of this month, a very large number of States would have to come into the Constituent Assembly. To those who had already come in and to those who were thinking of coming in, the resolution which he had moved offered congratulations.

There were other States like Indore who were wavering. There were yet others like Travancore and Hyderabad who had declared they would be independent. Bhopal too was reported to be thinking of declaring independence.

When the British Government left the British Provinces, obviously the Paramountcy of the British Government over these States would lapse. But the British had not said that the States could become independent. The Butler Committee had, after prolonged deliberations, been unable to define Paramountcy and left it by saying that Paramountcy shall be paramount. The British Crown's Paramountcy had in the past protected the States from external aggression and from internal commotion.

If the British people chose to leave the country, British Paramountcy might end, but Paramountcy would remain with the Central Government, by experience, history, fact and indeed by study of theory.

There were two kinds of rights vesting in the State—the right of sovereignty and the right of independence. The right of independence was the right to make war or peace. While sovereignty was divisible, independence was indivisible. Sovereignty was divisible between the Prince and his people. It really vested in the people, but the ruler could be the embodiment of sovereignty through the consent of the people. But independence was really and absolutely of the people.

The claim of States like Travancore to be independent was therefore, absolutely untenable, unjustified and ill-conceived. Hyderabad too had stated that it was

"entitled to become independent", but Dr. Pattabhi hoped that Hyderabad would yet return to the right path. Travancore had gone ahead and declared it would become independent. The highly educated people of Travancore would, he was sure, give an answer to the Dewan, "Such people cannot be expected to take this insult complacently and they will give a suitable answer to their Dewan."

Appealing to Sir O. P. Ramaswami Aiyar to retrace his steps, Dr. Pattabhi said the Central Government and the Constituent Assembly would always be willing to consider any proposal for a just sharing of the customs and other revenues not only with Travancore, but other States as well. For this purpose, it was unnecessary to go through all the devious processes. Perversity often led people astray.

CANNOT REMAIN OUTSIDE UNION

Seconding the resolution, Mr. Shankarrao Deo said that all through its fight for Indian independence, the Indian National Congress had made no distinction between British India and the Indian States. Freedom, which the Congress asked for, was for the entire united India. But now that independence was in sight, some Princes had declared their intention to assume sovereign status for themselves. This could never be accepted by the Congress. The Congress had no intention of interfering with the internal economy or politics of any State. But it could not, at the same time, permit any State to remain out of the Union of India against the wishes of its people.

The States' Negotiating Committee had accepted the principle of giving at least 50 per cent representation to the people in the Constituent Assembly. But now when such a vital decision was to be taken, the Princes had decided not to consult them at all. How did Sir O. P. Ramaswami Aiyar know that the masses of Travancore were not in favour of joining the Indian Union? The Congress was not going to recognise any step that did not have the support of the States' people.

Mr. Shankarrao Deo was confident that the residents of no Indian State at present wanted to remain out off from the rest of India and before any Prince decided to become independent, he must conduct a referendum in his State and get popular support to his claim.

The Rulers had no opinion but to become constitutional monarchs. Events had forced them into this position. They must appreciate the changed times and circumstances or they would not have a place in a free India.

Mr. Ajit Prashad Jain, Mr. Shiv Lakhpati Singh, Mr. Shushil Chander Deb, Mr. Mohan Singh Sawhni, Shrimati Ramdulari Sinha, Mr. Abdul Ghani and Mr. Shibban Lal Saxena then moved amendments to the resolution. Mr. Ajit Jain's amendment was lost while other amendments were withdrawn, when the closure was applied.

Seth Govind Das supported the resolution and said that he did not agree with the argument that as the logical result of accepting Pakistan they could not force the States to join the Indian Union. The Congress did not propose coercing the people of the States into joining the Union. But it could not permit the Princes to decide in an autocratic manner to stay out of that Union. The right of self-determination was given to the people and certainly not to the Rulers. In the present age of democracy mediaeval Princes had no right to decide things for their subjects without getting their approval. The States should not be allowed to turn into small units uncontrolled by the Union of India and thus become a menace to it, he concluded.

Winding up the debate after Pandit Nehru's speech, Dr. Sitaramayya challenged the Princes or Dewans who were talking of independence to-day to hold a referendum of the people of their States on the question whether they wished to cut themselves off from the Union, "We shall abide by the result," he declared.

The resolution was unanimously carried.

After Acharya Kripalani, the President, had addressed the meeting the House adjourned *sine die*.

President's Statements

ACHARYA KRIPALANI, THE CONGRESS PRESIDENT, ISSUED THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS TO THE PRESS

1. The Late Professor Abdul Bari

I am deeply shocked and grieved to hear of the tragic murder of Prof. Abdul Bari. His death has robbed India of one of its bravest and most selfless soldiers of freedom. He was utterly free from communal bias and knew himself only as an Indian.

His was a dedicated life filled with a passion for the service of the Working classes. During my recent tour in Bihar I was much impressed by his single-minded devotion, his indifference to physical comfort and his capacity for organisation and leadership. He was deservedly loved by the common people and was a hero of the working classes whose interests he cherished dearly and served loyally. It pains me deeply to think that so valuable a life should have been wantonly and brutally destroyed. The manner of his death is a cause of shame and sorrow to his countrymen, though the manner of his life will be cherished as a source of unflinching inspiration. The nation will join me in offering our heart-felt condolences to his bereaved wife and children.

NEW DELHI,
March 30, 1947.

2. National Week

Year after year for the last many years we have observed 6th April—13th April as the National Week. On 6th April, 1919 was inaugurated the first Civil Disobedience Movement. It launched the bark which is today nearing the harbour of independence surviving many storms on the deep seas. On April 13 of the same fateful year occurred the ghastly tragedy of the Jallianwala Bagh, where the blood of Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs flowed in a common sacrificial stream. The two dates are thus enshrined in the nation's memory, the one as the symbol of its will to freedom, the other as the emblem of its unity sealed in blood.

Today though the nation's will to freedom is about to be fulfilled, the unity of India is faced with its severest challenge. Even the freedom which seems so near may prove to be illusory, if we are not wise, for the last stage of voyage requires the most careful piloting. This year's national week has therefore a greater significance for us than it had ever before. We have to harness the passion and energy that we have roused in our people to the reconstruction of our national life.

By our non-violent struggle and sacrifices we have obliged the British Government to agree to a peaceful transfer of power into Indian hands. We have now to prepare the nation to receive that power. We cannot do so better or more effectively than by devoting ourselves to the Constructive Programme which Gandhiji and the Congress have kept before us. If we wish to achieve Swaraj or self-rule for the masses, if the power transferred is to be exercised by the people and not merely by a coterie or class, then the only way to ensure it is through the Constructive Programme. It is a comprehensive programme which touches every aspect of the life of our common people and strikes at the very root of the poverty and ignorance in which our masses are steeped. The Conference of Presidents and Secretaries of the Provincial Congress Committees which met recently at Allahabad adopted a scheme for the successful execution of this programme which has been approved by the Working Committee. Congressmen could not observe the National Week more fittingly than by inaugurating the scheme and mobilising the will and resources of the people to its whole-hearted implementation. Funds should be collected and workers enrolled to this end. The General Secretaries have already issued specific instructions to the Provincial Congress Committees which I hope every Congressman will carry out. The public too, I hope, will co-operate.

Owing to the unfortunate communal tension, public meetings and processions have been banned by the authorities in many places. Where such bans exist, Congressmen and the public must respect them. Communal unity is an important part of the Constructive Programme and nothing must be done which is likely to add to the prevailing passions. Moreover it is time that we realised that it is not by political demonstrations but by constructive work, discipline and sacrifice that we shall lay the foundation of a free and democratic India.

NEW DELHI,
April 1, 1947.

3. Minorities in Pakistan

Representatives of minorities from East Bengal, West Punjab and Sind have approached me for advice as to what they should do when the territories they live in become part of an independent State of Pakistan. Most of them fear that their lives, honour and property which are unsafe now would become even more unsafe then. I do not share that fear. On the contrary I hope that once the State of Pakistan is established, its government or governments would have enough sense of reality not to discredit themselves by unfair treatment of the minorities.

Up till now the Muslim League felt that it was in its interest to create an atmosphere of conflict and strife. Henceforth it would obviously be in its interest

to create order, for the spirit of lawlessness roused against the minorities would sooner or later be turned against its own governments. Moreover, ill-treatment of the minorities, either direct by government action or indirect by encouragement of mob passion, is bound to bring the State of Pakistan into disrepute and ultimately into conflict with the Indian Union. I have no doubt that it would not be in the interest of Pakistan to invite needless conflict.

I would therefore ask the minorities in the future Pakistan not to get unduly nervous or panicky and not to be in a hurry to emigrate. They should stick to their homes, lands and professions to which they have as much right as the members of the majority community. They should wait and watch and not lose faith in their own strength, in the potential sanity of the Pakistan Government and in the ultimate unity of India which can never be permanently destroyed.

It is in the obvious interest of the majority to win the affection and confidence of the minorities as it is in the interest of the minorities to give their co-operation to the majority, provided such co-operation is invited on just and honourable terms. Now that the Muslim League will assume the full responsibility of Government, I hope its leadership will with equal willingness accept the full obligations of such responsibility.

As regards the minorities in the Indian Union, Muslim or other, I assure them that they have nothing to fear. They will be justly and fairly treated. The Congress is a national organisation and will not tolerate special privileges or disabilities on communal or religious ground. It stands for justice and equal opportunities for all the people, irrespective of religion, caste, class or sex. As long as Congress has any influence with the Government and people of the Indian Union, no member of any minority community need fear discriminatory treatment.

Announcement by Premier Attlee (20-2-1947)

The following is the full text of Prime Minister Attlee's statement in the House of Commons :-

The following is the full text of Prime Minister Attlee's statement in the House of Commons :-
 "It has long been the policy of successive British Governments to work towards the realization of Self-Government in India. In pursuance of this policy, an increasing measure of responsibility has been devolved on Indians, and to-day the civil administration and the Indian armed forces rely, to a very large extent, on Indian civilians and officers. In the constitutional field, the acts of 1919 and 1935 passed by the British Parliament, each represented a substantial transfer of political power. In 1940, the Coalition Government recognized the principle that Indians should themselves frame a new constitution for a fully autonomous India and, in the offer of 1942, they invited them to set up a Constituent Assembly, for this purpose as soon as the war was over.

His Majesty's Government believe this policy to have been right and in accordance with sound democratic principles. Since they came into office, they have done their utmost to carry it forward to its fulfilment. The declaration of the Prime Minister of 15th March last, which met with general approval in Parliament and the country, made it clear that it was for the Indian people themselves to choose their future status and Constitution and that, in the opinion of his Majesty's Government, the time had come for responsibility for the Government of India to pass into Indian hands.

The Cabinet Mission, which was sent to India last year spent over three months in consultation with Indian leaders in order to help them to agree upon a method for determining the future Constitution of India, so that the transfer of power might be smoothly and rapidly effected. It was only when it seemed clear that without some initiative from the Cabinet Mission, agreement was unlikely to be reached, that they put forward proposals themselves.

These proposals, made public in May last, envisaged that the future Constitution of India should be settled by a Constituent Assembly composed in the manner suggested therein, of representatives of all communities and interests in British India and of the Indian States.

Since the return of the Mission, an Interim Government has been set up at the Centre, composed of the political leaders of the major communities, exercising wide powers within the existing Constitution. In all the Provinces, Indian Governments, responsible to legislatures, are in office.

It is with great regret that His Majesty's Government find that there are still differences among Indian parties which are preventing the Constituent Assembly from functioning as it was intended that it should. It is of the essence of the plan that the Assembly should be fully representative.

His Majesty's Government desire to hand over their responsibility to authorities established by a Constitution approved by all parties in India, in accordance with the Cabinet Mission's plan. But, unfortunately, there is, at present, no clear prospect that such a Constitution and such authorities will emerge. The present state of uncertainty is fraught with danger and cannot be indefinitely prolonged. His Majesty's Government wish to make it clear that it is their definite intention to take the necessary steps to effect the transference of power to responsible Indian hands by a date not later than June 1948.

This great sub-continent, now containing over 400 million people, has for the last century, enjoyed peace and security as a part of the British Commonwealth and Empire. Continued peace and security are more than ever necessary to-day if the full possibilities of economic development are to be realised and a higher standard of life attained by the Indian people.

His Majesty's Government are anxious to hand over their responsibilities to a Government which, resting on the sure foundation of the support of the people, is capable of maintaining peace and administering India with justice and efficiency. It is therefore, essential that all parties should sink their differences, in order that they may be ready to shoulder the great responsibilities which will come upon them next year.

After months of hard work by the Cabinet Mission, a great measure of agreement was obtained as to the method by which a Constitution should be worked out. This was embodied in their statements of May last. His Majesty's Government there agreed to recommend to Parliament a Constitution worked out in accordance with the proposals made therein by a fully representative Constituent Assembly. But if it should appear that such a Constitution will not have been worked out by a fully representative Assembly, before the time mentioned in paragraph 7, His Majesty's Government will have to consider to whom the powers of the Central Government in British India should be handed over, on the due date, whether as a whole to some form of Central Government for British India or, in some areas, to the existing Provincial Governments, or in such other way as may seem most reasonable and in the best interests of the Indian people.

Although the final transfer of authority may not take place until June 1948, preparatory measures must be put in hand in advance. It is important that the efficiency of the civil administration should be maintained and that the defence of India should be fully provided for. But, inevitably, as the process of transfer proceeds, it will become progressively more difficult to carry out, to the letter, all the provisions of the Government of India Act of 1935. Legislation will be introduced in due course to give effect to the final transfer of power.

In regard to the Indian States, as was explicitly stated by the Cabinet Mission, His Majesty's Government do not intend to hand over their powers and obligations under Paramountcy to any Government of British India. It is not intended to bring Paramountcy, as a system, to a conclusion earlier than the date of the final transfer of power, but it is contemplated that for the intervening period, the relations of the Crown with individual States may be adjusted by agreement.

His Majesty's Government will negotiate agreements in regard to matters arising out of the transfer of power with representatives of those to whom they propose to transfer power.

His Majesty's Government believe that British commercial and industrial interests in India can look forward to a fair field for their enterprises under the new conditions. The commercial connection between India and the United Kingdom has been long and friendly and will continue to be to their mutual advantage.

His Majesty's Government cannot conclude this statement without expressing, on behalf of the people of this country, their goodwill and good wishes towards the people of India as they go forward to this final stage in their achievement of Self-Government. It will be the wish of everyone in these islands that, notwithstanding constitutional changes, the association of the British and Indian peoples should not be brought to an end; and they will wish to continue to do all that is in their power to further the well-being of India."

British Government's Statement of June 3

The following is the text of the statement by His Majesty's Government:—

1. On February 20th, 1947, His Majesty's Government announced their intention of transferring power in British India to Indian hands by June 1948. His Majesty's Government had hoped that it would be possible for the major parties to co-operate in the working out of the Cabinet Mission's Plan of May 16th, 1946, and

evolve for India a Constitution acceptable to all concerned. This hope has not been fulfilled.

2. The majority of the representatives of the Provinces of Madras, Bombay, the United Provinces, Bihar, Central Provinces and Berar, Assam, Orissa and the North-West Frontier Provinces, and the representatives of Delhi, Ajmer-Merwara and Coorg have already made progress in the task of evolving a new Constitution. On the other hand, the Muslim League Party, including in it a majority of the representatives of Bengal, the Punjab and Sind as also the representative of British Baluchistan, has decided not to participate in the Constituent Assembly.

3. It has always been the desire of His Majesty's Government that power should be transferred in accordance with the wishes of the Indian people themselves. This task would have been greatly facilitated if there had been agreement among the Indian political parties. In the absence of such agreement, the task of devising a method by which the wishes of the Indian people can be ascertained has devolved upon His Majesty's Government. After full consultation with political leaders in India, His Majesty's Government have decided to adopt for this purpose the plan set out below. His Majesty's Government wish to make it clear that they have no intention of attempting to frame any ultimate Constitution for India; this is a matter for the Indians themselves. Nor is there anything in this plan to preclude negotiations between communities for a united India.

4. It is not the intention of His Majesty's Government to interrupt the work of the existing Constituent Assembly. Now that provision is made for certain provinces specified below, His Majesty's Government trust that, as a consequence of this announcement, the Muslim League representatives of those provinces, a majority of whose representatives are already participating in it, will now take their due share in its labours. At the same time it is clear that any constitution framed by this Assembly cannot apply to those parts of the country which are unwilling to accept it. His Majesty's Government are satisfied that the procedure outlined below embodies the best method of ascertaining the wishes of the people of such areas on the issue whether their Constitution is to be framed:—

- (a) in the existing Constituent Assembly; or
- (b) in a new and separate Constituent Assembly consisting of the representatives of those areas which decide not to participate in the existing Constituent Assembly.

When this has been done, it will be possible to determine the authority or authorities to whom power should be transferred.

5. The Provincial Legislative Assemblies of Bengal and the Punjab (excluding the European members) will, therefore, each be asked to meet in two parts, one representing the Muslim majority districts and the other the rest of the province. For the purpose of determining the population of districts, the 1941 census figures will be taken as authoritative. The Muslim majority districts in these two provinces are set out in the Appendix to this announcement.

6. The members of the two parts of each Legislative Assembly sitting separately will be empowered to vote whether or not the province should be partitioned. If a simple majority of either part decides in favour of partition, division will take place and arrangements will be made accordingly.

7. Before the question as to the partition is decided, it is desirable that the representatives of each part should know in advance which Constituent Assembly the Province as a whole would join in the event of the two parts subsequently deciding to remain united. Therefore, if any members of either Legislative Assembly so demands, there shall be held a meeting of all members of the Legislative Assembly (other than Europeans) at which a decision will be taken on the issue as to which Constituent Assembly the Province as a whole would join if it were decided by the two parts to remain united.

8. In the event of partition being decided upon, each part of the Legislative Assembly will, on behalf of the areas they represent, decide which of the alternatives in paragraph four above to adopt.

9. For the immediate purpose of deciding on the issue of partition, the members of the legislative assemblies of Bengal and the Punjab will sit in two parts according to Muslim majority districts (as laid down in the appendix) and non-Muslim majority districts. This is only a preliminary step of a purely temporary nature as it is evident that for the purposes of final partition of these provinces a detailed investigation of boundary question will be needed; and as soon as a decision involving partition has been taken for either province a boundary commission will be set up by the Governor General, the membership and terms of refer-

rence of which will be settled in consultation with those concerned. It will be instructed to demarcate the boundaries of the two parts of the Punjab on the basis of ascertaining the contiguous majority areas of Muslims and non-Muslims. It will also be instructed to take into account other factors. Similar instructions will be given to the Bengal Boundary Commission. Until the report of a boundary commission has been put into effect, the provisional boundaries indicated in the appendix will be used.

10. The Legislative Assembly of Sind (excluding the European members) will at a special meeting also take its own decision on the alternatives in paragraph 4 above.

11. The position of the North-West Frontier Province is exceptional. Two of the three representatives of this province are already participating in the existing Constituent Assembly. But it is clear, in view of its geographical situation and other considerations, that if the whole or any part of the Punjab decides not to join the existing Constituent Assembly, it will be necessary to give the North-West Frontier Province an opportunity to reconsider its position. Accordingly, in such an event, a referendum will be made to the electors of the present Legislative Assembly in the North-West Frontier Province to choose which of the alternatives mentioned in paragraph 4 above they wish to adopt. The referendum will be held under the aegis of the Governor-General and in consultation with the provincial Government.

12. British Baluchistan has elected a member, but he has not taken his seat in the existing Constituent Assembly. In view of its geographical situation, this province will also be given an opportunity to reconsider its position and to choose which of the alternatives in paragraph 4 above to adopt. His Excellency the Governor-General is examining how this can most appropriately be done.

13. Though Assam is predominantly a non-Muslim province, the district of Sylhet which is contiguous to Bengal is predominantly Muslim. There has been a demand that, in the event of the partition of Bengal, Sylhet should be amalgamated with the Muslim part of Bengal. Accordingly, if it is decided that Bengal should be partitioned, a referendum will be held in Sylhet District under the aegis of the Governor-General and in consultation with the Assam provincial Government to decide whether the district of Sylhet should continue to form part of Assam Province or should be amalgamated with the new province of Eastern Bengal, if that province agrees. If the referendum results in favour of amalgamation with Eastern Bengal, a boundary commission with terms of reference similar to those for the Punjab and Bengal will be set up to demarcate the Muslim majority areas of Sylhet District and contiguous Muslim majority areas of adjoining districts, which will then be transferred to Eastern Bengal. The rest of the Assam Province will in any case continue to participate in the proceedings of the existing Constituent Assembly.

14. If it is decided that Bengal and the Punjab should be partitioned, it will be necessary to hold fresh elections to choose their representatives on the scale of one for every million of population according to the principle contained in the Cabinet Mission's Plan of May 16, 1946. Similar elections will also have to be held for Sylhet in the event of it being decided that this district should form part of East Bengal. The number of representatives to which each area would be entitled is as follows:—

Provinces	General	Muslims	Sikhs	Total
Sylhet District	1	2	nil	3
West Bengal	15	4	nil	19
East Bengal	12	29	nil	41
West Punjab	3	12	2	17
East Punjab	6	4	2	12

15. In accordance with the mandate given to them, the representatives of the various areas will either join the existing Constituent Assembly or form the new Constituent Assembly.

16. Negotiations will have to be initiated as soon as possible on the administrative consequences of any partition that may have been decided upon:—

(a) Between the representatives and the respective successor authorities about all subjects now dealt with by the Central Government including defence, finance and communications.

(b) Between different successor authorities and His Majesty's Government for treaties in regard to matters arising out of the transfer of power.

(c) In the case of provinces that may be partitioned, as to the administration of all provincial subjects, such as the division of assets and liabilities, the police and other services, the high courts, provincial institutions, etc.

17. Agreements with tribes of the North-West Frontier of India will have to be negotiated by the appropriate successor authority.

18. His Majesty's Government wish to make it clear that the decisions announced above relate only to British India and that their policy towards Indian States contained in the Cabinet Mission's memorandum of 12th May, 1946, remains unchanged.

19. In order that the successor authorities may have time to prepare themselves to take over power, it is important that all the above processes should be completed as quickly as possible. To avoid delay, the different provinces or parts of provinces will proceed independently as far as practicable within the conditions of this plan. The existing Constituent Assembly and the new Constituent Assembly (if formed) will proceed to frame constitutions for their respective territories; they will, of course, be free to frame their own rules.

20. The major political parties have repeatedly emphasised their desire that there should be the earliest possible transfer of power in India. With this desire His Majesty's Government are in full sympathy and they are willing to anticipate the date of June, 1948, for the handing over of power by the setting up of an independent Indian Government or Governments at an even earlier date. Accordingly, as the most expeditious, and indeed the only practicable way of meeting this desire, His Majesty's Government propose to introduce legislation during the current session for the transfer of power this year on a Dominion Status basis to one or two successor authorities according to the decisions taken as a result of this announcement. This will be without prejudice to the right of the Indian Constituent Assemblies to decide in due course whether or not the part of India in respect of which they have authority will remain within the British Commonwealth.

His Excellency the Governor-General will from time to time make such further announcements as may be necessary in regard to procedure or any other matters for carrying out the above arrangements.

The Muslim majority districts of Punjab and Bengal according to 1941 (census) :—

1. THE PUNJAB

Lahore Division—Gujranwala, Gurdaspur, Lahore, Sheikhupura, Sialkot.

Rawalpindi Division—Attock, Gujrat, Jhelum, Mianwali, Rawalpindi, Shahpur.

Multan Division—Dera Ghazi Khan, Jhang, Lyallpur, Montgomery, Multan, Muzaffargarh.

2. BENGAL

Chittagong Division—Chittagong, Noakhali, Tipperah.

Dacca Division—Bakerganj, Dacca, Faridpur, Mymensingh.

Presidency Division—Jessore, Murshidabad, Nadia.

Rajshahi Division—Bogra, Dinajpur, Malda, Pabna, Rajshahi, Rangpur.

The All India Muslim League

Working Committee—Karachi—31st January to 1st February 1947

League withdraws acceptance of Cabinet Plan

The decision of the All-India Congress Committee (see p. 114) to accept the British Government's interpretation of the Grouping clauses did not make the path smooth for the Constituent Assembly, though that was the one object that actuated the Congress Executive in making a recommendation to which it must have known there would be considerable opposition. The newspapers that reflected the views of the Muslim League however with characteristic immoderation denounced the Congress resolution.

The Working Committee of the All India Muslim League at its meeting held at Karachi on the 31st January 1947, in a three-thousand word resolution on the constitutional question held that the Congress "as a major contracting party has not accepted the Statement of 16th May 1946, as clarified by the Statement of His Majesty's Government of 6th December, 1946, and feels that no useful purpose will be served by summoning a meeting of the Council of the All-India Muslim League to reconsider its decision whereby it had withdrawn the acceptance of the Cabinet Mission's plan of 16th May, 1946."

The Working Committee characterises the A. I. C. C. resolution as "no more than a dishonest trick and jugglery of words by which the Congress has again attempted to deceive the British Government, the Muslim League and public opinion."

It maintains that the Constituent Assembly, in which only the Congress Party is represented, has taken decisions on principles and procedure exceeding the limitations imposed by the statement of May 19 on the Assembly's functions and powers at the preliminary stage which impinge upon the powers and functions of the sections. By these acts the Congress has already converted that "truncated Assembly into a rump and something totally different from what the Cabinet Mission had provided for."

The Working Committee calls upon His Majesty's Government to declare that the constitutional plan formulated by the Cabinet Mission has failed because the Congress have not accepted the Statement of May 16, nor have the Sikhs nor the Scheduled Castes. The Working Committee is of the opinion that the elections to and the summoning of the Constituent Assembly were *ab initio* void, invalid and illegal and the continuation of the Constituent Assembly and its proceedings and decisions are *ultra vires*, invalid and illegal and it should be forthwith dissolved.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION

The following is the text of the resolution :-

The Working Committee of the All India Muslim League have given careful consideration to the Statement issued by His Majesty's Government on December 6, 1946, the resolution passed there-after by the Congress Working Committee on December, 22, 1946, and by the A.-I. C. C. on January 6, 1947, the speeches delivered by responsible leaders of the Congress at the A.-I.C. C. session referred to above, and the proceedings of the Constituent Assembly during its two sessions so far held; and record their views as follows :

By their Statement of December 6, His Majesty's Government admitted that the interpretation which the Muslim League had always put on Paragraphs 19 (5) and 19 (8) of the Cabinet Mission's Statement of May 16 was the correct one and accorded with the intention of the Cabinet Mission and His Majesty's government. By that Statement it was also proved that the Congress, on the other hand, had "put forward a different view" and therefore had not accepted what His Majesty's Government themselves described as "this fundamental point" namely, that decision in the sections, including questions relating to the settling of the constitutions of the provinces included in each group, "should in the absence of agreement to the contrary, be taken by a simple majority vote of the representatives in the Sections." His Majesty's Government, furthermore, added that "this Statement also interpreted must therefore be considered an essential part of the scheme of May 16 for enabling the Indian people to formulate a constitution which His Majesty's Government would be prepared to submit to Parliament. Accordingly, in their Statement of December 6, they urged the Congress to accept "this re-affirmation of the intention of the Cabinet Mission or in the alternative to refer the point to the Federal Court at a very early date.

CONGRESS AND H. M. G.'S. STATEMENT OF DEC. 6.

In their Statement of December 6, His Majesty's Government also affirmed that the Congress had agreed that other questions of interpretation of the Statement of May 16 which might arise might be referred by either side to the Federal Court whose decisions should be accepted, and on the assumption that the Congress had agreed to this procedure, His Majesty's Government asked the Muslim League also to agree to it in order to ensure that the procedure both in the Union Constituent Assembly and in the Sections may accord with the Cabinet Mission's Plan.

Thirdly, His Majesty's Government, in the last paragraph of their Statement of December 6, reiterated the fact that "there has never been any prospect of success for the Constituent Assembly except upon the basis of the agreed procedure" and they repeated the assurance: "Should the Constituent Assembly in which a large section of the Indian population had not been represented, His Majesty's Government would not, of course, contemplate—as the Congress have stated they would not contemplate—forcing such a constitution upon any unwilling parts of the country." The meaning and the application of this assurance were further clarified by Sir Stafford Cripps in his speech in the House of Commons on December 12, 1946, when he said, "But the Government also had to envisage the possibility in the clause in the final paragraph of the Statement." This was perhaps a statement of the obvious—that if the Muslim League could not be persuaded to come into the Constituent Assembly, then parts of the country where they were in a majority could not be held to be bound by the results.

The situation created by the issue of this Statement by His Majesty's Government was that the onus of taking the next step fell on the Congress and they were called upon:

1. To accept honestly and unequivocally the correct interpretation of Paragraphs 19 (6) and 19 (8) of the Cabinet Mission's Statement of May 16, which interpretation had been already accepted by the Muslim League, or to refer the point to the Federal Court;

2. To re-affirm that they accepted the procedure for the settling of other questions of interpretation that might arise, so that the decision should accord with the basic and fundamental principles of the Scheme of May 16, 1946, namely, that either side could refer such questions to the Federal Court whose decisions would be binding on all concerned; and

3. To postpone the session of the Constituent Assembly which had been called for the 9th December, 1946 pending settlement of the dispute over fundamental points of principle and procedure which had been brought to the fore by the Statement of December 6 and the correct interpretation of which the Congress had not accepted, as was made clear in that statement, there being no prospect of success for the Constituent Assembly without such agreement particularly on the part of the Congress.

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League regret to note that the Congress have reacted to the situation created by the Statement of December 6 in a manner which shows that they are determined to adhere to their own views and interpretations of fundamental provisions in the Cabinet Mission's Statement of May 16, which militate against clearly expressed intentions and interpretations of the authors of that Statement as well as of His Majesty's Government as a whole and which destroy the very basis on which the constitutional plan set forth in that Statement had been drawn up.

By their resolution on December 22, the Congress Working Committee rejected the suggestion that the point in dispute should be referred to the Federal Court if the Congress did not accept "this re-affirmation of the intention of the Cabinet Mission", and that Committee decided to convene a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee for the purpose of giving a decision on the issues by the Statement of December 6. The Working Committee of the Congress, however, in their resolution indulged in an attack on the British Government for their renewed interpretation and clarification, which had called the Congress bluff, and on the Muslim League for no other fault except that its stand had been at last vindicated.

A. I. C. C. RESOLUTION CRITICISED

The A. I. C. C., by its resolution passed on January 6, purported to agree to advise action in accordance with the interpretation of the Government in regard to the procedure to be followed in the Sections", about which there never was any doubt in the minds of any sane and honest person, but it immediately

added the following qualifying clauses: "It must be clearly understood, however, that this must not involve any compulsion on a Province and that the rights of Sikhs in the Punjab should not be jeopardised. In the event of any attempt at such compulsion, a Province or a part of a Province has the right to take such action as may be deemed necessary in order to give effect to the wishes of the people concerned. The future course of action will depend upon the developments that take place and the A.I.C.C., therefore, directs the Working Committee to advise upon it, whenever circumstances so require, keeping in view the basic principle of provincial autonomy."

These qualifying clauses in the considered opinion of the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League confer the right of veto within the Section on a "Province", and what is more abused, on "a part of a Province", as well as on the Sikhs in the Punjab, and therefore, they completely nullify the advice or the so-called "acceptance" by the Congress of the December 6 Statement, and this A.-I.C.C. resolution is no more than a dishonest trick and jugglery of words by which the Congress has again attempted to deceive the British Government, the Muslim League and public opinion in general.

The question at issue was a very simple one. What was required was a straight and honest answer and not these evasions, equivocations and camouflage from one of the two major contracting parties to the questions whether the Congress honestly and sincerely agreed to the proposals of May 16, as clarified by His Majesty's Government on December 6, 1946, and whether they were prepared to honourably abide by them and carry out the letter and spirit of the proposals which were put before the two major parties by the British Government, who were merely acting as mediators, as unfortunately the two major parties had failed to come to any agreement at Simla and the Conference at Simla had broken down.

QUESTION OF REFERENCE TO FEDERAL COURT

Of the second point in H. M. G.'s Statement of December 6 namely, the procedure whereby either side could refer other question of interpretation to the Federal Court, the resolution of the A. I. C. C. makes no mention, but the mover of the resolution, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, on being questioned on the second day of the A.-I.C.C.'s deliberations as to whether the Congress had agreed to this procedure, categorically answered in the negative and declared: "Apart from this, in view of the recent development and the Statement of December 6, which produces a new situation, I am not prepared to admit for an instant that we have agreed to any future procedure about references. Whatever the future brings we shall have to consider it. I should like to make it perfectly clear that we are giving no assurance about any references in regard to any other matters to the Federal Court. We are not going to commit ourselves at the present moment to any reference to the Federal Court or to any other authority. We shall decide—or the Constituent Assembly shall decide—as we think best in the circumstances."

With regard to the third point, namely that "if a constitution comes to be framed by a Constituent Assembly in which a large section of the Indian population had not been represented", such constitution would not be forced upon any "unwilling parts of the country", the A.-I. C. C. resolution in Paragraph 3, completely distorts the meaning and application of this principle and makes this an excuse to instigate a section of the population of Assam, the North-West Frontier Provinces, the Sikhs and even Baluchistan, to revolt against the decision that might be taken by the relevant Sections sitting as a whole and by simple majority vote. In the opinion of the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League the subsequent decision of the Assam Provincial Congress not to abide by the procedure laid down for Sections and its reiteration that "the constitution for Assam shall be framed by her own representatives only" is a direct result of this instigation and is step taken by Assam Congressmen in collusion with the All-India leaders of the Congress.

PROCEEDINGS OF CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY OBJECTED TO

The Constituent Assembly met on December 9 and subsequent dates and thereafter on January 20 and subsequent dates and has already taken decisions of vital character so far as it is known to the public, and as some of the sittings were held *in camera* it is very difficult to get correct information as to what other resolutions it had passed or what decisions it has already taken. It has passed a resolution known as the Independent Sovereign Republic Resolution

laying down the objectives. It is not only a proclamation of India as an Independent Sovereign Republic but it lays down fundamentals of the constitution as was admitted by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the mover of the resolution. It is a very vital resolution. It lays down the essentials of the next constitution: several things which are mentioned there are fundamentals of the constitution. It speaks of a Republic of "Union", functions and power vested in the "Union" or as are inherent or implied in the Union and resulting therefrom, and talks of present boundaries, states and present authorities, the residuary powers, powers being derived from the people, minority rights and fundamental rights. These are undoubtedly fundamentals of the constitution as they are beyond the limit of the powers and the terms of the Cabinet Mission's Scheme of May 16, and the resolution is therefore illegal, *ultra vires* and not competent to the Constituent Assembly to adopt.

Next it has appointed several committees and has proceeded to elect the Advisory Committee, referred to in Paragraph 20 of the Statement of the Cabinet Mission and the Viceroy on the rights of citizens, minorities, tribal and excluded areas. Further, it has appointed a Steering Committee and various other committees and as some of the decisions have been taken in *camera* it is very difficult to say what resolutions it has passed or decisions it has taken. It has also passed the "Rule of Procedure" and assumed control of Sections by means of these rules for which there is no warrant or justification particularly Rule 63, which runs as follows:

"63 (1) The Assembly shall before finally setting the Union constitution, give an opportunity to the several Provinces and States through their legislatures to formulate, within such time as it may fix, their views upon the resolutions of the Assembly outlining the main features of the constitutions or if the Assembly so decides, upon the preliminary draft of the constitution. (2) Before the constitution of any Province is finally settled or the decision to set up to a Group constitution for the Section in which the province is included is finally taken, an opportunity shall be given to the Province concerned through its legislature to formulate within such time as may be fixed for the purpose, its views (A) upon the resolution outlining the main features of the constitution or if the majority of the representatives of the Province in the Assembly so desire, upon the preliminary draft of such constitution, and (B) upon the preliminary decision of the Section concerned as to whether a Group constitution shall be set up for the Provinces included in the Section and, if so, with what Provincial subject the Group should deal."

And lastly, it has appointed a Committee to define the scope of the Union subjects whereas the position was made quite clear immediately after the Statement of May 16 was issued by the Secretary of State for India in his broadcast and by Sir Stafford Cripps at his Press Conference where he read out an explanatory statement. Both of them stated in the clearest possible terms to the time and manner in which the Group constitutions were to be framed by the Sections concerned before the Union constitution was taken up. The Secretary of State said: "After a preliminary meeting in common, these representatives of the Provinces will divide themselves up into three Sections. These Sections will decide upon Provincial and Group matters. Subsequently they will re-unite to decide upon the constitution of the Union". Sir Stafford Cripps at his Press Conference said: "So the three Sections will formulate the Provincial and Group constitutions and when that is done they work together with the States' representatives to make the Union constitution. That is the final phase." And the Union is strictly confined to three subjects.

It is clear from the above that the Constituent Assembly in which only the Congress Party is represented, has taken decisions on principles and procedure some of which exceed the limitations imposed by the Statement of May 16 on the Constituent Assembly's functions and powers at the preliminary stage and which further impinge upon the powers and functions of the Sections. By taking these decisions in the Constituent Assembly and by appointing a packed committee consisting of individuals chosen by the Congress, the Congress has already converted that truncated Assembly into a rump and something totally different from what the Cabinet Mission's Statement had provided for.

H. M. G. ASKED TO ABANDON PLAN

In view of these facts and circumstances the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League are definitely of the opinion that the Congress by rejecting this final appeal of His Majesty's Government to accept the correct interpre-

tation of fundamental procedure of the Cabinet Mission's Statement of May 16, and by having already by the resolutions and decisions taken in two sessions, converted the Constituent Assembly into a body of its own conception, has destroyed all fundamentals of the Statement of May 16 and every possibility of compromise on the basis of the Cabinet Mission's constitutional plan. The Working Committee accordingly call upon His Majesty's Government to declare that the constitutional plan formulated by the Cabinet Mission as announced on May 16, has failed because the Congress after all these months of efforts, have not accepted the Statement of May 16, 1946 nor have the Sikhs nor the Scheduled Castes.

The proposals of May 16 could only be given effect to and carried out if the two major parties agreed to accept them. The Congress had not and have not accepted and do not accept them although the Muslim League had accepted by their resolution the Statement of May 16 1946 as far back as June 6, 1946. But in view of the fact that the Congress refused to accept the proposals *in toto* and unequivocally, the Muslim League had to withdraw its acceptance on July 29, 1946.

CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY SHOULD BE DISSOLVED

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League are, therefore, emphatically of the opinion that the elections to and thereafter the summoning of the Constituent Assembly, in spite of strong protests and most emphatic objections on the part of the Muslim League, was *ab initio* void, invalid and illegal as not only the major parties had not accepted the Statement but even the Sikhs and the Scheduled Castes had also not done so and that the continuation of the Constituent Assembly and its proceedings and decisions are *ultra vires*, invalid and illegal and it should be forthwith dissolved.

In view of these facts and circumstances the Working Committee are clearly of opinion that as the Congress, as a major contracting party, has not accepted the Statement of May 16, as clarified by H.M.G.'s Statement of December 6, no useful purpose will be served by summoning a meeting of the Council of the All-India Muslim League to reconsider its decision of July 29, 1946, whereby it had withdrawn the acceptance of the Cabinet Mission's Plan of May 16, 1946.

Resolutions—Karachi—1st February 1947

Civil Resistance in the Punjab

The Working Committee adjourned *since die* to-day after four days' sitting. The Committee adopted a lengthy resolution on the Punjab situation, one on Bihar and another on Hazara. The following is the text of the Committee's resolution on the Punjab situation:—

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League have noted with grave concern the serious situation developing in the Punjab where thousands of Muslims, men and women, are courting arrest every day all over the province as a protest against the suppression of their political rights and civil liberties and against continued provocations offered to them by the provincial Ministry.

One of these provocations which deeply stirred the feelings of Muslims in the Punjab and outside, was the order promulgated by the Punjab Government on January 24 and since withdrawn, declaring the Muslim National Guards an unlawful association. The Committee strongly condemn this order which amounted to a biggest and most high-handed attempt to suppress the activities of the Muslim League in the Punjab. The National Guards is a body of volunteers organised by the Muslim League to assist in peaceful and legitimate political and social work. The National Guard functions under the Muslim League's discipline and control and forms part of the Muslim League organisation.

The Working Committee congratulates the Punjab Muslim League organisation on having successfully resisted this insulting order and secured its withdrawal. The Committee however cannot overlook the fact that the mere withdrawal of this order makes no improvement in the general conditions prevailing in the Punjab and involving on the one hand persistent and widespread persecution of Muslims for political reasons by the Ministry and on the other hand, almost total denial to them of those constitutional methods of self-expression and criticism of the Government by the opposition which are the essential basis of democracy.

The present Ministry, which is a fundamentally unrepresentative and unpopular one and which is a creation of combination of groups hostile to the Muslim League which is the largest party, and the Muslims in the Punjab generally, in its fear of free public opinion and democratic principles and in order to maintain itself in office in defiance of the wishes and rights of the

politically awakened majority in the Punjab has been resorting with growing recklessness to the Fascist methods of gagging public opinion, suppressing normal civil and constitutional liberties of the people and persecuting its political opponents.

For a long time now the provincial legislature has practically ceased to function except for the purpose of hurried voting on the budget once in a year, the opposition being given absolutely no opportunity of bringing forward non-official proposals in the House. A ban on public meetings under section 144 of the Cr. P. C. practically throughout the province has long been a normal feature of the administration. A so-called Public Safety Ordinance, which reduces civil liberties and the liberty of the Press to a farce, has been promulgated on a false pretext.

The fact that the powers vested in the Government and its officials, under this ordinance, are actually being used to put down an agitation for the restoration of civil liberties in the province has thoroughly exposed the falsehood of the pretext for promulgating it. It is significant that the Muslims are the principal sufferers from all these bans and restrictions on fundamental civil rights and normal political activity, because the other communities can influence the administration through their chosen representatives in the Ministry.

At the same time the Ministry has been carrying on a widespread campaign of persecution, coercion and intimidation against workers and supporters of the Muslim League with the object of disrupting and breaking up the political solidarity of Muslims. Its war on the united political front of Muslims has imposed untold suffering on numerous Muslims particularly in the rural areas of the province. Thousands have been and are being even refused any ration of controlled commodities, like sugar and kerosene oil and otherwise persecuted because they are members or supporters of the Muslim League. Muslim public servants from gazetted officers down to clerks and petty village officials, who refuse to act as the tools of the Ministers in their political war upon the Muslim League are being harassed, humiliated and removed from positions of responsibility.

Keeping in view the situation thus created in the Punjab, the Committee have no doubt that the responsibility for the present serious developments in the Punjab rests solely on those who have practically blocked every channel of constitutional political activity for Muslims and made it impossible for them to exercise their ordinary civil rights or to hold and express freely their political opinions, thereby reducing democracy in the Punjab to mockery.

The Working Committee express their whole-hearted sympathy for Muslims of the Punjab in their sufferings and trials. It is the Committee's considered opinion and earnest advice to Muslims that they should maintain a perfectly non-violent, disciplined, firm and dignified attitude in their protest against repression and coercion and the suppression of democratic freedom in their province.

The Working Committee wish to make it absolutely clear that the objectives of the Punjab Muslim League's present movement are confined to securing the restoration of normal civil liberties in that province and involve no inter-communal issue at all. The Committee warns Muslims as well as non-Muslims to be on their guard against attempts which may be made out of mischievous motives or because of misapprehensions, to give the present situation in the Punjab a colour of inter-communal strife or to import irrelevant communal controversies into it and feel confident that no community will lend itself to be dragged into this conflict by the machinations of those who want to discredit the Muslim League.

The Working Committee most earnestly urge and call upon the Punjab Government to forthwith withdraw all restrictive measures on political activities and not to misuse the special powers conferred by the Punjab Public Safety Ordinance 1946 and release all those who have been imprisoned, arrested, or detained in this connection.

Congress Ministries & Muslims

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League have noted with dismay and indignation that the Governments and officials in Congress-governed Provinces have not only failed to protect the life and property of Muslims in these provinces as evidenced by the continued daily stabbings of the Mussalmans in the city of Bombay and Ahmedabad for over five months and the massacre of the Mussalmans at Garhmukteshwar and in Kolaba district of Bombay Province and oppression and harassment of Mussalmans at other places in

U. P., O. P. and Madras, but have also been undermining their economic interests in the distribution of daily necessities of life, which have come under the direct control of the Provincial Governments.

Mussalmans are deliberately insulted and oppressed in the Provinces and treated as suspects. There is wanton interference in their religious observances on one pretext or another. A systematic attempt is being made to crush the spirit of Mussalmans by subjecting them to innumerable hardships and sufferings.

The Working Committee call upon the Governments concerned to take immediate steps to put an end to lawlessness and organised attacks on the Mussalmans and devise means of providing effective protection to their person and property and safeguarding their legitimate religious, political, economic and social interests. The Working Committee further urge the Governors of the said Provinces to safeguard the interests of the Muslim minorities, which is incumbent upon them by virtue of the powers vested in them for discharging their special responsibilities under the Government of India Act, 1935, under which the Congress Governments have come into power.

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League express their deep sense of pride on the courage, fortitude and endurance shown by the Mussalmans in the Provinces in which they are in a minority in not only patiently and cheerfully suffering loss of life and property but the injustice and harassment by the majority in many other ways affecting their interests. The Working Committee are confident that the Mussalmans in the Provinces will continue to stand firm and united in resisting oppression and injustice at the hands of the tyrannical majority for the freedom of Muslim India. The Working Committee further deplore the loss of life, injuries caused to persons, and destruction of property and deeply sympathise with the sufferers. The Muslim League will do all in their power to help them in every way possible.

Eviction Policy in Assam

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League strongly condemn the barbarous atrocities committed by the Congress Government in Assam, on thousands of immigrants from the so-called professional grazing reserves and Government waste land, by demolishing their houses and driving them to wilderness, rendering them homeless and destitute.

The Working Committee further record their emphatic condemnation of the inhuman practice resorted to by the Government of Assam of selling by auction the paddy and food crops of the immigrant cultivators, thereby depriving them of the fruits of months of labour of their sole means of subsistence, and exposing to starvation the families and children of the cultivators.

The Working Committee urge upon the Government of Assam to put an immediate stop to these inhuman evictions and auction sales and allow settlement of Government waste land and excess land in the professional grazing reserves to those cultivators who have spent time and labour in reclaiming their waste lands, built their homesteads and sown crops there. It is a matter of great surprise to the Working Committee that the Assam Government persists in its policy of oppression of the immigrant cultivators at a time when there is such acute food shortage in India, necessitating appeal to foreign countries for relief from distress in this country and not utilising its own productive resources.

Imposition of Fine on Tribes

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League strongly condemn the action taken by the External Affairs Department of the Government of India in imposing a fine of Rs. 75,000 in cash, surrender of 75 rifles and the delivery of 40 hostages on the tribes on the border of Hazara. This action is out of all proportion to the requirements of the situation and the demand for hostages in the 20th century is barbarous and reminiscent of mediæval ages. The Working Committee are surprised at the adoption of these methods for terrorising the independent people of the tribal areas.

The Working Committee have also learnt with concern the method of frightfulness adopted by the N.-W.F.P. Government in levying and realising collective fines in a manner calculated to crush the Mussalmans of the Frontier Province. The Working Committee urge upon the External Affairs Department of the Government of India and the N.-W.F.P. Government to give up their inhuman and terrorising policy.

Bihar Disturbances

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League express their deep sense of sorrow, grief and horror at the great Bihar mass slaughter of the Muslims in tens of thousands and on the most inhuman barbarities perpetrated against their men, women and children on an unprecedented scale. The Working Committee convey their profound and heartfelt sympathies to the Bihar Muslims in general and to those in particular whose relations have been killed or injured and assure the sufferers, refugees and survivors of every possible help from Muslim India for their rehabilitation.

The Working Committee most strongly condemn the Bihar Government for their utter failure to give protection to the Muslims for over two weeks when all conceivable methods of oppression were allowed to be perpetrated against men, women and children in many cases under the closest possible vicinity of the thanas and often in the presence of police officials. Even now after the carnage the Congress Government have not taken step to allay the fears of the sufferers by taking drastic action against the culprits and implementing schemes which may instill confidence in the minds of the afflicted Muslims of Bihar. The Bihar Government should realise that those Muslims whose houses have been destroyed and whose relations have been butchered maimed and injured cannot be expected to return to their villages and provision must be made for them by exchange of lands or acquisition of lands or otherwise to settle them in areas where Muslims still continue to live and where they are in sufficient numbers to protect themselves against repetition of such incidents.

The Working Committee after careful examination and consideration of facts in their possession are definitely of the opinion that the Bihar carnage was a well organised and cleverly planned scheme which was executed in all its gruesome detail with the active participation of some highly placed Congressmen and Government officials and call upon the authorities immediately to appoint an impartial judicial tribunal of the highest order to investigate the whole matter as a fact-finding commission, as demanded by the Bihar Provincial Muslim League in its resolution of December 1946 and January 1947. The Working Committee further affirm the demand of the Bihar Provincial Muslim League made in its resolutions of December 1946 and January 1947 and are of opinion that unless those demands are met the confidence of the Muslims will not be restored and they will not feel safe in the Province.

The Working Committee therefore call upon the Governor of Bihar to use his special powers for the protection of the minority and adoption of measures for giving them a sense of complete security. They further urge upon the Viceroy to discharge his special responsibilities and see that the Governor of Bihar uses his special powers for the protection of the Muslim minority in Bihar in a manner that may assure the safety of their honour, life and property.

League's Demand

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League further demand that the Bihar Ministry should immediately adopt the following steps for the prevention and against the repetition of such carnage: 1. Arrest and detention in jail of murderers and culprits of heinous offences who are still roaming about, freely applauding their misdeeds, and cancellation of bail in all such cases and their trial by special tribunals which may inspire confidence in the justice of the tribunals.

2. Imposition of punitive tax or collective fines on the majority community in the affected areas and binding down of instigators and those from whom there is further apprehension as deterrent and preventive measures to prevent recurrence of such carnage.

3. Release on bail of the Muslims whose kith and kin have been killed or attacked and who have been arrested for defending themselves and their relatives.

4. Supplying of Muslim officers and Muslim armed police force with trucks to enable Muslim men and women volunteers to rescue abducted Muslim girls.

5. To accept the plan of the Muslim League and the Central Relief Committee of establishing big pockets to consolidate the Muslim population with certain safeguards.

6. The entrustment of investigation in the hands of non-Hindu officers with a machinery for expeditious investigation.

7. Immediate award to affected and displaced Muslims of adequate compensation according to their respective status and position to build houses in

the centres of the pockets of their choice and granting them sufficient amount to enable them to buy household effects and implements of husbandry according to their respective needs.

8. The offer of all facilities and help including acquisition of lands for the rehabilitation of Muslims from the affected and apprehended areas.

9. Granting of sufficient funds for the establishment of Muslim women and children homes for accommodation, support, training, education and maintenance of women who have become widows and of children who have become orphans due to the carnage.

10. Granting of licences for firearms to at least ten per cent of the Muslim population wherever big pockets of consolidated Muslims are established.

11. Setting up of police stations in such areas manned by Muslim officers with at least a 50 per cent Muslim armed police force.

Pending a decision by the authorities concerned, the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League advise the Muslims of Bihar to consolidate their population by shifting to large Muslim villages. Even in the affected areas they advise the Muslims not to evacuate their larger pockets and concentrations in urban areas till further advice.

The Working Committee have learnt with great satisfaction and pride that wherever it was possible for the meagre, in fact negligible number of Muslims to defend themselves, their women and children they put in a brave fight to the last against well-organised and overwhelming number of Hindu mobs and died bravely in the cause of Islam. Their fortitude, courage and endurance in the cause of freedom of Islam in India shall serve as a beaconlight to millions of Muslims in Hindu India who are similarly placed in the Muslim minority provinces.

White Paper on India

Britain to Quit India by June 1948

House of Commons Debate—London—20th February 1948

Prime Minister *Clement Attlee* presented the British Government's White Paper on the constitutional future of India in the House of Commons on the 20th. February 1947 (*For the text of the 20th February Statement See page 142*).

After reading the White Paper Mr. Attlee said:

The House will wish to know of an announcement which is being made public to-day. Field Marshal the Rt. Hon. Viscount Wavell was appointed Viceroy in 1943, after having held high military command in the Middle East, South-East Asia and India with notable distinction since the beginning of the war. It was agreed that this should be a war time appointment. Lord Wavell has discharged his high office during this very difficult period with devotion and a high sense of duty. It has, however, seemed that the opening of a new and final phase in India is an appropriate time to terminate this war appointment. His Majesty has been pleased to approve, as successor to Lord Wavell, the appointment of Admiral Viscount Mountbatten, who will be entrusted with the task of transferring to Indian hands responsibility for the government of British India in a manner that will best ensure the future happiness and prosperity of India. The change of office will take place during March.

He will remain on the active list, in accordance with his wishes that his future employment in the Royal Navy shall not be prejudiced. I am sure the House will wish him well in his task.

The House will be glad to hear that His Majesty has been pleased to approve the conferment of an Earldom on Viscount Wavell.

Immediately, Mr. *Winston Churchill*, the Opposition Leader, got up to ask: Will the Prime Minister lay before the House the reasons for the termination of the appointment of Viscount Wavell (Opposition cheers) at this particular moment? Will he indicate to us what differences or divergences or disagreements have arisen between the Viceroy and the British Government?

Mr. Attlee replied: No. I have stated the announcement with regard to the

termination of the Viceroyalty of Lord Wavell. I do not propose to add anything to it.

Mr. Churchill: Surely, we are entitled to be treated in a reasonable manner. Is it not a fact that if Lord Wavell's Viceroyalty had ended with the war, it would have ended 18 months ago and that, if it had ended after three years, it would have ended in June last. What, then, is the reason for this difference and disagreement which has led to the removal and dismissal of the Viceroy in full conduct of the Government policy? (Opposition cheers).

Mr. Attlee: Mr. Churchill knows very well that Lord Wavell was not appointed for a fixed term. As has been stated, it was thought that, in the changed phase of the Indian problem, it was the suitable time to make a change and I do not propose to add anything to that statement.

Mr. Churchill: May I ask, in that humility, because the House is entitled to a reasonable explanation, why this moment has been chosen for this momentous new departure? There must be some reasons. Is there any reason why it should be concealed from the House? Why should we not be told the truth? (Opposition cheers)

Mr. Attlee: I have already stated the reason (Opposition cries of "What reason?" and "No reason at all"). Wait a moment (the Prime Minister went on). I have already stated the reason in the statement I made that we regarded it as the suitable time to make a change owing to the changed phase of the Indian problem. I do not intend to say more than that. I am not aware of any precedent for such a request.

Mr. Churchill: What are the reasons which make this time appropriate to a change? There must be some reason. Surely the Prime Minister did not wake up one morning and say, "Oh, let us get another Viceroy". The Prime Minister must have some purpose or reason behind it and we have a right to know what that purpose or reason is. (This was greeted with loud shouts from Opposition benches which developed into a chorus of "answer, answer").

Mr. Clement Davies, Liberal Leader in the House of Commons, asked for assurance that there would be a full debate at the earliest possible moment. "Did the statement mean that Government had now fixed a definite date when they would transfer responsibility to the Government of India, whether or not agreement had been arrived at between the Congress and the Muslim League?"

Mr. Attlee: Government are perfectly willing and would, indeed, welcome a debate—a full debate on all these matters.

Mr. Churchill again rose and asked for some reasons why this "extremely important executive action" was taken. He said it must have been animated by some motive accessible to human intelligence.

Mr. Attlee retorted with obvious anger: When Mr. Churchill was Prime Minister he made a good many changes, both in military and civil appointments and I am not aware that he gave reasons for any of them. (Labour cheers).

Mr. Attlee added: I never understood that he thought that an obligation on him to come to the House and explain why the changes were made.

Mr. Churchill, as excitement and uproar mounted in the House, answered: "Here we are dealing with a great policy. Are we not dealing with an officer, who has been serving Government in the most intimate relations and who is now dismissed? May we not know what the differences are which have arisen to lead to his dismissal and appointment of another? Surely, this is a matter which, in all the history of either Houses of Parliament, has never been denied."

Sir John Anderson, former Governor of Bengal, brought the House back to a quieter atmosphere by asking whether Mr. Attlee did not appreciate the extreme complexities of the issues involved and the utter impossibility of dealing with them in an orderly fashion within a fixed time-limit in the presence of so many uncertain and unknown factors, including the uncertainty which must continue for a long period. Would it in fact be possible to hand over responsibility to an authority capable of dealing with India as a whole?

Mr. Attlee: He is quite right about uncertainty. And one of the reasons for this statement is to try and remove that uncertainty which has continued, despite all our declarations. People are still thinking they can hang on and let things drift. We are against drift. We want definite action.

Conservatives laughed jeeringly at this and there were many shouts of "scuttle", while Government members cheered the declaration.

Mr. Attlee, continuing, said: We want to bring this uncertainty to a close.

Sir J. Anderson: Mr. Attlee has not dealt with my point about the fixed

time-limit. How can that be reconciled with the uncertainty which must continue for a prolonged and unknown period?

Mr. Attlee: That is the reason we put in a date. I think this is a point which would be far better developed in a debate than in a question and answer.

Mr. Raymond Blackburn (Labour): Will Mr. Attlee make it plain that the British Government, while very anxious to fulfil the promise of Self-Government which the Coalition Government gave to India, does not seek to abandon all responsibility for the security of India?

Mr. Attlee seemed to hesitate with his answer and the Opposition loudly pressed him to meet the point.

Mr. Attlee said: No, I have made it perfectly plain. It has been our constant endeavour that we should obtain a settled Government in India. You cannot obtain that by long continued uncertainty. It is the policy of this country and I think of this House, that Indians should become responsible for their own Government. I think it is time they faced up to the fact of that situation.

Mr. Richard Butler (Conservative), former Under-Secretary for India, asked: Was it Government's intention to bring legislation before the House before June 1948 and did that not give very much less than a year for all the difficulties to be resolved? If they were not resolved, was it still the intention to go ahead and hand over power to small units without proper consideration of a Central Government and, in fact, hand over India to chaos?

There was renewed uproar and **Mr. Attlee** declared hotly: It is not the intention to hand over India to chaos. I think these points can much better be developed in a debate.

Mr. Churchill: Is no answer to be given to the question whether there has been any differences or divergences (uproar from Government benches) between the Government and the Viceroy?

In spite of repeated shouts of, "answer, answer" from Conservative benches, the Prime Minister did not reply.

At this point, the Deputy Speaker intervened to say that the matter could now well await the promised debate.

Mr. Henderson Stewart (Liberal National): I would like to ask a question which has nothing to do with this matter. Does the Prime Minister realise that his reluctance to answer a reasonable.....(shouts of "Order" from Government benches).

The Deputy Speaker, again, intervened to end the discussion. But, amid further derisive cheers from Government, **Mr. Henderson Stewart** held his ground: "I want to ask a fresh point. Does not the Prime Minister's refusal on a point of order to answer indicate that this must lead to the view that sharp differences of opinion have arisen? (Opposition cheers). Are we to understand that the Viceroy, Lord Wavell, is to be permitted or not to make a public statement?" (Conservative cheers and shouts of "Answer")

Amidst further uproar, **Mr. William Gallacher (Communist)** rose to ask whether it was in keeping with the Rules of Order and Procedure of the House that the Leader of the Opposition could ask a question 15 times and the Leader of the Communists could not ask one simple question (Loud laughter). Was it not possible to ask, in view of the question raised by the Leader of the Opposition, if no Labour member or Trade Union leader was considered for this important appointment? (Loud laughter)

There was no answer.

Mr. Churchill: I submit that I am entitled to ask a question on this momentous statement. Cannot the Prime Minister tell us whether Lord Wavell is to be permitted to make a statement on his position?

Mr. Attlee still made no reply.

Mr. Will Nally (Labour) asked why whenever an important statement was made from the front bench, which involved matters in which all members of the House were vitally interested, time and again, an overwhelming part of the time available was taken up by **Mr. Churchill**.

There were cheers and counter-cheers at this.

Mr. Nally, continuing, said that **Mr. Churchill** rose from his seat with no look to the chair. Was that kind of thing to be continued?

Lord Winterton (Conservative): That is a reflection on the Chair.

The Deputy Speaker said that he thought it would be better if Mr. Nally repeated his question when the Speaker (Col. Douglas Clifton Brown) was in the Chair. The House then proceeded to the ordinary business on the day.

Pethick Lawrence Defends H. M. G.'s decision

House of Lords—London—25th. February 1947

Lord Pethick Lawrence, Secretary of State for India, in the House of Lords on the 25th. February 1947 appealed to the Conservatives not to defeat the Government when the House of Lords debated a motion critical of last week's White Paper setting a date for the transfer of power in India.

"If you should decide to carry this motion to a division and that division goes against the Government", he told Conservative Peers—who outnumber Labour Peers by 10 to 1—"it would considerably weaken our means of effecting our desires in India and very likely weaken the very purposes of which Viscount Templewood spoke".

Viscount Templewood (Conservative) opened the two-day debate on India by moving the following resolution in an unusually crowded House:

"This decision of the British Government to hand over India to an Indian Government or Governments in June, 1948, under conditions which appear to be in conflict with previous declarations of the Government on this subject and without any provision for the protection of minorities or discharge of their other obligations is likely to imperil the peace and prosperity of India."

Viscount Templewood described the Government statement as "unconditional surrender at the expense of many to whom we have given specific pledges for generations past," which would lead to a "division of India under the worst possible circumstances.

Lord Samuel, Leader of the Liberal Party, criticised the Tory motion and then Pethick-Lawrence rose in a crowded House. After paying a tribute to Lord Wavell, he said a new stage had been reached in the progress towards India's freedom "when, as it were, the balance has begun to tilt." Had Britain tried to restore the old position of complete control, it would have meant a staying in India for ten, fifteen or more years. But the Government had fixed June, 1948, as the date to impress the Government's sincerity on the Indian parties and also the sense of urgency of their finding solutions to their own differences.

Lord Pethick-Lawrence refused to anticipate what the Government would do when the time came for legislation in Parliament to carry out the Government's intentions, and he wanted to see the effect of the British declaration in India first. "If it does not achieve its purpose we shall have to take another course of action. I cannot say here and now that this and that will be done until I can judge which will be the most appropriate action."

With a date for British withdrawal announced, Lord Pethick-Lawrence said, there would be ample time for the main decisions and agreements to be reached between the Indian parties and for a great deal of details to be filled in. "If the task is not fully accomplished it will be possible for Britain to hand over power to a Provisional Government which can accomplish the remaining part of the task."

Most of the Conservative speakers during the debate, including the Earl of Munster, former Under-Secretary for India, the Earl of Selborne and the Earl of Scarborough, former Governor of Bombay, did not think that the fixing of a date would bring an agreement in India between Hindus and Muslims.

Replying to the debate, Lord Listowel, the Postmaster-General and former Under-Secretary for India, submitted that there was no satisfactory alternative to the Government's policy. "We do not forget what happened in Ireland and that the worst results came from a policy that gave too little and too late", he declared. The debate was then adjourned until the next day.

Second Day—House of Lords—London—26th. February 1947

At the end of the second day's debate on India in the House of Lords, acceding to appeals by Lord Halifax and the Archbishop of Canterbury, Lord Templewood withdrew his motion, criticising the Government's announcement of February 20, and there was therefore no vote. During yesterday's debate, Lord Pethick Lawrence had appealed to the Tory Peers, who are in a vast majority in the House, not to press the motion to a division and defeat the Government.

Lord Halifax, former Viceroy of India, told the House that he would find it

difficult to support Lord Templewood to a division and urged it would be possible to avoid one. "If this chapter of Indian history has to come to a close", he told a crowded House, "there is no better way of closing it than by offering to assist India's passage to a new order, and that would be the spirit of the message I would like to see this House send to India to-night".

Lord Jowitt, Lord Chancellor, making an interim reply for the Government, said he would like to say "ditto" to what Lord Halifax had just declared.

Lord Jowitt also announced, amidst applause, that it is the Government's "intention to withdraw our troops when the transfer of power takes place, for under no circumstances may British troops be placed under the control of the new Indian authority or any authority not responsible to this Parliament."

This afternoon's debate was opened by *Lord Simon* (Liberal) speaking on the motion put yesterday by Lord Templewood that transfer of power to India by June, 1948 "is likely to imperil the peace and prosperity of India."

Lord Simon said he thought it "a grave mistake" to think they were dealing with a problem similar to the granting of Self-government to South Africa and Eire. Then they were dealing with homogeneous peoples, he said. If no settlement had been reached by the date fixed "would they (the Cabinet) dream of handing the Government of India over to Pandit Nehru?" he asked.

In his reply *Lord Jowitt* said he knew that the Government was taking a very grave risk, but the true path of statesmanship to-day was not to attempt to avoid risks. The Government had come to the conclusion that it was a right risk to take. He did not regard this as a breaking up of the British Commonwealth. "The Commonwealth will survive not on force but on reason, not on violence but on persuasion," he declared.

Lord Cranborne, winding up for the Opposition, said that his first impulse was to divide the House on this issue and make the Opposition view known in no uncertain fashion, but he was impressed by the appeals made that the vote might be misunderstood in India and might be taken to mean difference to the ultimate object which Britain sought to obtain. That would be deplorable. Lord Cranborne declared that the Opposition would never have departed from the position of the Cripps offer that there must be prior agreement between the two parties before there was a major constitutional advance.

Replying to the debate, *Viscount Addison*, Dominion Secretary, said that some of the Opposition members found it difficult to forget their past. Labour believed in self-government in the same way as the great statesman, Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman, when he carried out "one of the greatest acts in British history" by giving self-government to South-Africa. He could not think of a better defence for Government's action than that provided by Lord Halifax "out of his vast experience in India, who knows the realities behind the present situation with the immense strength of the nationalist spirit". The debate then ended.

British Cannot Prolong Stay in India

Cripps Defends Decision to Withdraw

House of Commons—London—5th March 1947

Sir Stafford Cripps rose in a crowded House to move the resolution standing in the name of the Prime Minister, Mr. A. V. Alexander, Mr. Arthur Henderson and himself "that this House takes note of the statement on India made on February 20 by the Prime Minister and approves the policy set out therein."

On February 20, the Government announced its intention to transfer power into responsible Indian hands not later than June 1948.

Sir Stafford Cripps said: "The recent statement of the British Government on India has rightly been received as one of greatest importance not only to this country and to India but to the whole future of orderly and peaceful Government of the world.

"It is not necessary for me to recapitulate in detail the various stages in our long history of association with the Indian people throughout which we have travelled constantly, though with varying speed, towards the final and inevitable stage of Indian self-government.

"The British people have, by precept and example, done much to inspire Indians to go forward to achieve their own self-governing democracy. Strange though it may now seem, an English man, Mr. Hume, who has been called the Father of the Indian Congress, largely inspired that body in its origins in 1885

when first it was established. Our own constant reiteration of the advantages of free methods of democratic government have certainly encouraged Indians in the development of their own nationalist ideals.

"Even before the war, in the years preceding the Act of 1935 the tempo of advance towards self-government had accelerated and a very marked forward step was taken with the setting up of democratic self-government in the provinces under the provisions of that Act.

"Not unexpectedly, and indeed according to rules in these matters, the very fact of gradual extended powers of self-government in itself brought about a demand for further acceleration"

APPETITE FOR SELF-GOVERNMENT

Sir Stafford Cripps then quoted in French 'Appetite comes with eating.' He continued: "That appetite was developing rapidly before the war and unfortunately led to many sharp differences between the British Government and the people of India.

"When the war came to an end, stability and our continued control of India was obviously threatened. In the circumstances of the war, the keen Indian nationalist saw an opportunity to expedite the process which seemed to him unduly slow. As in so many other countries, in this war, after following the same line of the first world war, an appeal to fight for democracy and freedom awakened a strong echo and desire for their own freedom amongst the ranks of the nationalists in India.

"At the same time that these ideological arguments were favouring the rise of nationalism, the circumstances of the situation made it more and more difficult, even if we desired to do so, to continue with the resource and control which has been available to us.

"Only it seemed hardly logical and sensible that where freedom had been promised steps should be taken to restrain advance towards that freedom, and so, it was with the consent of all parties in this country that our policy for transfer of power in India to Indians developed under the wartime Government.

"Both the statement of 1940 and the offer of 1942 quickened this process of transfer of power. The substance of the offer of 1940 was recapitulated by the then Prime Minister in his statement to the House on March 11, 1942, when he announced the going of a mission to India on this matter."

Mr. Winston Churchill, Leader of the Opposition, sitting on the Front Opposition Bench, had been commenting loudly to his colleagues during Sir Stafford Cripps' speech.

Sir Stafford Cripps turned to him and said: "Would it be possible for him not to talk so loud?"

Continuing, Sir Stafford quoted from the statement by the then Prime Minister. He said it carried nothing short of a promise that as soon as possible after the war, India should attain full Dominion Status in full freedom and equality with this country and other Dominions under a constitution to be framed by Indians through agreement between themselves and acceptable to the main elements of Indian national life. This was, of course, subject to the fulfilment of Britain's obligations for the protection of the minorities and securing fulfilment of lesser matters arising out of her long association with India.

Proceeding, he said: "Although in 1940 it was still assumed that self-government would be granted within the Commonwealth in 1942 with the full acquiescence of the then Cabinet it was publicly stated that the Indian people were entitled to elect to go out of the Commonwealth if they so desired.

CRIPPS' OFFER RECALLED

"The 1942 offer was the basis of the setting up of a Constituent Assembly immediately after the war and subject to agreement between the major parties, but in effect it promised that Indian independence should be realised as soon as the Assembly had completed its deliberation. There was thus set a time limit upon our continued control of India. So far as we were concerned what should be the length of that term was left in the hands of Indians themselves to decide. This offer contemplated that if the two major communities could not reach agreement, then it might become necessary to divide India between them.

"The possibility of a division of India failing, agreement between the two major communities was thus put forward publicly by the British Government and proper protection of the minorities was made a condition of transfer of power as was indeed the negotiation of a treaty as to conditions of transfer.

"I will read some of these words: 'The British Government undertake to

accept and implement forthwith a constitution, so framed (that is by the Constituent Assembly) subject only to (1) The right of any province of British India which is not prepared to accept the new constitution, to retain its present constitutional position, provision being made for its subsequent accession if it so desired. With such non-acceding provinces as so desire, the British Government will be prepared to agree upon a new constitution giving them the same full status as the Indian Union and arrived at by a procedure analogous to that laid down."

"A second reservation was due to the signing of a Treaty which would be negotiated between the British Government and the Constitution-making body.

"This body will cover all necessary matters arising out of the complete transfer of responsibility from the British to Indian hands.

"It will make provision in accordance with the undertakings given by the Government for the protection of racial and religious minorities; it will not impose any restriction on the power of the Indian Union, to decide in future its relationship to other members of the Commonwealth."

"Although this statement and offer were not effective in bringing about an agreement between Indian communities, it did, nevertheless, have the effect of encouraging all parties in India to look for an early realisation of their freedom either by the path of a unitary Central Government or the path of a possible division.

"The major community did express impatience at what was regarded as a continued veto by the minorities and they blamed that reservation upon the British Government. The impatience led to a widespread civil disobedience movement which occurred in the autumn of 1942 and to drastic action to suppress that movement. But there were also other factors at work.

"The exigencies of the war situation were such that it was not possible for the British Government to continue with the recruitment of Europeans for the Secretary of State's services, while at the same time there was, of course, great increase in the Indian forces accompanied by rapid Indianisation of the officer cadre.

"This meant that side by side with the growing demand for an acceleration of transfer of power on the part of all parties in India, there was obvious and unavoidable weakening of the machinery of British control that is, control of the Secretary of State's services. It was, of course, through these services that British control had been exercised in the administration of Indian affairs.

"After the offer of 1943 had been rejected, it was repeatedly stated that it would remain open for acceptance. There was continued prospect of the Constituent Assembly meeting immediately after the war."

Sir Stafford Cripps said: "In the last resort, British responsibility was exercised through the Governor-General and Governors who could dismiss Indian Governments in the Provinces and themselves take over control, using for that purpose as the main support of their administration the Secretary of State's Services who looked to the British rather than to Indians for their future advancement, livelihood, and pensions."

Referring to the Secretary of State's services, Sir Stafford said: "It was not thought possible to reinforce the Services because of war circumstances. They were manned by both Indians and Europeans and at the end of the war there were a considerable number of time-expired officers who were being kept on by war emergency regulations."

"All these officers, Europeans and Indians alike, were most loyal in their service", said Sir Stafford Cripps, "but they were placed in an awkward position when Indian party leaders had clashed.

"After the change of Government in July 1945, it became abundantly clear that Indian public opinion was in the main against further recruitment for the Indian services and later urged the winding up of the services altogether. In July, 1946, it was decided to abandon any further recruitment and when the present Government came into office it found itself already committed to this.

"Provincial elections were arranged and since then new democratic provincial Governments have come into office for the first time."

"Even before these elections were concluded, the Cabinet Mission had left for India. By this time there had been a serious deterioration in Indo-British relations so that the first job of the Cabinet Mission was to convince Indians of the sincerity of intention of the British people and nothing contributed more to the

improvement in the relations that subsequently took place than the Prime Minister's statement in this House on March 15 last.

MINORITY VETO

"A resolution of the Indian problem was not then possible in the view of the extension which existed between the communities and so long as the minority could thwart the majority at every turn by exercising a veto which we are prepared to accept as absolute, there did not seem to be any solution."

Quoting the Prime Minister's statement, Sir Stafford Cripps said: "That made it clear, I think, for the first time, that the majority could not be indefinitely held up by the minority but on the other hand the majority would have to take fully into account the position of the minorities."

After quoting the Prime Minister further on the minority question, Sir Stafford Cripps said: "I quote that passage to make it clear that it was definitely stated that protection for the minorities must fall within the Indian constitution and could not come from outside."

"That statement met, I think, with almost unanimous approval both in Parliament and the country."

"When the Cabinet Mission left for India, the idea that this country was not sincere in its desires to see Indian self-government speedily realised had largely disappeared. During this period, between July 1945, when the present Government came into office, and July 1946 when the Cabinet Mission returned from India, it would have been most undesirable, and indeed wrong, to have restarted European recruitment to the Secretary of State's Services."

FORMATION OF INTERIM GOVERNMENT

"I can imagine no action which would more certainly have convinced Indians of our lack of sincerity if with one hand we had offered them self-government and with the other recruited Europeans to carry on the British raj. It would have rendered impossible the task of the Cabinet Mission which met with a considerable measure of success."

"At least very near agreement was reached on the scheme for a Constituent Assembly, something far nearer agreement than had ever been reached before. We had, as disinterested friends, succeeded in bringing the two major Indian parties nearer to each other."

"It is true that we had not succeeded so far as an Interim Government at the Centre was concerned, but the attempt was not for that reason abandoned and within a few months such a Government was at last formed—a thing which many people had considered to be quite impossible."

"Almost immediately after the Mission had left, some very unhelpful speeches were made by the Indian leaders which whipped up excitement already engendered by the complex and long-drawn-out negotiations and by the ever-nearing prospect of power passing into Indian hands and this brought about a sharpening of the communal conflict in the country which most unfortunately and disastrously led to the breaking out of mass violence in Bengal, Bihar and Bombay."

"At this time there were Indian party Governments in the provinces responsible to their Legislative Assemblies and a Coalition Indian Government at the Centre and one of the first questions taken up by these Governments last autumn was discontinuance of the Secretary of State's services. They felt that if they were to be responsible for the future administration of India within some reasonable period of time, the sooner the dual loyalty to the Secretary of State and the Indian Governments was brought to an end the sooner they would be able to settle down to a stable form of administration which would accord with the future state of India."

"When the Cabinet Mission was in India, we had naturally discussed this problem of the services and their automatic running down with those responsible for their maintenance and we had then explored the possibility of their temporary reinforcement."

"It was made clear to us and we accepted and took responsibility for acceptance of the proposition that no short-term scheme could yield effective or valuable results since a crucial period was immediately ahead and that for that period new or emergency entrants could contribute little especially in the very difficult and tangled political atmosphere that then existed."

"This committed us to continuation with the existing services under conditions, so far as the Indian personnel were concerned, such as I have already described."

BRITISH FORCES IN INDIA REDUCED

"We are, of course at the same time, demobilising the British armed forces as rapidly as was possible under heavy pressure from all sides of the House and that meant that the number of British troops which could be left in India and the East was being rapidly diminished from the war-time level.

"At the same time Indianisation of the Indian Army was proceeding rapidly, latterly, under the directions of the Indian Defence Member of the Viceroy's Executive.

"It was, in these circumstances, after the decision of the Muslim League not to join in the Constituent Assembly and their failure to reverse their decision on entering the Interim Government, that we invited their representatives and those of the Congress to come to this country with the Viceroy at the beginning of December last.

"Though the conversations that ensued produced no decisive result, we hoped that they might result in a lessening of the differences between the two communities and make it easier for the Muslim League, which was the only British Indian element then standing out, to join the Constituent Assembly.

"As a result of this meeting, we put out our statement of December 6 last and there can be no doubt that as a result of that statement there was a narrowing of the gap between the two parties.

"The Congress accepted that statement but included within their resolution of acceptance of words, which the Muslim League considered still to contain reservations.

"It is no doubt unfortunate and certainly unpremeditated that just at the moment when the Muslim League were about to consider the situation at Karachi, events in the Punjab boiled up leading to a clash between the non-Muslim League Punjab Government and the Muslim League. I am happy to see that some accommodation has been wisely reached in this matter.

"This is just another one of these factors that make it so difficult to predict the course of events in so complex a situation as exists politically in India to-day.

"But however difficult a prediction may be, facts have to be faced and dealt with when they arise.

"At the end of January, almost contemporaneously with the refusal of the Muslim League to reconsider their position in relation to the Constituent Assembly as a result of the Congress resolution upon the British Government's statement of December 6, came the demand by non-Muslim League members of the Viceroy's Executive that the Muslim League members should withdraw from the Executive.

"This demand was based upon the proposition that Muslim League representatives had been invited to join the Viceroy's Executive on the basis of the Muslim League taking its part in the Constituent Assembly. This proposition accorded with the facts of the case and had at the time of invitation been communicated by the Viceroy to the Leader of the Congress. It is true that in their acceptance of office in the Executive the Muslim League did not expressly accept this condition, but it was assumed by those concerned that as they had not repudiated it they would be bound by it.

"Whatever may be the rights or wrongs of this position, it does not seem to the British Government to be wise to precipitate a decision upon it so long as there is any hope of all parties meeting in the Constituent Assembly.

"It was in these circumstances which I have thought it necessary to detail at some length, that the British Government had to consider what action they should take to smooth out the difficulties of transfer of power in India.

"This was very difficult decision to take. It seemed essential that we should not lose the initiative and that we should not hesitate or adopt a policy of indecision. There is, I believe, nothing worse in such a situation than temporising or delaying for the sake of delay. What then were the alternatives which faced us? There were fundamentally two alternatives, though both might be subject to minor variations. First we could attempt to strengthen British control in India on the basis of expanded personnel in the Secretary of State's services and considerable reinforcement of British troops so that we should be in a position to maintain for as long as might be necessary our administrative responsibility while awaiting agreement among the Indian communities.

"Such a policy would entail a definite decision that we should remain in India for at least 15 to 20 years, because for any substantially shorter period we should not be able to reorganise the services on a stable and sound basis. The length of the period necessary would be determined by the consideration that the Indian members of the Secretary of State's and other administrative services should

look to us for their future career and prospects rather than to Indian leaders to whom we should undoubtedly find ourselves in opposition if such a policy were pursued. *Sir Stafford Cripps* said that secondly, they could accept the fact that the first alternative was not possible and a further attempt to persuade Indians to come together while at the same time warning them that there was a limit of time during which they were prepared to maintain their responsibility while awaiting an agreement. One thing that was quite obviously impossible was to decide to continue our responsibility indefinitely and, indeed, against our own wishes, into a period when we had not the power to carry it out. These were the alternatives and the only alternatives open to us.

"In pointing out these two alternatives, I must refer to the opinions expressed by the two noble Lords who have both had long experience as Viceroys of India. Both of them, one speaking recently in the House of Lords and the other speaking a few months ago, have stressed the reality of these two alternatives and have stated that in their view there is no third alternative.

"Though neither of them proposes to like either alternative, they are both driven to the conclusion that we must choose between them and the very remarkable speech of *Lord Halifax* makes it clear why we cannot oppose the decision arrived at by the British Government."

Sir Stafford Cripps said: "Government had no hesitation in putting the first alternative aside. It would be contrary to all we have said and to the policy of this country, to prolong our stay in India for more than a decade against the wishes of Indians and there can be no doubt that it would be against their wishes. It would be politically impracticable, both from the national and international point of view and would arouse the most bitter animosity of all parties in India. Even if we have been prepared to make available the extra troops that would be required to deal with the opposition by the Indian people, it is certain that the people in this country—short as are of manpower—would not have consented to prolonged stationing of large bodies of British troops in India for a purpose which was not consistent with our expressed desire that India should achieve self-government at as early a date as possible. There can be no doubt that such a decision would have been met by the hostility of all Indian communities as indeed has been shown by their favourable reaction to the Government's statement and we should, therefore, have had to rule India through the Governor-General and the Governors without any representative Indian Governments.

"We were, therefore, left with the other alternative and we had to consider the form in which that alternative should be expressed, consistently with our previous promises and particularly the time limit we should set beyond which we could no longer be reasonably asked to accept responsibility for the Government of India for reasons I have already stated.

"It will be remembered that it had already been decided at an earlier date, as I have mentioned that it was impossible to alter the situation by building up again the Secretary of State's services for a temporary period. We were, therefore, faced with adopting the first alternative of re-establishing the services for a term of years or to specify some terminal date beyond which we should not be willing to continue our responsibilities."

Saying that he had so far dealt with this problem from the British point of view, *Sir Stafford Cripps* added: "But we were, of course, equally concerned to do our very best to help India and to enter upon the new phase of our long association with that great continental area in a way that was worthy of our people and of the enlightened policy that we had followed.

"We were, therefore, determined to pursue our co-operation with the Indian communities and to make every effort to assist them to come to an accommodation. We took the view that the fixing of a definite term, during which they must either come to agreement to set up a united independent Government for all India or else break up the country into smaller and weaker units, should provide the strongest inducement to them to sink the differences and to act together.

"It seemed to us that as it was clearly impossible for us to contemplate an indefinite stay in India under constant pressure to side with one party or other in communal disputes, we must in fairness tell all parties when the time would arrive by which they must have settled their own differences or risk clash of forces and communities in which we should take no part.

"It is not right that we should allow ourselves to be put in the position of imposing the will of one community upon the other by exercise of force. The facts of the situation are hard and difficult, but they must be faced and

they flow, as I have tried to the House, not from some sudden and hurried decision, but from the whole historical development of the Indian situation. On more than one occasion I have pointed out to the House that we are making a tremendous experiment in methods of peaceful progress in attempting to hand over power in a continent of 400,000,000 people without use of violence. In the course of that great final stage of experiment we have constantly taken the right step. I do not think that any of us would claim that we have always been right, but we have nevertheless, done our best and we have gone a long way in the direction upon which we are all agreed and have now reached the final and most critical stage."

On the subject of risks, Sir Stafford Cripps continued: "We still have to take risks as to the effect of our actions both upon ourselves, upon India and upon the rest of the world. But there are two principles by which I am convinced that we should be guided. We must not let fear of difficulties prevent us from doing what we believe to be right and we must not fail ourselves or India through lack of decision at a critical moment. In giving up our control of India we want to do our utmost to help Indians of all parties and communities through these final stages of the realisation of their freedom."

Sir Stafford Cripps continued: "We therefore, decided to state frankly and openly to Indians the latest date till which we can reasonably be asked to accept responsibility for the Government of India in order that they might have an opportunity, to which they are entitled, to arrange how best they shall prepare themselves for that time. We might have set a time to carry through the constitution-making but that would not have conveyed the same sense of urgency, nor indeed if the Indian communities failed to agree could we have been in any way certain that we should be able to discharge our responsibilities after the date named. We arrived at the decision as to the date upon the best advice that we could obtain. The fixing of the date of June 1948 constitutes, therefore, an honest and frank acceptance of the facts of the situation and we are convinced that if the Indian parties at once set themselves to the task they can arrive at a decision upon their new constitution by the date named or at least agree upon an Interim National Government to which we can hand over power by that time."

"The House will appreciate that there are certain inescapable facts arising out of past circumstances which must condition our action to-day and it is of no use wishing that they were other than they are. They must be faced and it is in the light of these facts that we must reach our decisions."

"There will, I have no doubt, be a number of questions as to the form of the statement and as to its effect upon the different sections of the Indian peoples. And I will try and deal with one or two of the most important before I conclude."

Dealing with the Indian States first, Sir Stafford Cripps said: "As we have repeatedly stated, there is no intention of handing off our rights and obligations under paramountcy to anyone else. When we transfer power in British India these rights and obligations of paramountcy will lapse. We are very glad to see that beginnings of agreement have been reached between representatives of the Princes and members of the Constituent Assembly."

"We have envisaged in the statement that some States might wish in these final stages of paramountcy to adjust or modify their position *vis-a-vis* the Paramount Power and we have stated that we are prepared to agree to such modifications where they are necessary and reasonable. Such modifications will not, of course, in any way determine the future relationship of the States to the rest of India. It is purely a matter of transitional convenience."

Sir Stafford said: "The next question arises out of para 10 of the Statement. It has been stated by some that this paragraph is unduly vague. To whom, it is asked, do we hand over power if by the due date a new Central Government for all British India has not been constituted by a fully representative Constituent Assembly. We shall do all in our power to encourage the formation of such a Government as put forward by the Cabinet Mission and in accordance with the procedure suggested by them. If this proves impossible of realisation and there is no such Central Government in being or in prospect when the time comes for decision, then we shall be forced to choose in the light of circumstances existing at the time of our decision, the most appropriate Government or Governments to which to hand over power. We have said in our statement that it might be the then existing Provincial Governments as was suggested in the offer of 1942 or it might be some form of combined Government for parts of India depending upon what seems best and most helpful for the future of India."

"In our statement of December 6 we stressed the fact that if a large section of the Indian population had not been fully represented in the Constituent Assembly we could not accept the forcing of unwilling provinces into a United Indian Government if they have not been represented in the making of the constitution. To that principle, which has the assent of the Congress we understand we adhere and if it should evaluate that a large group of provinces—but not all—agree upon the form of constitution then it may be necessary to hand over separately in areas which have not been fully represented.

"We shall have to consider in what way this can best be done to meet the best interests of the Indian people. The position is, however, sufficiently uncertain at this stage to make it impossible now to forecast what will be the wisest action to take when the time comes to make a decision. The only way to remove this uncertainty is to get agreement of the Indian communities as to what it is they wish us to do. We can hardly be accused of vagueness or uncertainty when the Indian communities themselves cannot come to any common agreement.

"About the minorities, Sir Stafford Cripps declared: 'What I have already said covered to some degree the position as to the minorities and their protection. But in addition to that there are provisions which the Cabinet Mission laid down in accordance with the promise of the Prime Minister on March 15 last that this matter should so far we could influence it, be dealt with in the new constitution. The minorities Commission which has now been set up to advise the Constituent Assembly as to the proper measures of protection to be incorporated into the Constitution will we hope and expect make full provision for minority protection.

"It is to be noted that all the minorities are represented in the Constituent Assembly and the Minorities Commission, the only gap is that left by the Muslim League, who would not thank anybody for calling them a minority. We believe that judging by the way matters are proceeding there will be ample protection of the minorities in the new Indian constitution. That is the only way in which effective protection can be given for they must ultimately rely upon the tolerance of their own fellow Indians for their safety and freedom. There will be nothing any outside Power can do if there is intolerance or unfair treatment.

Dealing with future relationships between Britain and India, Sir Stafford Cripps declared: "There is one further question which must, I am sure, be to the mind of every member of this House and that is what of the future relationship between Great Britain and India.

"Government have always stressed the fact that we in this country would welcome India as a partner in the British Commonwealth of Nations but we have equally emphasised the point that we do not seek unwilling partners. If the Indian people wish it, we shall be only too glad to see them associated with the British Commonwealth of Nations and we believe that from that association they like ourselves and other Dominions, would derive great benefit. But there is something more important and precious than any such formal association, that is, continued friendship between the two countries which cannot grow and flower in an atmosphere of distrust.

"Friendship must be freely given and not forced or held by chains of power. It has always seemed to me a profound mistake to believe that we could accomplish mutually advantageous relationship with India by continuing our control over that country against the will of the people in however modified form.

"The only true basis for our future friendship is absolute freedom of choice on both sides and I believe that this latest statement of the British Government marks the final clearing away of those influences which have militated against full and free friendship in the past and that it is therefore a great and valuable step to our continued, close and friendly relations with a Free India of the future. Most statesmanlike views have been expressed by Pandit Nehru and others and with this good feeling between the Indian and the British people I trust statesmanship may find ways and means to bring about agreement between the Indian communities.

"It must be obvious, I think, to anyone who objectively studies the present situation that there is really only one way in which all these various difficulties can be overcome and that is by cooperation of the Indian parties. It is their problem and for it they alone can find a solution.

"We shall continue during the time that we remain in India to do all we can to assist and we believe that this latest statement that we have made of our intentions will do something to help to bring the Indian communities and their leaders face to face

with the realities of the situation and the urgent necessity for their coming to a decision amongst themselves. Time is short and the matter brooks no delay. These next few weeks and months must be decisive of the future of India and the happiness of its 400,000,000 inhabitants. Whatever may have been the misunderstandings and differences that have divided Indians and the British Government over the past few years, and whoever may have been at fault, we have now made it abundantly and inescapably clear that we intend by June 1948 to withdraw our control of India in favour of that freedom which Indians of all communities have persistently demanded.

"During the next 16 months we have agreed to remain, while they reach their final decisions which must, as I have said, determine the future fate of the Indian people for better or for worse.

In conclusion, Sir Stafford Cripps said: "Our policy and action has been based upon acceptance of the Indian claim that they are worthy and fit for Self-Government and anyone who has the privilege of knowing their leaders would not for a moment doubt that claim. They have their own difficulties which are indeed great; they too find themselves enmeshed and entangled in the skein of their own historical development.

"It is only by acts of real statesmanship on all sides that they can free themselves from their own internal antagonisms. Their problems cannot, I am convinced, be solved by use of force nor stable future can be built on foundations of civil strife. I would, therefore, urge upon Indian leaders with all the force and sincerity at my command that they should seize this, the last and greatest opportunity for supreme statesmanship through which they may bring happiness and prosperity to their own people and may show the world that they can not only solve their own internal problem but can also make a great contribution to world progress.

"Over the last year, they have, despite all difficulties and bitter feelings, come much closer to agreement upon how the future constitution of India shall be worked out than ever before. Both sides have moved forward to meet one another but each much still make a small advance to meet the other.

"Now is the time when the wider good of all India, throughout which both the communities are widely dispersed, must make precedence to narrower claims, over all-gle communities or single parts of that great continental area.

"If only they will come together in both the Constituent Assembly and the interim Government with determination while respecting one another's rightful claims to co-operate in the working out of the new constitution in a form suitable to the diversity of their religions and races, they will avoid the horror and tragedy of internal strife and allow her to develop her great resources through peace into prosperity to the unending benefit of all her peoples, whether Hindus or Muslims."

SIR JOHN ANDERSON'S CRITICISM

The chief Opposition speaker to day, *Sir John Anderson*, former Governor of Bengal, began by saying that deeply as he disagreed with many aspects of the present Government's policy, he took no pleasure in attacking them unnecessarily. In particular, he had no desire to attack the present Prime Minister Mr. Clement Attlee who, he believed, identified himself in a very special sense, with the policy that was being discussed to day. He had worked with the Prime Minister during the years of Coalition and on the problems of India and he knew very well how much thought he had given to these problems.

"I know how enthusiastic has been his desire for a happy issue over the grave difficulties regarding India, quite apart from the heavy burden he is carrying at the present time," Sir John Anderson added.

Recalling that last December he had described as a "cardinal blunder" the handing over for practical purposes the executive powers to representative bodies without being first assured that steady progress had been made towards a satisfactory constitutional settlement, Sir John Anderson declared: "I think and believe it my duty to say frankly that the British Government are making even a greater blunder now". All were agreed on the ultimate objective in India (appliance) but success should not be hurried unduly.

"What I disagree sharply with the British Government is in fixing a definite and final date for handing over power", he declared. He could not understand how anyone, however gifted or inspired, could say he was going to carry through in a satisfactory fashion the series of processes still undetermined and indeterminate by any fixed date.

Answering the argument that you must bring the people up sharply to a sense of reality and the people would be made to realise as never before that the policy of drift could not go on indefinitely, Sir John wondered whether those were not right who said that the argument might be more likely to work in the opposite direction. It held up a definite prospect to the party that if they could only dig their toes in the stand fast and endure patiently a point of time would be reached at which they would be free to pursue their own courses.

He continued: "The other argument is a terrible one. It was in effect that our position in India is deteriorating so rapidly that we cannot hope to carry on with any satisfaction to ourselves or anyone else after 1948.

"If we were certain that we should be able to hand over powers and responsibilities to a single authority the matter would be comparatively simple but when you have to contemplate, as Sir Stafford Cripps made quite clear, that the British Government do contemplate, a contingency that instead of undertaking the simple task of handing over powers to one successor Government you have to hand them over to a number of separate authorities indeterminate in number and in composition, the matter is entirely different.

Sir John Anderson continued: "I will be something that has never been undertaken before anywhere in the world.

"It would be difficult enough if we knew now exactly what the alternative units were to be, but we do not know. Can any Minister tell the House exactly what will be the units in whom power will be transferred if a single authority cannot be found by agreement to whom we can hand over? Of course the Minister cannot.

"What has to be included in his programme of breaking up and transferring? You have judicially a very important element in the Government in the widest sense in India—the judiciary which has been our pride and India's pride—that has to be somehow or other divided with all necessary provision for subordinate courts, the High Court of Judicature, appeals and so on. The revenue services will have to be sub-divided. How are rail-roads going to be dealt with?

"There is the whole question of defence with which communication are vitally bound up. Is India's defence, after we go, not to be provided for? If we are to transfer to a single authority, that is comparatively a simple matter, but how are we to ensure if India has to be broken up that each unit shall be provided by a fixed date with adequate defence services? What about defence against a possible attack by sea? If India is going to be decided, what are we going to do about that?"

Sir John said that the problem had to be faced. It really would not do to talk airily about handing over to a Provincial or interim Government. Whatever might be the Interim Government it would have to be provided with all the necessary organs—provision to the protection of individuals and communities—otherwise, there faces India nothing but red ruin and breaking up of laws." To say that all this was possible within a fixed time limit was surely "utterly irresponsible."

Listing other problems Sir John Anderson asked what about Assam, the problems of Western Bengal and Calcutta—a problem which put Dansig and all the rest in the shade.

The fixing of a date was throwing away the bargaining power which was needed to discharge certain solemn obligations. "People will only have to have patience and we will be out of the way.

"The British were pledged to hand over the power on three conditions—there should be an agreement among the Indians on the form of constitution; provision for carrying out the solemn pledges undertaken; and proper regard for the position of the Princes."

Sir John Anderson declared: "It is idle to talk about fundamental rights and equality of opportunity. What the minorities, in respect of whom we have given these pledges, desire is not equality; they desire and they have been given to understand that they will receive special protection—preferential treatment if you like." He said the pledges Britain had given should not be dismissed very lightly. "It is not a question of protecting these minorities against intolerance or unfair treatment."

The Muslims, for instance, were in relation to India as a whole a minority, said Sir John Anderson. In his opinion, the Muslims on the whole were pretty well able to look after themselves. Whether the British ought to derive comfort from that fact was another matter.

"I have very much in my mind something that one of those rugged warriors from the North-West said to a friend of mine. This warrior said: "What is this talk, Lord Sahib? Say the word and we will go down and deal with these talking folk." Sir John Anderson said that to quote that expression was not in any way to commend it, but they had to be realistic. The Sikhs, in his opinion, were in much the same case. They could look after themselves. Indian Christians and Anglo-Indians presented no great difficulty. They had been fused into a general community and were not politically-minded.

The position of the Depressed Classes was very difficult. There were 60,000,000 of them and they were widely scattered belonging to many different castes and different races. They had been given pledges of the most definite character.

Sir John Anderson added: "I have given them pledges myself. I thought I was justified in doing so. I have given them assurances anyhow. Their leader has come to me with tears in their eyes asking whether we were going to hand them over or whether they could count upon us for protection. I gave them the most positive assurance."

Mr. Woodrow Wyatt (Labour): Does Sir John Anderson mean that if it was not for the existence of the Scheduled Castes, it would be quite all right for Britain to leave India? Every other community is well able to look after itself."

Sir John Anderson: "I was coming to the tribal communities. They require protection of a different kind. The Scheduled Castes do not want equality. That is the last thing they would desire."

"The caste system in India is inter-woven into the structure of the Hindu system. The Depressed Castes and outcastes, strangely enough, often appear to be just as intent on preserving the essential features of the caste system as the High-class Hindus. This caste outlook of the Hindu, to whatever section he belongs, is not limited to this life and the doctrine of what is called Karma exercises a most powerful influence over Indian minds. One has to bear that in mind.

Sir John Anderson continued:

"What these people want is not temple-entry or the abolition of practices which we Westerners are inclined to regard as abuses not understanding them. They want assurances of educational facilities of which they can take advantage. They want assurances of a certain minimum representation in the legislative bodies, a certain representation in the services and professions.

"These are not things which can be secured to them in any charter of fundamental rights. They have to be the subject of a specific provision in legislative enactment. If we can ensure that a new India starts off with a provision on these lines there may be good reason to believe that such a provision will be allowed to stand. The tribal communities want something different. They want to be assured in the occupation of their land to be protected against exactions of the money-lender. I would not myself, provided we have the opportunity of dealing at reasonable leisure with these matters, expect any very grave difficulty in securing for these people to whom we are deeply pledged, the provisions that they require.

"For there are indeed, as I can testify, many high-minded generous and enlightened people among Caste Hindus who would be glad to take an active part in ensuring that such protection should be guaranteed to these unfortunate folk by having a provision made in law with which the new constitution starts off. We cannot do more.

Mr. Thomas Reid (Labour): "Will the law stop the warrior of Waziristan and the North-West from invading India?"

Sir John: "That is a question apart from the matter I am dealing with. Our pledges are not confined to minorities. We have also given pledges—and this is a point upon which I am particularly sensitive—to the services in India. Sir John said he was concerned to know just how these pledges, which did not extend only to the privileged class of the Secretary of State's services, but to the services as a whole, to all little people who had served the British Raj loyally, faithfully and were well going to be treated.

I think here too a fixed date is a severe handicap. The only jurisdiction for a fixed date is to be found in a chance, such as it may be, of thereby securing the maintenance of the unity in India. I think myself—I am sorry to have to say so—that the chance is so slight as to be almost negligible. I earnestly hope I may be wrong but to stake everything on such a chance is to gamble unjustifiably, Sir John continued.

There may be differences of opinion among us as individuals as to whether gambling is ever justified, but a gamble is unjustified, when the stakes are beyond

the means of a gambler and the stakes here are the lives and happiness of hundreds of millions. I take the view that it should have been quite unnecessary to bring this House or the people of this country up to the issue of a fixed date if the British Government had not during recent months neglected an elementary duty."

Dealing with the argument that it was impossible to carry on efficiently after 1948, Sir John Anderson said that he did not believe a serious weakening of the services should have been inevitable. It might have been inevitable after the Government made their first mistake—the handing over of power to representative Indians without being sure that a constitutional settlement would assuredly follow.

He still held the view that the Government had departed unjustifiably from the terms of the Government of India Act when they took that course. This was not a matter in which the opinion of the authorities in India should be regarded as conclusive because the sort of measures that might be taken were not necessarily within the purview of the Government of India at all.

On recruiting for the Indian Civil Service and the Indian Police, Sir John Anderson asked why should not a special service cadre be formed of people who in the first instance would go and serve in India and later be assigned to other services. That sort of experiment had been tried before. He refuted the argument that in India one needed trained men and that a trained man needed five years before he was of any real use.

Speaking of his own experience, Sir John said: "It is true that a district officer living in isolation and having to know the language and customs of the peoples must have a certain amount of experience, but there were a great many trained men in the Secretariat and so on who could be released for work requiring special training. An appeal might have been made to officers retired from service in India to go back for the purpose that Britain hand over her authority in an orderly and dignified manner and meanwhile maintain the services of the King Emperor. That sort of thing has been tried with success.

"As to the police, to a very large extent, the functions of officers in the Indian Police Service can in an emergency be assigned to and effectively discharged by carefully selected men drawn from the army. I say that again from the basis of personal experience. The British Government has done none of these things. The Government of India could not have done them."

What had the Government done to reassure and put heart into the members of the services? In the House of Lords, the Government representative was not ready to give any assurance that the Government were to carry on the Government of a country of a vast territory with reasonable efficiency. Had no one taken grip of these problems? Amid Opposition cheers, he charged the Government with lack of imagination. Units of the British Army in India should have been maintained at the level which would ensure that any difficult circumstances that might arise might be dealt with effectively. I know how important it is to have available people not closely identified with the life of the community—people whose careers and interests are not bound with local circumstances. I do most definitely charge the Government with having been negligent in this respect."

There were three counts in the indictment which he levelled against the Government: First, their action which he described as reckless, in allowing the Indian leaders to form a Government without assurance of progress towards constitutional development. "I suggested that it was bound to react disastrously on the services and was right," Sir John said. Secondly, the Government was guilty of complete failure to take measures even to consider the measures necessary for the future maintenance of efficiency. In that regard, even now, much might be done. Thirdly, the matter or date which was described as a tremendous experiment was in his opinion an unjustifiable gamble.

"I say now, if a date had to be fixed why should it not have been a date after which, if no Central authority had been brought into being by agreement, the Government would conclude that the most desirable possibility would have to be dismissed, so that then they could proceed with all energy to arrange the transfer of functions as speedily as possible to the most convenient separate authorities in India that could be found. It seems to me that by suggesting an experiment the Government would have secured all the advantages they claim for their plan and would have avoided all the disadvantages I have mentioned.

Second Day—House of Commons—6th March 1947

Mr. Churchill's Speech

Mr. *Winston Churchill*, Leader of the Opposition, was greeted with a roar of Opposition cheers when he rose to re-open the debate on India today.

"When the great parties in this country", he said, "have for many years pursued a combined and united policy on some large issue, and when for what seemed to them to be good reasons they decide to separate not only in debate but by division, it is desirable and even necessary that the causes of such separation and limitations of differences which exist should be placed on record. In regard to the Indian problem, we on this side of the House, have for some time made it clear that the sole responsibility for control of India's affairs rests, of course, with the Government. "We have criticised their actions in various ways, but this is the first time we have felt it our duty as official Opposition to express our dissent and differences by a formal vote. Let us first of all place on record the measure of agreement which lies between us and separate that from the differences that now lead us into the opposite lobby. Mr. Churchill said that both sides of the House were bound by the declaration made at the time of the British Mission to India in March 1942. It was not true to suggest as was done lately that that declaration marked a decisive change in the policy of the British Parliament towards India.

"There was a long story before we got to that. Great Britain had for many years been committed to handing over responsibility for the governing of India to representatives of the Indian people. There was a promise of Dominion Status implicit in the Declaration of August, 1917.

"There was extension and definition of Dominion Status by the Statute of Westminster. There was the Simon Commission Report of 1930 followed by the Lord Linlithgow Report of 1935. Then the Linlithgow Offer of 1940, for which as head of Government I take my share of the responsibility—and by this the Viceroy undertook as soon as possible after the war that the Indians themselves should frame a full self-governing constitution."

Mr. Churchill said that this was the preliminary basis upon which the proposals of the Cripps Mission of 1942 were set. The proposals were not a departure in principle from what had long been growing up and they constituted a definite and decisive project for action.

Asking the House to consider the circumstances in which this offer was made Mr. Churchill said: "The violent eruption of Japan on East Asia, the withdrawal of the United States fleet to the American coast, the sinking of the "Prince of Wales" and the "Repulse", the surrender of Singapore and many other circumstances left us with no assured means of defending India from invasion by the Japanese. We had lost command of the Bay of Bengal and, indeed, to a large extent the Indian Ocean. Whether the provinces of Madras and Bengal would be pillaged and razed by the Japanese at that time seemed to hang in the balance."

"The problem naturally arose with poignant force how best to rally all the Indian elements to the defence of their native land," said Mr. Churchill. The offer of the Cripps Mission was substantially this: The British Government undertook to accept and implement an agreed constitution for an Indian Union, which should be a Dominion, framed by an elected Constituent Assembly and affording representation to the Princes. This undertaking was subject only to the right of the non-acceding provinces to receive separate treatment and to conclusion of a treaty guaranteeing protection to racial and religious minorities.

The offer of the Cripps Mission was not accepted by the political classes in India who alone are vocal and to whom it was addressed. Mr. Churchill continued: "On the contrary, the Congress led by Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Nehru did their very utmost to make a revolt intended to paralyse the communications of our armies in Burma and to help the fortunes of the Japanese." (Opposition cheers). Therefore, the National Coalition Government of those days made a large series of mass arrests of Indian Congress leaders and the bulk were kept in prison to the end of the war.

"I was not present in the Cabinet when these decisions were taken. I was at Cairo preparing for the operations which opened at Alamein, but I highly approved the action taken in my absence by the Deputy Prime Minister, the present Prime Minister. It was the only action possible on that occasion. Therefore, it is quite clear that whatever was the offer of the Cripps Mission it was not accepted. On the contrary, it was repudiated by the parties to whom it was addressed. In fact, on his return from India, Sir Stafford Cripps said, "I said when I left India that

In default of acceptance the draft declaration must be considered as being withdrawn." Mr. Churchill said that he did not make any complaint about that. Later in the year, having returned to this country, he said on September 10, 1942, with the full consent of his colleagues that the declaration which formed the basis of the Cripps Mission must be taken as representing the settled policy of the British Crown and Parliament. Those principles he had added stood in their full scope and integrity.

Mr. Churchill then declared: "That is where I stand now. Both sides of the House are bound by this offer, and bound to all of it, and it is on the basis of this offer being an agreed matter between the parties and on that basis alone that our present and future controversies arise. If I am bound by the offer of Dominion Status, the Prime Minister is or was equally bound by the conditions that there should be agreement between the principal communities, that there should be proper discharge of our pledges about protection of the minorities, but the Prime Minister has a perfect right to change his mind. He may cast away all the stipulations which we jointly made and proceed only with the positive side of the offer. He has a right to claim the support of his Parliamentary majority for any action he takes."....."He has no right to claim our support beyond the limits of the Cripps Declaration. A statement was made during the caretaker Government by Mr. Amery who had been the Secretary of State for India throughout all this business.

"Frequent reference has been made to that statement as if it implied some further advance. But that is not so. I was not consulted on the exact terms of the statement as I should have been, if the Secretary of State had intended to make any further advance on the position established by the Cripps Mission of 1942."

Mr. Churchill then read Mr. Amery's statement in which he said that the offer of March 1942 stood; that no limit was put to India's freedom to decide for herself her own destiny, whether as a member of the British Commonwealth or even without it. The statement proceeded: "This can only be achieved under a constitution or constitutions framed by Indians to which the main elements of Indian national life are consenting parties. That is a confirmation of our own loyal purpose and the inescapable fact of the Indian situation. We can only transfer our ultimate control over India to a Government or Governments capable of exercising our responsibility to the people. Mr. Amery's letter then proceeded to state: 'We have not considered the possibility of an Indian Constituent Assembly declaring for or against separation before a constitution has been accepted by Parliament.'"

Mr. Churchill continued: "Before this latest announcement, they had already departed from the Cripps Declaration of 1942. The first essential element was the creation of a new Indian State with Dominion Status associated with the Dominions and equal to them in every respect."

This, said Mr. Churchill, was all changed by the Prime Minister sending out a Cabinet Mission a year ago. "I was not in the country at that time or I would have drawn attention to the serious change. It might be that my colleagues do not regard it as seriously as I do if the Dominion Status procedure had been involved. This new Indian Dominion would have been perfectly free to leave the Commonwealth if they wished to do so, but there would have been an opportunity for the danger and consequences to be surveyed by India's statesmen and also for the wishes of the great mass of the Indian people to be expressed, as they could not now be expressed. It would have been possible to have made proper provision in regard to certain safeguards for the minorities and particularly those elements of Indian life, notably the Depressed Classes. The Agreement would have been on the lines of the North American Act to which this country and the Dominion of Canada attached so much importance."

Mr. Churchill said that a second departure was the total abandonment of all responsibility for carrying out its pledges to the minorities and the Depressed Classes. All these were to be left to fend for themselves as best as they could. That, said Mr. Churchill with emphasis, was a great error.

A third essence of the Cripps Mission declaration was that there should be agreement between the principal Indian communities, namely, Muslims and Hindus, but that also had been thrown overboard. "It is our duty in this Chamber to-day to say that this Government has broken away from the agreement which had been reached and that it is not we, the Conservative Party, who have gone back on their former undertaking."

"To these departures in principle, there seemed to be added a formidable list of practical mistakes in handling the problem during the past year since the

Cabinet Mission was sent out. Some of the mistakes might have been made by the Government and some by the Viceroy but they were both jointly responsible for all. First, the attempt to formulate a constitution and press it on the Indians instead of leaving to the Indians, as had been promised, the duty of framing their proposals—that action, however well intended, had proved to be devoid of advantage and must be rated as a mistake.

"Secondly, there was the summoning of the so-called Constituent Assembly on an altogether inadequate representative franchise. An assembly so called into being had absolutely no right to decide the fate of India and express the wishes of the great masses of India. Thirdly, there was the dismissal of eminent Indians composing the Viceroy's Council and handing over of the Government of India to Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru. This Government of Mr. Nehru has been a complete disaster", declared Mr. Churchill. "Great degeneration and demoralisation in the already weakened departmental machinery of the Government of India has followed from it. Thirty or forty thousand people have been slaughtered in warfare between the two principal religions. Corruption is growing apace. People talk of giving India freedom. Freedom has been restricted since this Interim Nehru Government has come into power. Communism is growing apace (Government laughter). It has been found necessary to raid and suppress Communist establishments and centres which we do not do here and have not even done in India.

"It was a cardinal mistake to entrust the Interim Government to a leader of Caste Hindus, Mr. Nehru. He had good reason to be the most bitter enemy of any connection between India and the British Commonwealth."

That, said Mr. Churchill, must be regarded as the third practical administrative mistake apart from those large departures in principle which might be charged against the present Government in this Indian sphere.

"Such was the situation before the latest plunge which the Government had taken was made. It is this plunge, which, added to all that has gone before, makes it our duty to sever ourselves altogether from the Indian policy of the Government and to disclaim all responsibility for the consequences which will darken and rend the coming years in India."

Dealing with the Viceroy, Mr. Churchill said: "The Viceroy, Lord Wavell, has been dismissed. I hold no brief for Lord Wavell. He was a willing or unwilling agent of the Government in all the errors or mistakes into which they have been led. But I have no idea why he has been cast aside at this juncture. The Prime Minister has refused to give the slightest indication of the differences which must have arisen between the Government and the Viceroy.

"It is not possible for us to form an opinion on the many aspects of the Indian controversy while this concealment is maintained. It is most unusual for great political severances of this kind to take place in time of peace without statements being made both by Government and by the dismissed functionary to justify their respective positions."

Mr. Churchill said that he had some argument with the Prime Minister the other day about this. It was true that in war many Ministers were removed without their wishing to make any explanation to Parliament but if they had wished to do so or if there had been any demand in Parliament for an explanation he would certainly have felt it his duty as Prime Minister to facilitate such explanatory statement (Government cries of, "oh").

"Before the war such statements and explanations were common place." It was an unwholesome way of conducting public affairs, he said, in time of peace that Ministers or Viceroys were dismissed or resigned and not felt it necessary to their self-respect to explain to the nation the reasons of their departure.

"However, I understand that Lord Wavell will be free as soon as he returns to this country." "Is that so", Mr. Churchill demanded of the Prime Minister and his colleagues on the Government front bench.

The Ministers apparently nodded and Mr. Churchill added: "Certainly it will be expected of him to make a statement."

"There is one point however," Mr. Churchill continued, "that we ought to know because it is material to the issues. Was the Viceroy in favour of a time-limit or was he not?" Mr. Churchill hoped that they could have some information on this point.

Turning now "from the dismissed Viceroy to the new," Mr. Churchill said he did not think that the 14 months' time-limit gave the new Viceroy a fair chance and he did know what directive had been given to him."

Mr. Churchill went on: "I am surprised looking at this Indian problem

how many great gaps there are on which there is no information. We are told very little what is the policy and purpose for which he is being sent out. How is he to employ these 14 months? Is he to make a new effort to restore the situation or is it to be merely an "Operation Scuttle" on which he and other distinguished officers have been dispatched? The Prime Minister should tell us the purpose behind these movements."

Mr. Churchill again stressed how little information had been given to the House, and added: "Everyone knows that 14 months' time-limit is fatal to any ordinary transfer of power." Thumping the despatch box he exclaimed: "The whole thing wears the aspect of an attempt by the Government to make use of brilliant war figures to cover up a melancholy and disastrous transaction. One thing seems to be absolutely certain—Government by their 14 months' time-limit have put an end to all prospects of Indian unity. I have never believed myself that could be preserved after the departure of the British Raj, but the last chance has been extinguished by the Government's action. How can you suppose that a thousand years' gulf which yawns between Muslims and Hindus will be bridged in 14 months! How can you expect in 14 months that there is going to be agreement between these races? From henceforth everyone will start staking out their claim and preparing to defend it and they will have the assurance that the British Government will recognise them if they only make enough noise, enough demonstration of their identity and their right to separate existence and consideration. That is not going to lead to a melting of heart which will throw them altogether. On the contrary, it is inviting them to take advantage of the time that is left to peg out their claim which they value more than life itself." (This passage was greeted with cries of "incitement.")

Mr. Churchill went on that no arrangement had been made about all the great common services which had been explained yesterday so fully by Sir John Anderson—questions of foreign affairs, defence, communications by road, rail and water. "India" he said, "is to be subjected not merely to partition, but to haphazard fragmentation and a time-limit, a time-guillotine, is imposed which will certainly prevent full and fair, reasonable discussion of the great complicated issues which are involved. These fourteen months will not be used for melting of heart and uniting of Hindus and Muslims, but for preparation for civil war and they will be marked continually by disturbances and disorders such as are going on in the great city of Lahore, in spite of the effort made by the leaders of both sides to allay their alarm and fear at what was going to happen."

At this point, Mr. Churchill looked at Sir Stafford Cripps. He said: "The Right Honourable Gentleman laughs. He ought not to laugh. Although of fanatical disposition, he has a tender heart and I am sure that the horrors which have been going on since he put the Nehru Government in power—and viewing these horrors, of the spectacle of corpses of men, women and children littering the ground by thousands—these horrors would have wrung his heart. I wonder that his imagination does not guide him to review these matters searchingly in his own conscience."

Mr. Churchill said that the Indian political parties and political classes did not represent the Indian masses. It was a delusion to believe that they did. That was proved in the war. The Congress Party declared non-co-operation with the Allies, this great party of Hindus to whom all power was to be given. The Muslim League sought to make a bargain, but failed. Both the two great political parties in India stood aside, but the only great volunteer army in the world which fought on either side in the struggle, was formed in India (Conservative cheers).

"More than 3,500,000 came forward to support the King Emperor and the cause of Britain, came forward not by conscription or by compulsion, but out of their loyalty to Britain and to all that Britain stood for their lives.

"In handing over the Government of India to the so-called political classes we are handing over to men of straw, of whom in a few years no trace will remain. (Conservative cheers).

"By their latest action—this 14 months' limitation—this Government is destroying the prospect of even getting through the business agenda which has to be settled. "That is the only explanation of its complete adoption of one of Mr. Gandhi's most scatterbrained observations made on May 24, 1942 after the Mission."

Mr. Churchill then quoted the observation beginning 'Leave India in God's hands, in modern parlance, leave her to anarchy.'

"This statement was indistinguishable from the policy of the British Government," said Mr. Churchill. He compared with complete bewilderment the difference

in the attitude of the Government to India and to Palestine. There was a time-limit for India but no time-limit for Palestine. That astonished him. "Two bottles of powerful medicine have been prepared," he said, "but they have been sent to the wrong patients (laughter and Opposition cheers)."

"The policy for these two places taken together is incomprehensible. I cannot see how that can have originated in any coherent human brain or even in the minds of the Cabinet which, no doubt, has many incoherences in it. Can the House believe that there are three or four times as many troops in little Palestine as there are in all mighty India—British troops? What is the point and sense of this distribution of our forces which you tell us are so limited?"

"I do not know what element of obstinacy has forced this peculiar assertion in the midst of a general scuttle; this peculiar assertion of will-power in Palestine. I do not know where it comes from, unless some powerful Minister has said that he must have his way and no one has dared to withstand him. I do not know, but I have my surmises."

"A similar sustained effort in India would have enabled the plan of the Cripps Mission to be carried out, fully discussed with cool deliberation and firmness and we should have kept our pledges and have moved steadily forward from this crisis. It is indeed a paradox that an opposite course should be taken. Here in India, where such consequences are at stake, we are told that we must be off in 14 months whereas in this small Palestine, which we were first connected with only 25 years ago and held only in mandate, we are to pour out all our treasure and keep 100,000 men marching around in the most vexatious and painful circumstances when we have no real interest in the matter."

Mr. Churchill continuing said that he had given the reason why the Conservative Opposition thought it necessary to dissociate itself from this further progress of the Government on the road to ruin. They had not taken that decision without a great deal of heart-searching and consideration.

The house then enjoyed a pleasant domestic interlude when Mr. Churchill said that he had read Mr. Zilliacus' speech made the previous night and found that they were thinking on similar lines. (Mr. Zilliacus is a Labour member with very different views from Mr. Churchill).

"Do you want to examine yourself?" said Mr. David Kirkwood (Labour). Mr. Churchill wagged an admonitory finger and, amid laughter, said "Now, David keep quiet."

Turning to the Speaker, Mr. Churchill said: "He and I are old allies and we do not interfere with each other when we are in action."

Continuing, Mr. Churchill said he had intended striking the note which Mr. Zilliacus had struck about bringing the United Nations into the India problem. He had for some time past pressed the Government that if they were unable to maintain order in Palestine to return their mandate to the United Nations or invoke its aid in that work.

"After six or seven months of needless delay they had actually done that. It was difficult to resist the feeling that the same trend of reasoning applied on a far wider scale and with much stronger force to India. They were told that they could not walk out of Palestine because they would leave behind a war between 600,000 Jews and 1,200,000 Arabs."

"How could we walk out of India and leave behind us a war between 90,000,000 Muslims and 200,000,000 Caste Hindus and all the tribulations that would thus fall on a helpless population of 4,000,000? Would it not be a terrible disgrace to our record and our name, to allow one-fifth of the population of the globe to fall into chaos? That would be a world crime and a crime that would not only strip us but stain our good name for ever."

Yesterday, said Mr. Churchill, Sir Stafford Cripps and others brought into great prominence Britain's physical and military weaknesses. They asked how she could keep a large army in India for 15 or 20 years. It was a very grave point. Sir Stafford Cripps might well have urged that Britain had not the moral strength or will power. "It we lack physical and moral strength to wind up our affairs in a responsible, humane and honourable fashion, ought we not to consider invoking the aid or at least advice of the world international organisation which is now clothed with reality and on which so many of us stake our hopes for peaceful progress, freedom and indeed salvation of mankind? Mr. Churchill asked. "I say to the Government, if you feel it right in the case of little Palestine to lay your difficulties before the U.N.O., what conceivable reason can there be for not following a similar course regarding the great sub-continent of India."

"Granted that the position to which you have carried the affairs by your action—that you cannot through weakness and moral frustration fulfil your pledges to the vast helpless communities numbered by scores of millions—are you not in point of honour and decency, and indeed commonsense, call upon to seek the aid of wider instruments and authorities if all practical hopes of Britain discharging her task have vanished ?

"It is not my view that they have but this is the prevailing mood of those who are all powerful brought into being by the agonies of two devastating wars which should not be overlooked. Yesterday Mr. Zilliacus spoke of the precedent of multiple national membership of the Soviet Union and spoke of its affording those safeguards to the minorities which, we are assured by the Government, Britain has lost strength and will-power to provide; he spoke of the right of the minorities to appear before the Permanent Court of International Justice.

"I do not think that such aspects should be overlooked in this period of British depression and eclipse."

In conclusion, Mr. Churchill said: "I have spoken with a life-time of thought and contact with these topics. It is with deep grief that I watch the clattering down of the British Empire with all its glories and all the services it has rendered to mankind. I am sure that in the hour of our victory, not so long ago we had the power or could have had the power to make a solution of our difficulties which would have been honourable and lasting.

"Many have defended Britain against her enemies but none can defend her against herself. We must face the evils coming upon us that we are powerless to avert. We should do everything in all these circumstances and exclude no expedient that may help to mitigate the ruin and disaster which will follow the disappearance of Great Britain's power in the East. Let us at least not add by shameful fight, by premature and hurried scuttles, let us not add to the pangs of sorrow, which many of us feel, the taint and smear of shame."

Opposition cheering for Mr. Churchill's speech continued for a considerable time after he had resumed his seat and he was warmly congratulated by his colleagues.

Mr. Alexander's Reply to Mr. Churchill

Mr. A. V. Alexander, Minister of Defence and Member of the Cabinet Mission to India, began: "On the great issue I am quite certain the Party supporting the British Government is in no way afraid to take up the challenge. Mr. Churchill has made one of his usual and from the point of view of language, one of his best phrased speeches of his life-time. It will be recorded. It may be that history will decide that perhaps that speech this afternoon was the principal factor in preventing the sides coming together." (Ministerial cheers.)

Mr. Alexander said that Mr. Churchill's build up of the present situation since 1917 had a good deal in it that was factual. But, said Mr. Alexander, "I thought the conclusion he drew from his historical examination and the negotiations about Self-Government in relation to the present proposals could really not bear examination."

"One would have thought that the proposals of 1942 and the statement of Mr. Amery, the Secretary of State for India in 1945, had no relation at all to the policy we had pursued and which is now inherent in the offer we are now making. For example, Mr. Churchill said that there was a great difference between Mr. Amery's statement and our approach to this matter in regard to whom we were to hand over to. "One would have thought it incumbent on us to have handed over to a single Government. That is not so."

Mr. Alexander said that Mr. Amery himself contemplated that there might be more than one Government in India to hand over to, in the statement he made at the time when Mr. Churchill was the Prime Minister.

Amid Government cheers Mr. Alexander declared: "We have acted upon the statement on behalf of the care-taker Government to bring self-government to India in perfectly good faith and it is a great pity that reflections are now made on our aims. Mr. Churchill said that we had totally abandoned all our pledges to the minorities—said in effect that we had thrown them overboard—and that one of the main reasons why they (the Opposition) have now come down to party division was that Government had broken away from its pledges.

"May I say that in the case of the minorities the position that we have always taken was that in a constitution framed by Indians, there ought to be provided proper protection for the minorities and I think it is only fair to both the

leading parties in India to say that never at any time have they ever taken any other line, but are anxious and willing to give the fullest legal freedom for these minorities, whatever class they might belong to.

"The proposals made at the Simla Conference in 1946 contain offers of pledges from both sides on this matter and might I bring it more up-to-date? I ask the House to consider the terms of the resolution of the Constituent Assembly providing for "justice, social, economic and political freedom of thought, expression, belief, faith, worship, vocation, subject, of course, to law and public morality. I give as much faith to this pledge as I would to one made here in my own country."

Referring to Mr. Churchill's comment on the Cabinet Mission Mr. Alexander said that he wondered what the Leader of the Opposition meant by the words, "we attempted to formulate a constitution and force it on Indians".

Mr. Churchill, interjecting, "I did not use the word 'formulate'."

Mr. Alexander: When did the Cabinet Mission attempt to formulate a constitution and force it on Indians? Not at all. All we did then was to make suggestions as to a procedure for them to get where they wanted to get in having a Constituent Assembly and in having a constitution drafted by Indians for Indians. Any attempt to settle a constitution for them was never in our minds and there was never any attempt to force a constitution on Indians.

Mr. Churchill: The Minister and his colleagues did make a positive contribution in the shape of a plan and whether they forced it or pressed it, we need not argue. They certainly commended it to Indians".

Mr. Alexander: I have said enough to make it clear that we do not accept the view put in Mr. Churchill's speech.

Referring to Mr. Churchill's contention that the Constituent Assembly had been set up on inadequate franchise, Mr. Alexander said that the basis of the franchise was that settled under the 1935 Act which was passed by the Conservative Government.

As to the mistake which Mr. Churchill had asserted had been made in setting up the interim Government, Mr. Alexander said: "I felt that part of Mr. Churchill's speech was a good deal unfair to my comrades on this side of the House who were faced with a situation in November and December 1945 when it might be said that the Indian authorities were literally sitting on the top of a volcano and when as a result of the situation which arose after the war, the outbreak of a revolution might have been expected at any time.

"Ever since then, this Government and their supporters have laboured incessantly to try and get an agreement in India which would avoid a grave outbreak of that kind.

Mr. Alexander then dealt with Mr. Churchill's remarks about Pandit Nehru.

"I do not know whether Mr. Churchill intended an attack on Mr. Nehru but his language was pretty forcible. I must say that while we had cause in the past to regret that Mr. Nehru, in pursuit of his own conscience and in the leadership of his home rule party in India, was often willing to go to prison, nevertheless he is the most able, cultured and experienced person now at the head of the Interim Government and I believe that he and his colleagues, if given a fair and reasonable opportunity to cooperate with the other great communities in India, will be capable and willing to lead in bringing India through her present difficulties to one of power, influence, prosperity and peace (Government cheers). I much regret therefore, the references which Mr. Churchill made.

Mr. Churchill interjecting: I made no attack on Mr. Nehru, except to say that he had reason to be our bitter enemy having been interned 10 or 12 years in goal. I went out of my way when last I spoke on India to draw attention to Mr. Nehru's action in ordering troops to fire on his own co-religionists in Bihar when Government officers had failed in their duty, I have not said anything derogatory to Mr. Nehru's character.

Mr. Alexander continuing said: "I am certain that what the British people want is to have a long-term understanding, friendship and brotherhood with the Indian people. After all that has gone so far, I think that Mr. Churchill getting up in the House with all the responsibility and authority that his experience conveys, should appreciate that it is fatal to talk about the leaders with whom we have negotiated and got into closer relations than ever before as existing and current enemies of this country."

Taking up Mr. Churchill's reference to the position of the Viceroy Mr. Alexander said: "I should be content to leave it to my leader to make a general reply

to that part of Mr. Churchill's speech and in view of the explanation which the Prime Minister has already made I, who came in the course of our India mission, to form a great personal friendship with Lord Wavell, resent the way in which Churchill on February 20 and to-day referred to Lord Wavell.

"I am bound to say here that I am most grateful to Lord Wavell for all that he has done to try and help us in the crisis we have been passing through. Lord Wavell will be found among those men who have earned the right to belong to history as men who have displayed at all times the great English spirit.

Mr. Alexander described as "quite unworthy Mr. Churchill's suggestion that this Government was seeking to take advantage of brilliant war figures to cover the melancholy and disastrous transactions in India." I shall wait and see what will be the final conclusions of Mr. Churchill on the change from Lord Wavell to Viscount Mountbatten". Mr. Alexander continued: "But we did not appoint Lord Wavell. Mr. Churchill appointed him, or rather recommended his appointment, and we have certainly taken no cover. We owe responsibility to this House and to the British people for the actions of the Government just the same as we take responsibility for whatever has to be done in what we hope this concluding phase of handing over self-government to India under the new Viceroy." Mr. Alexander referring to the suggestion that the political parties did not represent the masses said: "It may well be true that there are large masses who have not yet got the franchise and do not hope to get it until there is a new constitution. But many of them are still behind the political parties and to say, therefore, that the political parties do not represent them cannot be proved at all." Mr. Alexander said that he was very glad to hear a tribute paid to the great voluntary army which was raised in India and that he thought it was the best to the somewhat slighting references last night on India's war service when the suggestion was made that they had "done very well out of the war, thank you" and "had displayed a good deal of profiteering in the matter".

This remark was at once challenged by a member of the Opposition who said that Mr. Alexander should withdraw the remark. Mr. Alexander persisted that the general reference in a number of Opposition speeches last night was slighting.

Mr. Alexander then dealt with Mr. Churchill's remark on the time-limit for India and no time-limit for Palestine. "I find it difficult to understand why he asked the question that way. One would think that the circumstances were exactly the same. Are they? Mr. Alexander said that with regard to Palestine the reference to the next Assembly was in one respect a warning and that was in effect a time-limit when the United Nations made their decision upon the matters laid before them. It had been said, continued Mr. Alexander, that if there had been the kind of truce in India as was being used in Palestine, then something on the lines of the Cripps plan could have been forced upon India—at least it could have been pushed through under the threat of force. "However", he added, "Mr. Churchill said instead that we are on the road to ruin. I say if we have followed a procedure like that we certainly would have been on the road to ruin. I felt that all the time, bearing in mind the talk in the House of Lords and the different opinions expressed from members of that side of the House, the principal thing that was happening was marshalling once more, if it could possibly be arranged, a united party on India on these lines."

Mr. Alexander added: "If one looks at the expression of the Conservatives in the House of Lords you can see there were very serious rifts in the ranks. It would have been very much better if the Conservative Party had had second thoughts about this matter as they had in the House of Lords last week. The attitude of the former Viceroy, Earl Halifax—and a very great Viceroy he was—was far and away more likely to lead to peace and concord in India than the kind of a speech we have had from Mr. Churchill."

At this point, Mr. Churchill stepped forward and explained that he wanted himself to refer to Earl Halifax's speech but there was a rule about not quoting speeches from the House of Lords.

Mr. Alexander continued: "Although Mr. Churchill may not agree with the fixing of a date, he cannot object, unless he had some better alternative to propose. But what alternative does he propose?" This was greeted with Government cries of "None".

Dealing with the question of the time limit of 14 months, he said that the Opposition had been dealing with question of India for a long time. They had had Round-Table Conferences; they had had five years in the building up of the

1935 Act; they had the subsequent Cripps Mission and all the work of the Cabinet Mission.

Mr. Alexander continued: "If the people of India at this stage would come together and co-operate in the light of these circumstances, it is perfectly possible that they will be able to draft a constitution within 14 months. It may well be that there will be certain matters of administration which will call for adjustment and which may not be operating at the time fixed of June 1948, but it can well be, if they wish, that they come to a settlement and that the constitution can be framed and sufficiently advanced for Provisional Government at the Centre to be set up and for adjustments to be made afterwards."

Mr. Alexander said that the Government had taken a very difficult decision. Everyone knew the width of the gap which had to be bridged between the two Indian communities. But it would have been also a very grave decision to make to say that the British were prepared to say in India and hold down India. "We were not prepared to take that decision, because not only would it not have been in accordance with the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations or with the Atlantic Charter, but it would also have been one we ought not to have taken in the light of our present resources. Above all, it was one to which the Labour Members would never have consented."

The desire of the Government is that the two parties should still come together.

Mr. Churchill: "Indian parties?"

Mr. Alexander: "Yes I hope they will. The consequences if they do not must be grave."

Continuing Mr. Alexander said that it was true that the Government had taken a decision which would mean the bridging of the gap in one jump, but he reminded the House what Mr. Lloyd George once said that when you had to jump a chasm you could not do it in two hops. The policy outlined by Sir John Anderson would only have meant Britain's saying in India a certain measure of time longer before taking the present action. It would always be the practice of whatever Government was leading this country to give India the utmost goodwill to continue in the utmost co-operation with India and to extend whatever help was within British resources.

On the future defence of India, Mr. Alexander declared, "After June, 1948 we shall be glad if, in the course of the treaty we hope to make in the transfer of power, they will agree with us to co-operate in that respect, subject to the limitations imposed on each party by membership of the United Nations."

Admiral Taylor (Conservative) asked whether British forces were going to be withdrawn from the North-West Frontier.

Mr. Alexander said that on the question of the external defence of India he would refer Admiral Taylor to the Prime Minister's statement of February 25. In regard to the defence of the Frontier, very much would depend on whether the parties would come together in such a way as to maintain the splendid unity and integrity of the Indian Army.

Premier's Reply to Debate

Mr. Clement Attlee, the Prime Minister replying to the debate, said he noticed that the more recent and more complete the experiences of members, the less were their speeches ready to commend outright the decision of the Government. "We have all to realise how little we knew about India and how soon what knowledge we have gets out of date. I recognise that I am out of date on India myself. I ended my time in India on the Simon Commission nearly 18 years ago. I, therefore, hesitate to be dogmatic or prophetic as to what may happen in India. In this I admit I differ from Mr. Churchill. I think his practical acquaintance with India ended some 50 years ago. He formed very strong opinions—I might almost say prejudices then. They have remained with him ever since and I think I agree it is a remarkable example of constancy (laughter) because I have heard him reiterate these views over a period of years with a constancy that completely ignored the march of events.

"Although he feels deeply on these matters," Mr. Attlee continued, "I feel that he does not really believe in Self-Government in India. I think he has forced himself to recognise that the steps over many years cannot be entirely retraced. I think he still feels that the steps were mistaken and he will not face the logic of the situation."

"Yet even he did not suggest that we should seek to restore the British Raj as it was in the days when he was in India. We have to make up our minds that those days are past. Indeed, at the opening of his speech, Mr. Churchill took great pains to bring himself abreast with the movement of opinion in the Conservative Party. I know of the good work done by the members of all parties who went out on the Goodwill Mission." The Prime Minister claimed that it had been shown that there had been a movement of opinion and added: But although Mr. Churchill sought to bring himself abreast, I noticed a certain amount of recidivism all the time when he accused the Government of dealing with the Indian politicians who were not elected on adult franchise in 1942.

Mr. Attlee added: "At that time the franchise was not as extensive in this country as to-day but it never sapped his confidence. Mr. Churchill will recall how well he did when he was attacked by the Conservative Party of that day, when he was accused of throwing away Africa. The only difference is that Mr. Balfour said nothing about franchise" (Loud laughter).

"I must say I thought there were a great many irrelevancies—delightfully expressed no doubt—which were reminiscent of the days when he and a small band fought such a long, distinguished rearguard action against the member for Saffron Walden (Mr. R. A. Butler)." (Laughter). After the laughter had subsided, Mr. Attlee continued ".....and Lord Templewood and in fact the bulk of the Conservative Party at that time."

On the question of Viceroyalty, Mr. Attlee said: "Churchill suggested that whenever there was a change of Minister of high function there was need of an explanation." Mr. Attlee went on: "I do not accept that doctrine. There has been occasions in this House when Ministers have made no statements on leaving office. I can recall occasions when nothing was said and there was no reason why anything should have been said. There were very few explanations offered. I have known changes in high civil service positions—Ambassadors, etc., indeed I used to keep a list in the 1935 Parliament and I tried to keep up-to-date the various changes in the Government of the day. Some were up and some were down but I was never sure which was which. It looked like a chart of Eight's Week at Oxford. Changes are desirable, but it is not always necessary that there should be elaborate explanations."

Referring to the rundown of the administration, Mr. Attlee said the device suggested by Sir John Anderson was turned down by the Coalition Government in 1945. There were Conservative cries of "were you not in it at that time?" and Mr. Attlee added: "It was in April, 1945, pretty near the end, was it not?"

He continued: "We took this matter up when the Cabinet Mission went to India. I myself thought that some strengthening would be useful but we were told that it would not be possible. If it had been possible to strengthen slightly the British cadre, it must be remembered that India is governed in the main by Indians with only a few British. A great mass of services are under the Provincial Governments. Indian civil servants were looking to the future. They had stood up wonderfully under the strain of war because they knew from all the declarations that had been made that the British Raj was coming to an end. You have as a matter of fact to govern India through Indians and the conditions are not such that you can throw over what has been done and go back to Section 93 Government in all the Provinces. It just does not work out. The mere strengthening of Government would not carry us through if you were going to take a line in opposition to the political forces in India.

Mr. Churchill suggested that political people do not count very much, that the great mass of people are very much interested. I agree they are not much interested, but after all you have to govern India through educated Indians. You cannot suddenly take people from the depressed classes and do so. The national feeling runs right through all Indian classes and that is why you cannot carry one against the will of the Indian people. All our advice has been that strengthening in that way will not get over the difficulties."

Mr. Attlee agreed that the time they had set was short, but they were strongly advised that it was desirable to fix a date. Sir John Anderson had suggested that there ought to be two stages: one to allow India to decide whether there should be one India or several and the second for the framing of the constitution. The effect of that, said Mr. Attlee, would be to divert the mind of Indian politicians from one particular issue and you would in fact get delay. Sir John Anderson thought it was a great mistake to bring Indian politicians into the

Government but the essence of the Indian problem was to get Indian statesmen to understand what were the real problems they had to face.

Mr. Attlee said that although the British had given Indians the experience of office in the Provinces, at the Centre they had taught them irresponsibility, instead of responsibility. It was not good to be always in the Opposition. It made for irresponsibility (Laughter). It was essential to get politicians of all communities into the Government to understand the problem. Sir John Anderson rightly stressed the complexity of the problems. All the more reason why Indian politicians must be given the experience of how complex they were.

The British Government believed profoundly that it would be better to have an All-India Government if they could possibly get it. Their object had been to get Indian politicians to look at this problem and see what it meant to India. He disagreed with Sir John Anderson when he said it was wrong to put responsibility as soon as you could on the Indian politicians. One of the faults of the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms was that they taught irresponsibility, not responsibility. "We had given Indians all the pleasant jobs and retained the difficult ones for ourselves."

Mr. Attlee knew that the difficulties of handing over would be enormous and he did not imagine that they could get everything fixed to the last gaiter button before leaving. Mr. Attlee went on to deal with the problem of minorities. He said: "I have very great sympathy with the people of the Scheduled Classes. I remember going into a village in Madras. We found the conditions they were in. Has it occurred to the Opposition that that is after 100 years of British rule? (Ministerial cheers.) Did we lack the will to raise the people? I do not think so, but we lack the power. The fact is that the existence of the Scheduled Classes is part of the whole Hindu social system. They are at the bottom of the social pyramid and although at one time before the Indian Mutiny we interfered with some Indian customs we never interfered with others. You cannot change the Hindu social system from outside by an alien power. These things have got to be done by Indians. Whatever you put in your treaties it rests on Indians themselves. There is the money-lender. There is gross inequality of wealth in India. That social and economic system was continued all during the time of our rule. We did not go in for a revolution in dealing with money-lenders. We did something to repress the money-lender but not enough.

"We accepted that social system and we are told at the end of our rule that we must clear things up before we go. If that trust was there it ought to have been fulfilled long ago." Mr. Attlee said.

"Of course, Government will carry out all its proper obligations to members of the services. They may be assured they will not be let down. As to the amendment in essence it is a plea for delay, a plea for inaction (cries of "No"), for having greater time waiting until the Indian parties had come together and every detail of the new constitution has been worked and agreed.

"We have been warned by two members, who knew India very well—the same warning we have had from India—that the dangers of delay and hanging on are as great as the dangers of going forward. When we took office we did not find India in a very easy state. It is a volcano of hidden fires. I think that a great deal has been done by the visits of members of the Government and the visits of members of all parties."

Mr. Attlee added: "I was very much impressed by what Sir Stanley Reed said. He reminded us that it was thirty years since Lord Curzon initiated a change. Thirty years ago there was a declaration which changed the entire outlook and in these thirty years the Indians have grown up in a climate of delayed hope—a climate very largely of impatience and frustration—and during these 30 years the administrative machine has been changed out of all knowledge. The political advance has been too slow to keep pace with this administrative change, particularly in the Central Government. Political advances—would, I think, have been easier if undertaken earlier when the administrative machine was stronger. I think that there has been too much delay, too much hesitation, too much tear to go forward, but having reached the present stage we cannot go back and cannot remain as we are.

"We believe, we have done great work of India. We believe, the time has come when Indians must shoulder their responsibilities. We can help, but we cannot take the burden on ourselves. Even as we are speaking to-night there are serious communal disturbances.

"I would have liked a message to go from this House without dissenting

voices that it is our earnest will that Indians should grasp now this great opportunity of knowing that all of them, without distinction of creed, place the good of the Indian millions before the interest of any section whatever and that to-day we have said in this House. "We have placed this responsibility clearly on you and we believe you can carry it." I close by saying that whatever differences there may be between us in this House on the matter, I am quite sure the whole House will wish 'Godspeed to the new Viceroy in his mission' (cheers). It is a mission, not as has been suggested, a betrayal on our part, it is a mission of fulfilment (cheers).

"Anyone who has read the lives of the great men who built up our rule in India and did so much to make Indian unity will know that all of them looked to the fulfilment of our mission in India of placing the responsibility for their own lives in Indian hand." (Loud and prolonged Ministerial cheers.)

The Opposition amendment was defeated by 337 votes to 135 and the Government motion was carried without a division. As Mr. Churchill walked out he turned towards the Government benches and raised his hand and said: "We give you that one", a reference to there being no division on the Government motion. He left the Chamber amid peals of laughter from the Government benches.

The All India Hindu Mahasabha

Working Committee—New Delhi—8th. to 10th February 1947

Scheduled Castes' Demands

The Working Committee of the All India Hindu Mahasabha which met at New Delhi on the 8th February 1947 under the presidentship of *Sj. L. B. Bhopalkar* considered *Dr. B. R. Ambedkar's* letter embodying the political demands of the Scheduled Castes Federation and appointed a Committee to contact the Federation and Scheduled Caste leaders to examine them in all their bearings. The Committee consisted of the President, *Dr. B. S. Moonje* and *Mr. Asutosh Lahiri*, General Secretary.

Second Day—New Delhi—9th February 1947

Hindu Sabha's Appeal to Princes

An appeal to the Princes to join the Constituent Assembly was made by the Working Committee of the Mahasabha at its meeting to-day. The following is the text of the resolution:

"The Working Committee is definitely of the opinion that Akhand Hindusthan would not be able to play her proper role in the comity of nations and particularly of the Asian nations, unless and until the Central Government is under her constitution rendered strong, paramount enough to make all the Provinces and States work in union with each other. Viewed in this light the Working Committee feels that the second objective as stated in the Objectives of the Constituent Assembly, viz., the objective of granting Provincial Autonomy with all residuary powers will not fail to create dissimilar tendencies among the Provinces resulting in weakening the Centre and thereby making the Indian Union more a shadow than a substance.

"The Working Committee is of the opinion that the Constituent Assembly as it is, is a properly constituted legal body with full sovereign power and authority and competent to frame the political constitution of Akhand Hindusthan. It is definitely of the opinion that the objections recently raised by the Muslim League in its Karachi resolution are true neither in fact nor in law. In its opinion the resolution indicates not only an attempt to sabotage the Constituent Assembly but holds out a threat of internecine war between the Hindus and the Muslims.

"The Committee is of opinion that the Karachi resolution of the Muslim League indicates the abandonment by the League of the method of negotiation and settlement as the means of attaining the freedom of the country and marks a definite departure from the path of constitutionalism in favour of direct action which is now the only other declared method left to the League for the achievement of the political objectives.

"The Committee, however, warns the people of Akhand Hindusthan that the action movement of the Muslim League with its inevitable consequence of violence and civil war in the country is imminent and the Committee urges all sections of the people to prepare, to organise and to mobilise national resources for meeting this new menace to India's peace and tranquillity and to resist the enactment of the horrors the nation has witnessed during the last few months in various parts of the country.

WORK OF ASSEMBLY MUST GO ON

"The Working Committee is of the opinion that now that the Congress and other representatives have started the work of the Constituent Assembly they should complete it irrespective of the consideration as to whether the Muslim League joins or does not join the Constituent Assembly or even if the British Government withdraws the Cabinet Mission proposals.

"The Working Committee re-affirms its faith in the principles which the Hindu Mahasabha has from time to time advocated in so far as the political constitution of Akhand Hindusthan is concerned; the main principles of which are firstly, the integrity and indivisibility of India; secondly, a strong Central Indian Union; thirdly, one Constituent Assembly to frame the political constitution of such Union; and its federating units; fourthly, adult franchise with one man one vote and fifthly, joint electorate.

"The Working Committee is of the opinion that when the Constituent Assembly is deemed to be a sovereign body, it is entitled to frame a constitution for Akhand Hindusthan not necessarily within the framework of the Cabinet Mission proposals but purely on national lines and principles as indicated above.

"Without entering into the controversy as to where sovereignty lies the Working Committee recommends to Indian Rulers both in their own interests and in those of their subjects, to join the Constituent Assembly by giving adequate representation thereon to their own people. Further, it requests them to introduce Responsible Government as speedily as possible in their own States after reserving such dynastic and personal rights and privileges to themselves as would not be inconsistent with the operation of Responsible Government.

DRAFT CONSTITUTION PROPOSED

"The Working Committee is of the opinion that in the present confusion of political thought and action as regards the constitution of Akhand Hindusthan it is necessary and desirable to place before the country the outlines of a constitution which will be broad-based on the principles of equity, democracy, justice and fair-play to all the communities and interests. With this object in view, it appoints a committee consisting of the President Mr. N. C. Chatterjee, Dr. B. S. Moonje, Mr. Panoharath, Dr. G. O. Narang, Mr. B. G. Khaparde and Mr. Gopinath Kunzru (with power to co-opt) and to submit the same to the Working Committee on or before the 30th April 1946."

The Working Committee heard a deputation from Hapur on the communal situation there and appointed Mahant Digvijaynath, Mr. Indra Prakash, the Rani of Sberkore, Pandit Mukund Malaviya and Mr. Deshpande to conduct an enquiry and report within a fortnight.

Another Committee was appointed to visit places where Hindu-Muslim fracas have occurred and submit a report. It will consist of Dr. B. S. Moonje (Chairman) Mahant Digvijaynath, Mr. B. G. Khaparde, Mr. G. Salwan, Kumar Gangand Singh and Pandit Mukund Malaviya (convener).

Third day—New Delhi—10th. February 1947

"Pakistanisation" of West Bengal

The Working Committee of the All India Hindu Mahasabha, which concluded its deliberations to-day, passed a resolution resenting "the attempt now being made by the Bengal Muslim League Ministry to settle in Bengal, Muslims from Bihar and other provinces with the definite political objectives of increasing the Muslim population strength in the Muslim minority districts of Western Bengal. Already 1,50,000 of such Muslims had been settled in Bengal and the Pakistanisation of Western Bengal is being carried on with a definite plan and with the help of the States found at the disposal of the Bengal Ministry."

The Committee "requests the Government of India to inquire into the situation, to ascertain the amount of funds so far spent by the Bengal Ministry and to take steps for preventing the utilisation of public funds in furtherance of such communal

objectives". Resolutions on the communal situation in Bihar, Bombay, and U.P. were also passed by the Committee. The resolution on Bombay riots expressed regret at the inadequate measures adopted by the Bombay Government to cope with the acts of stabbings and acid throwings committed at Bombay and Ahmedabad for the last several months, thereby indicating its inability to keep public peace and order at the respective centres of trade and commerce".

The Committee charged the U. P. Government with failure to check riots and said: "The communal riots have been and are going on in the United Provinces for the last eight or nine months as a result of which the Hindus, in spite of their being in a majority, have been the sufferers both in life and property. In the opinion of the Committee the only reason these riots are continuing for such a long time is that, in that province Muslims, though a minority of 16 per cent, hold a brutal monopoly of service in the police department as they hold 79 per cent of the police services. Besides, the Minister in charge of the Police Department is a Muslim, as a result of which the Muslims get various direct and indirect support and encouragement from the police." The Committee called upon the U. P. Government "to stop further recruitment of Muslims to the police services and the recently started home guards till such time as the number of Hindus attain the ratio according to their population in the province".

The A. I. Trade Union Congress

Jubilee Session—Calcutta—16th. February 1947

Sj. Mrinal Kanti Bose's Appeal

The "new role" of the All-India Trade Union Congress in which it would demand from its members allegiance to itself "first and last", was stressed in speeches at the Jubilee session of the All-India Trade Union Congress which began in Calcutta on the 16th February 1947.

Referring to this aspect, the President, Sj. *Mrinal Kanti Bose*, said that "more importance has been attached to the views of political parties taken separately than those of the A.-I.T.U.C. taken as a whole. My conception of the A.-I.T. U.C. in its new role is that it should command allegiance, first and last, from its members and it must devise and organise a machinery exclusively devoted to working out its policy and programme".

The session was held in a large pandal at Wellington square and was attended by over ten thousand persons, prominent labour leaders from all over India including Mr. N. M. Joshi, Mr. S. A. Dange, Mr. S. S. Mirajkar and also Mr. Reid of the N. U.S. of Great Britain attended. The International Youth Commission, at present in India, was also present.

Delivering his presidential address, Sj. *Mrinal Kanti Bose* said that only a tremendous politico-social revolution, either violent or non-violent, can bring to an end India's gigantic social inequalities. The A.-I. T. U. C. as the spearhead of the labour movement would have to take a large share in bringing about this revolution.

Sj. Bose protested against the post-war "repression of labour" and also against legislative efforts, both at the Centre and in the Provinces "to deprive workers of their right to strike" and urged that the A.-I. T. U. C., with Socialism as its immediate objective, must be prepared to work for it on a well thought out plan.

The unity of the workers, he insisted, should be maintained on the basis of a revolutionary programme. He called upon the A.-I. T. U. C. to carry the message to the masses, from one end of the country to the other, that the issue before workers was not one of religion, but of bread and an improved standard of life.

"The masses should be told unceasingly," Mr. Bose said, "that anyone inciting them against their brethren, Hindu or Muslim, was their enemy. The truth must be impressed on them that the raising of hands against fellowmen means, particularly, for the poor, the destruction of whatever chance there may be for the uplift of their economic condition. It will be making their slavery to the capitalistic classes only the stronger, if they allow themselves to be duped by the name of religion or any slogan to indulge in fratricidal war."

Sj. Bose deprecated the tendency to take it for granted that since a National Government had come into power, labour had nothing more to do than place its case before them. "I have no such illusion," said Mr. Bose, "and recent events have not convinced me that we shall have an easy task before us."

Sj. Bose, at the same time, paid a tribute to *Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru*, a former President of the T. U. C. and said: "He is a prince among political sufferers whose passionate desire to serve the masses has earned for him the love and respect of all."

Pointing out that *Pandit Nehru's* Government was not yet firmly in the saddle, Sj. Bose said: "In this transitional stage when the old bureaucracy representing British imperialism is passing away, this new Government will require all the assistance from the progressive forces. Our approach to this Government must, therefore, be more constructive than critical. I would therefore begin by placing before this Government our views in regard to its five-year plan which represents the declared labour policy of the Government."

Mr. Bose was critical of Government's inaction regarding certain phases of the five-year plan especially housing for workers and pointed out that "not a brick has been laid nor a bamboo pole set up anywhere in the coal area, though we had been assured that construction would be completed by the end of March, 1948." If there was a will behind the policy, said Mr. Bose, the difficulties could be overcome "as had been done in the Land of Five-Year Plans."

Mr. Bose urged that the whole policy *vis-a-vis* labour should be reviewed by a conference of representatives of the Central and Provincial Governments.

"The economic system as it obtains in India", he said, "has proved to be too wooden to be adjusted to the needs of a rapidly changing social fabric. Governments all over the country have resorted to repression as the only effective means of checking the upheaval. There has been a regular blood-bath in many parts of India due to police firing. There have also been arrests on a mass scale". Although strikes could not be resorted to on flimsy grounds, the time had not come to cast off "the tremendous weapon that labour has in its hands in organised strikes." Sj. Bose recalled the words of Sarder Vallabhbhai Patel: "If all normal business and activity throughout the length and breadth of India were suspended for just one week, the British will have to quit in no time" and himself added: "Is it altogether inconceivable that such an action may have to be taken to abolish the inequalities of which Mahatma Gandhi has spoken?"

Referring to riots, Sj. Bose said that workers belonging to trade unions had generally speaking "kept themselves aloof from the mad orgies".

Sj. Bose suggested that the A.-I. T. U. C. should establish contact with agrarian labour and help them in improving their lot. That, in his opinion, would go a great way "in restoring communal harmony which had been sadly disturbed all over India by political propagandists moving about in villages and exploiting the discontent among the half-famished agricultural population".

SOVIET DELEGATE'S APPEAL FOR UNITY

The A. I. T. U. C. session was addressed by members of the International Youth Delegation who received a great ovation when they arrived at the pandal.

The Soviet delegate Miss *Olga Chetshotaina*, speaking in English, said that the world over the people were bent on two things—to be free and to live in peace. During the last war, the people had fought against Fascism and Imperialism and their success was due to workers of the world lining up behind them. To-day we need fraternal unity between the workers and the youth of the world. Then we shall be able to achieve our aim." She appealed to the leaders of the A. I. T. U. C. to help the youth of the country in their struggle. Miss Chetshotaina ended with these words: "Long live the unity of the people of the world".

The French delegate, *M. Jean Joutssier*, in a speech in French (which was translated by the Yugoslav delegate) said that the delegates on their return would be pledged to help the Indian youth in their fight.

Mr. *George Reid*, representative of the National Union of seamen of Great Britain, conveyed greetings from British workers.

The conference also received greetings from the World Trade Union Congress and similar bodies in Soviet Russia, Poland and Yugoslavia.

Two resolutions were passed to-day, one demanding the release of all students and workers arrested in connection with Viet Nam Day demonstrations and the other expressing solidarity with the Calcutta strikers.

Indian National Trade Union Congress

New Organisation for Labour—New Delhi—3rd. May 1947

At a conference organised by Hindustan Mazdoor Sevak Sangh at New Delhi on the 3rd May 1947 in New Delhi under the presidency of *Sardar Patel* it was resolved to form a separate workers' organisation in India under the name of Indian National Trade Union Congress. *Sj. Kripalani*, Congress President, inaugurated the Conference.

The idea of forming a separate Trade Union Congress for workers who would follow the Gandhian philosophy of life was mooted some years ago and the Congress Working Committee passed a resolution last year suggesting the adoption of such a course. The organisers consider that the recent strikes under Communist leadership in the different parts of the country have not only paralysed the normal life of the country but actually affected production so as to cause misery to millions in India. *Sardar Patel*, it was understood, urged that the present anarchy in the labour movement should be checked forthwith if the country was to be spared untold suffering and peaceful transfer of power was to be effected. The need for a separate organisation was explained by more than one speaker.

There are now about seven lakhs of organised workers in the All-India Trade Union Congress of whom between three and four lakhs follow the lead of Hindustan Mazdoor Sevak Sangh. Membership of several trade unions affiliated to the A. I. T. U. C., it is alleged, is artificially bloated and several unions have fictitious and grossly exaggerated membership. It was urged that Communists could not escape responsibility for such a state of affairs and as it would not therefore be possible to capture the A. I. T. U. C. by non-Communists, with a view to giving a proper lead to workers at the present critical time, the need had arisen for separate organisation. A Committee with *Dr. Suresh Bannerjee* as President and *Mr. K. K. Desai* as Secretary and an influential Executive Committee including *Messrs. Deven Sen, G. L. Nanda, Abidali Jafferbhoy, S. K. Patil, M. John, B. R. Diwakar, P. Deshpande* and others was formed to draft a constitution for the new organisation.

It was believed that the Government of India might very soon undertake legislation to tighten up the process of scrutiny before registration of trade unions in order to prevent any fraud being committed. There seemed to be a feeling that employers in India had in many cases taken an unfair advantage and even assisted Communists to discourage genuine trade unions from growing up. Socialists including *Messrs. Shib Nath Bannerjee* and *Khedgikar* did not support the move for a new central organisation of workers. Even leaving the socialists out, with their hold over about one and a half lakhs of workers, the Hindustan Mazdoor Sevak Sangh claimed a following of four lakhs.

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel presided over the meeting. Those who attended included members of the Central Board of the Sangh, *Sj. Jagjivan Ram*, Labour member of the Interim Government, *Dr. Rajendra Prasad* and certain Labour Ministers from the Congress Provinces.

Sj. Gulzarilal Nanda, Labour Minister of Bombay and Secretary of the Mazdoor Sangh at a Press Conference to-day explained the terms of the resolution which the Board adopted. He said that at its meeting in November last the Sangh had called upon its various member unions to affiliate themselves to the Trade Union Congress and to promote through it the policy and programme of the Congress. Subsequent experience had compelled a total reversal of this policy and the Board had rescinded its previous resolution to-day.

It was obvious, *Mr. Nanda* said, that the prevailing labour unrest in the country was primarily due to the privations and difficulties experienced by the workers. To serve their political ends certain parties and groups pushed labour into discarding peaceful methods for the redress of its grievances. They were directing labour unrest into channels which often led to breaches of peace, accentuation of the hardships of the people and harm to the interests of the workers.

There was an acute shortage of supplies in the country which created serious discontent and retarded the progress of reconstruction in every direction. "we must maintain," *Mr. Nanda* said, "and expand production. We must also make sure that in the course of the political transformation which is proceeding apace a stable democracy is safely installed in the seats vacated by Imperialism."

Mr. Nanda asserted that the policies pursued by the All-India Trade Union Congress under Communist leadership which functioned in its name, stood in sharp and total conflict with the aims mentioned above. "Their ways," he said, "threaten the security and are inimical to the best interests of the workers themselves. The bulk of the working class is opposed to the political philosophy of the Communists. This is amply borne out by the results of the elections to the legislative assemblies in the country from the various labour constituencies. The workers have had enough of loss and suffering which are inseparable from the methods adopted by the Communists in dealing with the difficulties of the working class. But the presence of Congressmen and others in the T. U. C. in subordinate association with the Communists creates the wrong impression that the present policies and leadership of the T. U. C. reflect the mind of the entire working class. The urgent need of the moment is, therefore, to provide machinery for co-ordinating the scattered forces of those who are in fundamental opposition to the Communists in their approach to labour matters".

Mr. Nanda charged the present Trade Union Congress with indulging in malpractices. He alleged that it had been found that the composition and the voting strength of the various bodies in the T. U. C. were managed in such a manner that the democratic procedure of achieving a change by the influence of ideas and the relative superiority of real numerical strength has no scope at all in this case. The T. U. C. admits paper organizations and accepts fictitious or grossly exaggerated returns of membership. Another matter of deep concern to those who refuse to enter the T. U. C. is that certain dominant groups within it waged a violent campaign against arbitration as a method of avoiding strikes and securing justice to the workers. Mr. Nanda anticipated that the proposed organisation would be exposed to a fierce attack on the ground that the Sangh was seeking to disrupt the unity of the working class but pointed out that many of the unions which were now coming to form a new organisation, had for years stayed away from the T. U. C. Others which would decide to sever their connection with the T. U. C. would be leaving a hot-bed of diannity, and not a place where there was any collaboration on the basis of mutual goodwill and understanding.

Central Board's Resolution

The Central Board's resolution on the subject adopted to-day *inter alia* said :

"The Sangh deplors the fact that the discontents and difficulties of the workers are being exploited by parties and groups for ulterior political motives, causing serious damage to the economic and political life of the country and doing deep injury to the best interests of the working class and the masses in general. In the opinion of the Board, the most urgent need of the moment is to speedily bring into being and develop a central organisation of labour in the country which will strive to secure the highest benefits and the maximum progress for all categories and classes of labour while preserving a national spirit and outlook, and which will conduct the struggle of the workers for improved standards and just conditions in accordance with the principle set out in the statement of the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress dated 13th April 1946. The Board recommends to the members of the Sangh and other Congressmen actively interested in Labour to take immediate steps to form an organisation on these lines, which will be purely non-communal and which will not be subject to the control of any political party.

The Board also passed two other resolutions, one to start a fund to be known as the Labour Constructive Work Fund to be utilised exclusively for the purpose of promoting the welfare and efficiency of the working class and the other introducing the principle of election in the case of local and provincial branches of the Sangh which had been functioning for a period not less than two years.

Mr. Nanda refuted suggestions that the proposed organisation was sponsored by industrialists. The Sangh would not receive any money from the capitalists except those paid as subscriptions by workers themselves.

Most of the Congress Socialist members who were present at the meeting agreed to the proposal to start an Indian National Trade Union Congress except from one member who wanted to wait for a few months before deciding upon the course. This organization, Mr. Nanda said, would be entirely non-political and non-communal in character.

Acharya Kripalani Inaugurates

Committee to draw up Constitution

The Indian National Trade Union Congress was formally launched at a Conference of labour workers convened by Hindustan Mazdoor Sevak Sangh at New Delhi on the 3rd May 1947. *Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel* presided over the Conference, which was inaugurated by the Congress President, Acharya Kripalani.

The Conference appointed a provisional Executive for the INTUC, consisting of *Dr. Suresh Chandra Bannerjee* as Chairman, *Mr. Khandubhai K. Dasai*, Secretary and an Executive Committee of twenty-one. The Conference adopted a resolution condoling the death of prof. Abdul Bari, the Bihar labour leader.

Those who attended the Conference included *Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru*, *Sj. B. G. Kher*, *Pandit Ravi Shanker Shukla*, *Sj. Haro Krishna Mehta*, *Sj. U.P. Rama-swamy Reddiar*, *Sj. Jagjivan Ram*, *Sj. Shankarrao Deo*, *Srimati Kamaladevi*, *Mrs. Aruna Asaf Ali*, *Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia*, *Sj. Asoke Mehta* and prominent Trade Union leaders from most of the Provinces and some Indian States.

Inaugurating the Conference, *Acharya Kripalani* pointed out how it was difficult for those who believed in peaceful and democratic methods to co-operate with those who dominated the Trade Union Congress to-day. He said it was a happy augury that the Conference met under the presidentship of *Sardar Patel*, who was himself a trade unionist and who organised the B. B. C. I. Railway employees in 1919 and later the postal employees of Gujerat.

Sardar Patel explained why they had to part company with the T. U. C. and form their own organisation. The T. U. C., he said, which was given prestige by Congressmen and over which leaders like *Pandit Nehru*, the late *C. R. Das* and *Lala Lajpat Rai* had presided, was today adopting a thoroughly anti-Congress attitude. The T. U. C. was to-day dominated by Communists, who called strikes not for the good of the workers, but merely to serve their party ends or discredit the government. It was no use, he said, trying to reform the T. U. C. and capture it, because the Communist Unions put up bogus membership and did not hesitate to resort to unscrupulous methods. As a contrast, he narrated how the labour movement started by *Mahatma Gandhi* in Ahmedabad resulted in the best organisation in the country. Due to the untiring efforts of *Mr. Shankerlal Banker*, *Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda* and *Mrs. Anusuya Sarabai*, the textile Labour Association of Ahmedabad was admitted as the strongest and best organisation in the country. As a result of the work of the Union, Ahmedabad had prospered and workers got the highest wages. There were few strikes, since the parties settled their differences through the machinery of arbitration.

"We are anxious to see that the right type of union on Ahmedabad lines are started throughout the country," said *Sardar Patel* and added, "A beginning was made in 1937, when Congress accepted office to train labour workers and send them to various places. Those who started work in this manner have succeeded even though they were interrupted by political struggles. The Communists who dominate the T. U. C. today are fomenting strikes, refuse to accept arbitration, advocate a 'go slow' policy when production is most needed, and bring about frequent strikes by agitating for irresponsible demands, the step which is being taken now should have been, in fact, taken earlier. Now, with the advent of independence, we have to fight with people within the Congress itself, who are out to create chaos and capture power by any means".

Dr. Suresh Chandra Bannerjee, thrice President of the A. I. T. U. C. moved a resolution for the formation of the Indian National Trade Union Congress.

Dr. Bannerjee said that the present strength and prestige of the T. U. C. was largely due to the presence of Congressmen in it, and it was only right that they should not allow their names to be exploited any more for the furtherance of the aims of the Communist Party.

Mr. Michael John of the Tata Workers' Union strongly supported the resolution.

Sjts. R. A. Khedgikar, *Brahma Prakash* and *Sj. Shibnath Bannerjee* opposed the resolution on the ground that one more central organisation of labour would create confusion in the minds of workers. They, however, admitted that it was difficult to work with the Communists, but suggested that if all the unions now keeping aloof from the T. U. C. joined it, they would be able to secure the necessary majority to mould and reform the T. U. C.'s policy.

The Conference carried the resolution by overwhelming majority.

The Socialist Party Conference

Constitution Modified in a Convention

The All-India Congress Socialist Party will hereafter be called the Socialist Party (India) and its membership has now been thrown open to non-Congressmen also.—This vital change in the constitution of the party was finally approved by the Convention of the All-India Congress Socialist Party, which after long discussions lasting about eight hours at Cawnpore on the 28th February 1947, adopted with minor modifications, the new draft constitution as approved in the morning by the National Executive of the party.

The Convention agreed to drop the word Congress from the name of the party in deference to the wishes of senior Congressmen. The ordinary or associate membership of sympathisers will now be discontinued.

Another important modification in the constitution was that there shall be a General Council of the party consisting of not more than 100 members elected by the provincial branches, in proportion to their membership as fixed by the National Executive, provided that every branch is represented and the minimum representation is one and the maximum ten. Members of the National Executive shall be *ex-officio* members of the General Council, which shall meet at least once every six months and shall have the power of the general conference when it is not in session, provided that its decisions are not inconsistent with those of the annual conference. If for any reason the annual conference cannot meet, the General Council shall have all the powers of the conference.

Open Session—Cawnpore—1st. March 1947.

Chairman's Address

The open session of the All-India Congress Socialist Party Conference (now Socialist Party (India)) commenced at Cawnpore on the 1st. March 1947. About 275 delegates from various provinces and a large number of visitors were present.

The session was held in open air but a shamiana had been erected to accommodate the top-ranking Socialist leaders, delegates and other distinguished visitors. The pandal and the rostrum were tastefully decorated with tri-colour national flag. The leaders arrived in a procession headed by a band and led by Acharya Narendra Dev. The proceedings commenced with national songs by batches of girls and boys respectively.

Acharya Narendra Dev, Chairman of the Reception Committee, then read his welcome address. He said: "We have to reaffirm our faith in democracy and freedom. The necessity for such affirmation is the greatest to-day because if the last war has proved anything it is this that the common man after having secured for himself employment and good conditions of work, will surely demand freedom and democracy for himself in order that he may develop himself to the fullest extent."

Acharya Narendra Dev added that a new era is ushering in and the hour of fulfilment for Socialism seems to have arrived but still there are some formidable obstacles in our way which have to be surmounted because the world can reach the goal. Referring to the demand of unity of the Left by certain parties, Acharya Narendra Dev said that there was no doubt that a union of all revolutionary and socialist forces would constitute an indomitable force against reaction, but unhappily such a collaboration did not seem possible in the near future because those who expressed their eagerness to unite wanted to do so only for party advantage and not with a view to strengthening the movement.

Presidential Address

"The main task before the Socialist Party is to establish the people's raj where no distinction of caste, creed or colour will be allowed to exist," observed Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia in the course of his presidential speech.

Commenting on the announcement of H. M. G., Dr. Lohia said there was no doubt as to the fact that the British would leave their legacy of destroying the unity of this great country. It was up to them, he added, to maintain this unity which could only be done if the people of this country were united.

The decision of the party to drop the word 'Congress' from its name, Dr. Lohia declared, should in no way be interpreted as a hostile gesture. The bond between the Congress and the Congress Socialists had not been removed but had been loosened only. The Socialists could hereafter work in different spheres of

public life, such as labour and kisan movements with freedom. He warned that no one should think that this liberty was to be utilised for abusing the Congress organisation which had been built with the efforts of all of them. He, however, expressed the view that the Congress leadership at present was drifting away from democratic principles and was sticking to constitutional methods and capturing of power. Dr. Lohia criticised the Communists and characterised the Communist Party as "non-Indian." The next sixteen months up to June, 1948, were very crucial and they had to quicken the pace of their efforts to achieve their objectives of establishing socialism and nationalism, he added.

H. M. G.'s STATEMENT

Sj. Jai Prakash Narain next moved the following main resolution of the session on the political situation :

"The latest statement of the British Government fixing June 1948 when full power must be transferred to Indian hands, creates a new situation, at once full of hope and danger : hope because the end of British rule seems so near ; danger, because the statement makes possible a disruption of India and formation of British footholds. India so disrupted and infested with British pockets cannot be completely independent.

"The development of the national independence movement has not been uniform in every part of the country, the comparatively backward parts coinciding generally with the areas under the sway of communalism and the areas ruled by the Princes. Transference of power can in these areas be only to authorities depending in varying degrees upon the British Government, and therefore neither full nor complete. Accordingly, this Conference is of the opinion that it is fraught with danger for the future of the country if the British power remains here while the authority to which power is to be transferred is being created. In such a situation, it would be possible for the British to interfere with this process and to take advantage of the country's internal differences. The British have, no doubt, protested their sincerity, but recent months have shown that they took not only the fullest advantage of our internal difficulties but also accentuated them. The recent British statement itself gives every encouragement to fissiparous and anti-national and anti-democratic elements in the country by offering to treat with them separately. Therefore, this Conference demands that all power including the powers of Paramountcy to be immediately transferred to the present Interim Government at the Centre and all British troops be immediately withdrawn. There can be no danger in this to the peace of the country, as this Government is universally admitted to be broadly representative of the Indian people. Failure to make this immediate transference would only mean that it is the British desire to fight a rearguard action in order not to be pushed further back than needed. In these circumstances, this Conference warns the Indian people not to look upon the British statement as a charter of Freedom, but as a challenge and a call to greater efforts.

"The fixing of a date for the British to go has given an urgency to all our problems and our short term action has acquired a deciding importance. The energies of the people have to be so keyed up that at the promised time the country in all its parts will be completely freed from any traces of British influence.

"The statement has put in grave peril the unity of the country by endangering even a weak Union as envisaged in the Cabinet Mission's statement of May 16. So, the struggle for freedom acquires an urgency greater than ever before.

This Conference, therefore, urges all fighters for freedom, particularly in the Indian States and other areas, where there is danger of disruption to launch a campaign for national unity and to thwart every attempt to attach areas to political units without the declared acquiescence of the people concerned. As an essential part of this campaign, it is necessary to rouse the people to struggle for their economic betterment.

"There is a further danger, and so a task, to which this Conference desires to draw the attention of the people. The British, unable to meet the challenge of the national movement, are attempting to shift the struggle against them from single front to hundreds if possible. The Conference, therefore, again urges the fighters for freedom to mobilise the peoples of all possible British pockets to resist every attempt made in their name to give any quarter to the foreign power in their areas. India disrupted but all her territories completely freed from British influence may still hope in her future, but a hundred ulsters will long delay the fulfilment of her destiny,

"Lastly, this Conference wishes to draw the attention of freedom fighters and of Socialists in particular, to the new emphasis which must now be placed on the social and economic interests of the masses. It should be the particular duty of socialists now to see that the Governments at present functioning in the provinces and at the Centre govern not only in the name of the masses, but also in their immediate and ultimate interests. Further, every care must be taken that power passes not merely into Indian hands but into the hands of the toiling masses. It has become the urgent duty of Socialists now to create sanctions, so that the authority that takes power from British hands is no other than a Government of the toiling people of this country".

Moving the resolution, S_r. *Jai Prakash Narain* said that there was every danger of all their efforts being frustrated to solve their internal problems in the presence of the British Government and, therefore, asked them to leave this country here and now and hand over the power to the present Interim Government constituted of the representatives of various political and communal organisations.

Maintaining that a revolution alone could bring about a change in the existing rule and give power to the people, which was real Swaraj, S_r. *J. P. Narain* asserted that he had no faith in the constitutional methods and firmly believed that these peace proposals would result in weakening their movement and struggle for freedom.

Referring to the latest announcement of H. M. G. he said that on the basis of past experience about the professions of the Britishers, he could not believe that they would leave this country and hand over power to Indians.

The speaker placed before the audience a fourfold programme of the Socialist Party for achieving complete independence. They are to start a unity campaign all over the country, to propagate among the Muslims that the division of India was against their interest, to prepare the people of West Bengal and Eastern Punjab to resist if they were forced to join Pakistan and lastly to organise mazdoors and kisans for launching a movement to obtain power for them.

After *Munshi Ahmed Din*, Secretary of the Panjab Socialist Party, had seconded the resolution it was put to vote and passed unanimously.

The Indian Chambers of Commerce & Industry

20th Annual session—New Delhi—3rd March 1947

Pandit Nehru's Assurance to Indian Business Men

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru made a reference to criticisms of the Government's Budget Proposals in his inaugural address to the annual session of the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry held in New Delhi on the 3rd March 1947.

"It is entirely wrong," he said, "if you imagine that this Government is out to injure industry. That would be folly on our part. We want to provide facilities for industry and facilities for production—technical, scientific, power resources and all that."

Continuing, Pandit Nehru said: "When some of you gentlemen talk vaguely or definitely about Government doing something which will crush industry from growing and new schemes being undertaken, all this seems to me so very far removed from our conception of what industry must do."

Referring to the question of planning, he said that Government were pursuing numerous schemes of development at the present moment, some of them bigger, in extent at any rate, than the TVA scheme. "We had been held up by various difficulties but we want to go ahead. We want to produce power in India because power is the basis of industry, and we want basic industries, without which we will always be dependent on others for our industrial growth."

Commencing his speech, Pandit Nehru said: "It is not proper for me as a member of the Government to discuss proposals of Government here. You will no doubt discuss them with my colleague, the Finance Member, but I want to tell you that, first of all, you must view this question in its larger context. Secondly, we want to proceed in this and other matters in the closest co-operation."

We may agree or disagree. That is a different matter, but we want to proceed with as large a measure of co-operation of the people concerned as possible.

"I am sure the Finance Member will welcome any brilliant suggestion that you might put before him." (Laughter.)

"If you point out anything that can be done better, or, anything that is injurious to the country's cause, I am sure that will produce an effect on him and he will think about it and consider how he can find some way which, while it helps him to attain the end he has in view, does the least injury to any interests. If we find we have committed a mistake, we will change that. But it is obvious also that this is a very difficult question before us. We have to balance so many factors and it is not an easy thing to find out immediately and clearly that is the hundred per cent right course to follow.

"We have obviously a very big deficit to face. We have, probably, very large further demands coming from the Pay Commission, which will not only affect the Central Government but will have inevitable reactions on all Governments in India. How is all this to be done? It is a difficult matter you have to face. We can possibly shift the burden or try to shift it to the next generation or the next few years, this is rather a timid thing to do. It is better to face the burden today and accelerate progress rather than simply carry on and follow what might be considered today a popular and pleasing policy and yet which may involve a greater burden tomorrow. All these factors have to be considered.

"I am not expert enough to see the golden mean; I am merely placing before you various considerations that have to be borne in mind and, especially, I want you to appreciate that this Government or any Government, whether we are there or not, functioning at the Centre, cannot but have a policy of encouraging industry and production in every possible way and we are certainly going to follow that. Referring to the question of planning, *Pandit Nehru* said that the idea of planning as it had thus far been thought of and considered by many people—may be many amongst his audience and even in the Government of India—was something that had nothing to do with planning.

Planning meant having some conception of the goal we were striving for, of the kind of society we were aiming at, trying to work up towards that end harmoniously and peacefully with as few upsets as possible, laying down targets, so that on all sectors we would advance simultaneously. If we advanced on one sector and did not advance on others, even that one sector would come to a stop and we would get bottlenecks and difficulties. An attempt was made by the National Planning Committee to consider problems in their entirety and even the partial work the committee had done had been very helpful in that respect. He hoped that the Government of India would before very long also take steps in regard to planning in that way.

About four months ago, he continued, Government appointed a Provisional Advisory Planning Board just to look at the things that had been done and produce some kind of a report to help us take the next step. The Board had submitted its report, which was likely to be considered more fully before very long.

"The whole policy of Government, in so far as I can speak for Government, is to encourage the industrialization of India (cheers), to encourage the use of India's manpower in every possible way. When I talk about industrialization, for my part I do not see any essential conflict between the development of cottage industries in India and the industrialization of India. (Cheers).

"If we want to use all our manpower, it is quite impossible for us to absorb it in big industries for very long time to come. Even if you have millions and millions coming into big industry, yet tens of millions remain. Therefore, there is no essential conflict, though there may be a little difficulty and overlapping which can be adjusted. "Mahatma Gandhi has laid stress again, as he has often done on using India's man power to the best advantage. That ought to be axiomatic with us."

All this required most careful planning. It should be remembered that economic factors did not pay too much attention to boundaries. If we had the Damodar valley scheme, which affected at least two provinces, Bengal and Bihar, it was not a Bengal scheme or a Bihar scheme. If we had a river commission for the Ganges Valley, it would affect three provinces.

So, when there was talk of planning of a particular type, it seemed to him that we simply could not do it. If we planned for the whole of India the only right way to plan was to bring up the industrially backward parts so that there might be a balanced economy in all parts of India. Not that a part of India

should be industrialized and a part remain agricultural. That would be bad for India from every point of view.

Of course, nobody was going to force down something against the will of a province. A province would have to agree to, and carry out, that plan, but the whole conception of planning, if it was to become provincial, would become ineffective.

Pandit Nehru recalled his address in Calcutta to the representatives of a British commerce and industry in India and said that obviously India was changing rapidly and was coming into her own and others from outside India would have to fit into the structure that we produced in India.

Nevertheless, he thought that in future there was no reason why there should not be a place in India for industrialists and business men from outside, provided they fitted into the picture we produced in India, our structure would necessarily be based on considerations of India's progress, of the benefit to the hundreds of millions who inhabited India. Within that scope, he saw a place for others also.

"Today I have the honour and privilege of addressing you on whom inevitably a greater burden than you may have borne in the past is going to fall in regard to India's progress. And yet, much as I appreciate this honour, I feel a certain difficulty. The difficulty lies partly in the fact that I am a little embarrassed as a member of the Government of India to speak to you about many matters that are before you and might interest you. Secondly, the difficulty lies in the situation itself because it is a very difficult situation from every point of view, whether political or communal, but much more than all these from the economic point of view. I am no expert in financial and economic matters, though necessarily I have to try to understand them and I have to try to come to conclusions about them. Sometimes, it has struck me that perhaps those who are not experts might even understand a little more than the great experts (laughter). However, there is this advantage, that I have tried and I do try to look at these problems always in their larger context."

Referring to the recent statement made by the British Prime Minister, in regard to "the imminent withdrawal of British power from India," *Pandit Nehru* said: "Obviously that statement, or rather the facts which made that statement inevitable, made many people, who had been moving in small grooves and not paying attention to these major factors, sit up. The fact is that behind that statement, generous as it is, because it is certainly a brave act to recognize facts occasionally—and many people try to avoid recognizing the most obvious facts—there is a certain dynamic quality about the Indian situation, whether you consider it politically or economically, which cannot be ignored and which cannot be stopped.

"India is going ahead in spite of all manner of setbacks. You cannot stop India (cheers). On the political side of it, the British Government recognize that, and we must appreciate their wisdom and courage in doing so. But the fact remains, and from that fact flow other facts, that India, as she is situated geographically and economically, is going to be the centre of Asia (Hear, hear). India inevitably becomes in a sense the hub of the future work of western, southern and south-eastern Asia. We cannot escape that. It is inevitable and we have to live up to it."

Continuing, *Pandit Nehru* said that recently, Dr. Evatt, the eminent foreign Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia, "delivered a speech in which he referred to South-east Asia problems. In that speech he realized that it was necessary and essential to have co-operation between the countries of South-east Asia for the solution of pacific problems. He thought that the co-operation of India was also essential and he invited India for that co-operation.

"That was a wise speech of Dr. Evatt's and the general policy that the Australian Commonwealth has been following in regard to foreign policy has been a wise policy, because it is thinking in realistic terms of the present, it is thinking of those areas which are tied together."

Possibly the most important and immediate problem today in India was to add to our output. It seemed to him that almost everything depended on addition to our production. If we did not add to it, we could not even begin solving our problems.

We had vast schemes for dams, reservoirs, irrigation, hydro-electric works, scientific research and technical institutions, and educational progress.

All these schemes were meant ultimately to help in the production of wealth in India, the production of a better type of human being and more wealth in India. All these schemes required resources. Where were they to come from? Ultimately, we must depend upon our capacity to produce wealth in this country.

Though production was the most important thing of the moment, far too much stress had been laid on production in the past, it being thought that distribution would look after itself. "Distribution will not look after itself; in future, if there is no proper distribution, no proper social justice, there are going to be conflicts on an enormous scale. Therefore, distribution must be taken in hand and considered as a highly important factor. Nevertheless, I do say that production is the first thing today. We have on the one hand demands, and generally speaking they are justifiable demands and right demands from labour for a higher standard of living for higher wages, etc.

"Examined separately, there are very few persons who can say 'No' to them or should say 'No' to them. We want these higher standards. Yet, obviously, we can only get the standards for which we can pay. We cannot create standards out of nothing, and if we have not got enough, we simply cannot pay for them and a slow paralysis creeps into our structure.

"Unfortunately, we got into a vicious circle. Justifiable demands for wages led to strikes, strikes led to loss of production and less capacity to pay, and so, although perhaps for the moment, higher wages might be granted, the capacity to pay higher wages grew less and less.

Sj. Rajagopalachari's Address

Sj. *Rajagopalachari* in his address, said that labour should be made to see that it was a short-sighted policy to demand more wages and leisure when there was no production or shortage of production. Wages would be worthless if they were merely raised without production also being increased. Labour must be made to see this. "But," he said, "you are as responsible for it as Government is. Think it out." Referring to the question of controls, Sj. *Rajagopalachari* said: "You have said that restrictive controls of Government are responsible for producing a repressive effect on industry. I am inclined to agree with you but that does not mean that I have a remedy or that you have a remedy. We both agree that controls are not good. Man does not like any kind of controls, not even clothing, nice as it is (laughter). But to protect ourselves against the cold and for the sake of decency, we have to wear clothes sometimes (more laughter).

"We can have effective and useful controls if we have a cent per cent honest trading community and a cent per cent honest purchasing community, but we cannot have cent per cent of anything in this world. If we had even 90% honesty in all the ramifications of our economic organisation, we could have controls if we like and we might dispense with controls if we like. But that is not the position now. You argued about the many defects of controls. We will try to get rid of them one by one if you will co-operate in the matter.

"When I looked at your assembly here I grew jealous, not of your money (laughter) but of your talent—so much talent encased in the heads of those assembled here. If only we could hand over the Government of our country to you (more laughter). I felt, how wisely and well will the country be governed (cheers and laughter). But I have heard the talk in other circles also, and I hear so much said against you people (laughter) ever so much with reason and without reason, sweeping generalities, most of them, and yet you must note the fact that there are different opinions in different assemblies.

"There, every one of the ills of our country is attributed to you people (laughter), and when I come here and find every of the ills in our country or at least every one of the responsibilities in the country, attributed to the Government on the whole, I must give you gentlemen the credit of being more moderate. (laughter).

Mr. *Rajagopalachari* said that one of the principal causes of the present shortage of commodities was the wide-spread desire among the people to live better than they used to live before. Shortage was a painful thing, but if it was traceable to a growing standard of living, it was a good thing. It should encourage industry and enterprise and there was great hope before us. Our present troubles should, therefore, be an incentive to further production and need not make us miserable.

He urged the Chamber to "exorcise the ghost of nationalization." The very people who were honestly convinced that, for equalizing happiness in this country, we wanted socialization of industry, admitted freely that we could not have it straightaway. Just as the certainty of death did not disturb our day-to-day life, similarly we must deal with Socialism. Nationalization was not practicable at the present time. "Therefore you must go on and if you have belief in the character of our own people, you may rest assured that compensation will go along with any scheme of nationalization, whatever may be the value of rupees, annas and pias at

the time." Referring to criticism of the Budget proposals, S_j. *Rajagopalachari* said that it was an admitted corollary of private enterprise that we must have high taxation. The argument against the present proposals was that, since the nation depended on individual enterprise and management, there should be some incentive to profit. Surely nobody wanted to kill the goose that laid the golden egg. They had to be coaxed to lay the golden egg (laughter). Not only should there be incentive left for management, it should be a fair dividend for those who invested their money in shares.

Then again, just as the labourer was worthy of his hire, skilled management, represented at the conference should also have fair wages. He urged the Chamber not only to give their criticisms of the taxation proposals but also to show how the Finance Minister might find the money by doing something else.

Second Day—New Delhi—4th March 1947

Resolution—Working of State Controls

The annual session concluded to-day. Mr. *M. A. Master* who was elected President of the Federation at this morning's meeting, said that a deputation from the Federation had a full and frank discussion with the Finance Member, Mr. *Liaquat Ali Khan*, and placed before him for his consideration the views of the Federation on the budget proposals. It was possible, he said, that there might be a further meeting with the Finance Member.

The Chamber passed a resolution on economic policy viewing with concern the deterioration in all spheres of economic activity "created as a result of the absence of any definite economic policy on the part of Government." The resolution calls upon the Interim Government to take immediate steps to examine *de novo* the operation of various controls. Export restrictions should be reviewed to permit India to re-establish her pre-war markets and to retain existing ones, the resolution continues, and states that the import policy which permits unrestricted entry of non-essential and luxury goods will exhaust India's limited foreign exchange resources, and, therefore, this policy should be overhauled. Internal restrictions such as inter-provincial and State barriers should be removed and there should be co-ordination in the administration of measures of control adopted by the Central Government and the Provinces and the Indian States. Non-officials should be associated with the administration of controls and Government should take steps to set up a permanent Tariff Board machinery to review on its own initiative the effect of protection on various industries.

The resolution was moved by Mr. *Ramdas Kilachand* and among those who supported the resolution were S_j. *Ramanathan Chettiar*, Dr. *K. A. Hamid*, S_j. *Amritlal Kalidas Kanji* and *Lala Harprasad Agarwal*.

Sterling Balances

S_j. *A. D. Shroff* moved a resolution welcoming the opening of negotiations on sterling balances between representatives of the Government of India and the British Government and reiterating the unqualified opposition of the Federation to any scaling down. It was regretted that no non-officials had been associated in the negotiations, and it was hoped that this omission would not occur in future talks on the subject. The resolution, which was seconded by S_j. *Lalji Mehrotra*, was passed.

A resolution on the need for increased production proposed by S_j. *G. D. Birla*, and supported by Dr. *S. B. Dutta* and S_j. *Begraj Gupta*, was also accepted by the House. The resolution pointed out that there was a spiral of increasing costs of production and higher wages due to decreased production and scarcity of goods, which, if unchecked, would "distort the entire national economy." The resolution said that the continuance of controls would hamper production and prolong conditions of scarcity and urged Government to take immediate measures to maximise production by encouraging private enterprise to expand production to the full and extend all facilities to industry, such as better transport, adequate supplies of necessary raw materials and the stabilisation of wages.

Budget Proposals Criticised

A resolution on the Budget proposals was moved by Sir *Purshottamdas Thakurdas* and was passed after four speakers, S_j. *M. A. Master*, the President designate of the Federation, S_j. *S. P. Jain*, Dr. *K. A. Hamid* and S_j. *Pandurangiah Chetty* had supported the motion. The resolution expressed keen disappointment over the Budget proposals and stated that its concrete proposals were calculated to "cripple trade and industry." Regret was expressed that there was no

recognition in the proposals of the economic deterioration in the country and no constructive plan. Plans for economic development, trade, commerce and industry, if continued, would "hardly be able to bear the staggering burdens which are proposed to be laid almost exclusively "such as the special incometax on profit over one lakh the tax on capital gains, the increase in the corporation tax and the change in the level of application of Supertax. The resolution requested the Finance Member to revise the proposals so as to ensure all round development of the country. The Federation welcomed the abolition of the salt tax and the appointment of a Committee to scrutinise Government expenditure and the "Finance Member's bold presentation of India's claim in respect of the payment of sterling balances."

Three resolutions were moved from the Chair and passed. In a resolution on the International Conference on Trade and Employment, the Federation approved in principle the formation of an International Trade Organisation but expressed dissatisfaction with the procedure outlined in the draft charter regarding protective measures by underdeveloped countries. The resolution further stated that India could not surrender to the Organisation her liberty to adopt protective measures to protect and develop her industries. The Federation requested the Government of India to make direct reference to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, that services such as shipping and insurance should not be excluded from the application of recommendations made by the Joint Committee of the Preparatory Session of the International Conference on Trade and Employment for the regulation of restrictive business practices.

In a second resolution, the Federation recorded its appreciation of the amendment of immigration law by the United Congress to enable Indians to enjoy the rights of U. S. citizenship.

The Federation was of the opinion that while it was necessary to nationalise defence and certain basic industries when private capital was not forthcoming the system of private enterprise offered the best way of speedy industrialisation of the country and urged the Government of India to make an early announcement on the subject giving Indian industry and commerce full encouragement.

CIVIL AVIATION

Sj. G. L. Mehta moved a resolution on civil aviation urging the Government to formulate and implement a clear and vigorous policy of development of air transport both internal and external immediately, and to encourage private enterprise under strict Government control and thus ensure the most rapid and orderly progress. The resolution continued that Government should secure for India her proper share in international air traffic through bilateral agreements. To develop civil aviation Government should also expedite the scheme for training air pilots and technical personnel, establish a fullfledged aircraft manufacturing industry and encouraging flying and gliding clubs. The resolution was supported by Sj. N. T. Khandawalla and Mr. A. R. Bhatt.

By another resolution, moved by Sj. Rattilal Mulji Gandhi, the Federation called upon Indian Provinces and Indian States to co-operate with the Central Government in its efforts to increase agricultural production. The resolution expressed grave concern over the food situation in the country and welcomed the Government's five-year plan for increased production and also the appointment of the Commodity Prices Board. Those who spoke on the resolution included Sj. Ramdeo A Poddar, Sj. S. P. Virmani, Seth Devji Ratani and Sj. Ashutosh Bhattacharya.

POWERS OF INDIAN UNION CENTRE

The last resolution on the powers and policies of the Indian Government was moved by Sj. Shroff and supported by Lakshminarasu and Bawa Bachittar Singh. The resolution expressed the view that the implementation of the State Paper of May 16 "will result in releasing forces of disruption which will be immensely intensified by the Statement of the British Prime Minister" on Feb. 20. The minimum powers that should be vested in the Union Government must enable it to make policies in respect of currency and coinage customs and tariffs, protection to Indian industries, defence and communications, the resolution continued. The fear was expressed that if the units were left free to make their own policies in these subjects "it will be a serious menace to the entire economic fabric of the country." Revenue from customers, income-tax, profits from currency and coinage and from centrally-owned services such as railways, posts and telegraphs should be allocated to the Union Government.

The All India Forward Bloc Council

Bauria (Howrah)—16th. to 18th. March 1947

Call for Fresh Struggle under Netaji's Slogan

The view that the latest declaration of the British Government to transfer power to Indian hands after 15 months was a "well-designed and serious attempt at disrupting India in the name of bogus transference of power," was expressed in a lengthy resolution passed at a meeting of the All-India Forward Bloc Council which assembled for a 3-day session at Bauria (Howrah) on the 18th March 1947.

The resolution expressed the opinion that British Imperialism had sought through this statement not to voluntarily liquidate itself but to perpetuate its stranglehold over India in newer and subtler ways. The dead-line mentioned in the British Government's declaration should be regarded as the zero hour for launching a struggle under Netaji's slogan 'all power to the Indian people'.

Inaugurating the session *Sardar Sardul Singh Caveeshar* who presided, criticized Mr. Attlee's statement as regards transfer of power at the end of the period fixed by him. Mr. Attlee's reference to various parties, *Sardar Caveeshar* said, to which the sovereign power was to be transferred were extremely mischievous. In so many words, he meant that he had gone back upon the previous decision of the British Cabinet to hand over Defence, Foreign Affairs and Communications to a United Centre.

"I am sure," *Sardarji* said, "no Indian will tolerate division of India on the lines indicated by Mr. Attlee. We must have a United India having full powers to defend the country against foreign aggression. By dividing India into different units we will not only create internal troubles as is the case in the Balkan States, we shall also be inviting foreign aggression from all sides. If the British are really honest to hand over power to Indians, they ought to have followed the democratic principles in vogue all over the world. They should hand over the Government of India to the majority party of India, that is, the Indian National Congress, specially as it represents not only the Hindus, but also nationalists of all other communities.

"After the transference of power, if any minority has any grievance, it is the duty and privilege of the majority to satisfy such grievances. In case, the minority feels dissatisfied, they have the constitutional power to change a majority into a minority. But if under the present circumstances, majority cannot be turned into a minority because of the communal electorates, then the minority has the inherent right to fight out the majority. It is no business of the foreigner to interfere in such a settlement. Otherwise, such interference is only a camouflage of the "divide and rule" policy."

Sardarji then referred to the role of the Forward Bloc at the present time. The Forward Bloc has to fight for a united India in which all provinces shall be autonomous, having full powers except those which are absolutely necessary for a strong united Centre. He appealed to strengthen the Azad Hind Dal and organise kisan, labour and youth movements in the country for the next struggle.

TEXT OF THE RESOLUTION

The following main political resolution was passed:—

"The latest British announcement, made by Prime Minister Attlee in the House of Commons on the 20th February last, fixing June 1948 as the dead-line for the transfer of power from the British to Indian hands, has been hailed in some quarters, particularly of the Congress leadership, as the harbinger of that freedom and liberty for which India has been aspiring and striving for decades. It is tragic that in their enthusiasm the Congress leadership and others who think in their manner, lose sight of the historical antecedents of Imperialist rule as also the disastrous implications of the Attlee declaration. It is the considered opinion of this Committee that British Imperialism has sought, through this statement, not to voluntarily liquidate itself but to perpetuate its stranglehold over India in newer and subtler ways suited to the new national and international conditions and with this end in view England has taken fifteen months' time to carry through the new Imperialist conspiracy. It is a fact that while on the one hand the last Imperialist war shattered the bastions of British Imperialism, it has on the other released enormous patriotic and revolutionary forces of the Indian people, which are powerful enough to break the shackles that have bound them for ages. Along

side of being confronted with a deepening economic crisis at home and an inescapable revolutionary situation in India and the colonies Britain is, in the international sphere, dragged into an alliance with American Imperialism for an eventual war against the Soviet Union. This has compelled Britain to seek alliance with national movements of India and elsewhere. The immediate factor to evoke the latest British Statement was the crisis in the Interim Government of India which Britain could not solve and has consequently attempted to bypass for the time being.

"This Committee is pained to note that the latest British declaration has deliberately given the go-bye even to a superficial unity of India as envisaged in the British Cabinet Mission plan and instead has sought to partition India not only into separate States independent of each other but also bring into existence numerous satellite States with whom Britain will negotiate separately and thus create imperialist pockets and maintain its grip over this country. England knows well that an India divided into a number of warring States will become an easier prey to British imperialism's pressure and machinations. Besides, by posing the question of compulsory grouping or a forced partition British imperialism has sought to accentuate Hindu-Muslim conflicts to an unprecedented scale, as is clear from what is happening in the Punjab, Bengal, N. W. F. P. and elsewhere. Thus the traditional imperialist policy of divide and rule has reached its culmination in the latest British declaration which is a well designed and serious attempt at disrupting India in the name of bogus transference of power to her hands after fifteen months when really imperialists will be in comfortable position to dictate terms to India and settle her fate in a manner that suits them best. Strangely enough, the terms of Indo-British treaty that will come up some day are yet a closed secret. But it is evident that in the name of joint defence of India and her frontiers, the British will have military bases at strategic points and in the name of a "fair deal" to the British commercial and industrial interests the British finance capital will have retained its hold over Indian economy. Apart from this Britain will have a powerful ally in the Indian vested interests in the event of a war with the Soviet Union.

This Committee is painfully aware that frightened by the revolutionary upsurge of the people, Indian vested interests are entering into a junior partnership with British imperialism which is fraught with a grave danger to the interest and well-being of the teeming millions. The Indian reactionaries are, therefore, at one with the British imperialists in suppressing the struggles of the people provoking at the same time fratricidal strife so as to sidetrack the main economic and social issues in the life of the people.

In the circumstances, this Committee is convinced that the British declaration constitutes a supreme challenge to India's will to freedom and independence, to her patriotism and national solidarity and that the challenge should be accepted in right earnest on behalf of the Indian people. Happily in this respect the British have set a dead-line, which should be regarded as the zero-hour for the final assault on British Imperialism. It is high time that Netaji's slogan of seizure of power, through a relentless struggle of the toiling people themselves under the slogan of "All power to the Indian people" be advanced and the masses called upon to rally round it under a common banner, the banner of freedom, democracy and socialism.

Indian people have now a mere fifteen months at their disposal for an all-out preparation for seizure of power. In the opinion of this Committee, national unity and revolutionary solidarity of the Indian people is the paramount need of the hour, in view of the coming life and death struggle. Unfortunately enough, that national unity has been gravely impaired and the present policy of British imperialism, as also of the Congress and League leaderships, tends to weaken it further in the coming months. In this respect, this Committee is shocked at the desire evinced by the Congress leadership at the instance of communal bodies for the partition of the Punjab and Bengal on religious and communal basis. By this action the Congress High Command has gone counter to the nationalist traditions of Congress and has encouraged centrifugal forces in the body politic of India. All this augurs ill for the future.

While this Committee believes that the right of self-determination must be granted to cultural and linguistic units in a socialist society under the Union of socialist republics of India, it is definitely opposed to the disruption of India on religious and communal basis and consequently the All-India Forward Bloc Council calls upon the Indian people to resist the proposed partition of the Punjab and Bengal and to fight the League Scheme of Pakistan as well as the latest British plan of Balkanisation of India.

Time has also come when it should be unequivocally declared that power seized through a revolutionary fight of the people will belong to the toiling masses, the workers and peasants of India who will be free to shape their destiny and eliminate all exploitation of nation by nation, class by class and man by man and themselves become masters of fields and factories under the aegis of a really free and democratic Peoples Government. In the future society of free India all sections of the people should be assured of full cultural linguistic freedom and freedom of worship and faith and every son and daughter of the soil guaranteed un'entered opportunity of growth and development and enjoyment of the fruits of their own labour.

The Committee also believes that a mighty joint front of all the patriots, revolutionaries and the toiling masses of the country should be forged and on this basis the final battle for India's complete liberation should be planned and prepared during the coming fateful months.

The Council calls upon all the fellow patriots and revolutionaries, the workers and youths and intellectuals to realise the supreme gravity of the hour and rise to the height of the times.

The Council directs all the units and members of the Forward Bloc to take the earliest initiative on the basis of the following programme of work.

PROGRAMME OF WORK

1. To mobilise the people under Netaji's slogan of "All power to the Indian people."
 2. To form panchayats in every village and factory.
 3. To achieve leadership of the day-to-day political and economic struggles of the workers and peasants on the basis of their basic and day-to-day demands, as accepted by the Forward Bloc.
 4. To build a people's volunteer organization under the Azad Hind Dal all over the country.
 5. To assume active leadership of the States people's struggle for the liquidation of the princely order and establishment of democracy and socialism.
 6. To build invincible national unity, Hindu-Muslim brotherhood and revolutionary solidarity of all the people of the land.
 7. To organise shop assistants' clerks, teachers and employees.
 8. To organise movements of students, intellectuals and women.
 9. To fight against food and cloth scarcity, famine and pestilence and liquidate the black-marketeers and profiteers.
 10. To fight for the civil liberties of the people wherever they are assailed.
- India's hour of destiny has arrived. This Committee believes that the sons and daughters of India who have inherited the great patriotic traditions of the past, particularly those of the I. N. A., of Netaji and of the August Revolution of 1942, will not fail her at this supreme hour. Let all gird up their loins, steel their hearts and assert Indian's will to freedom and forge the necessary organs of struggle and seizure of power.'

The All India Majlis-e-Ahrar

The Working Committee—Lahore—24th March 1947

Ahrars' Change of Attitude to Congress

The Working Committee of the All-India Majlis-e-Ahrar at its session at Lahore on the 24th March 1947 passed a resolution suggesting the revision of its policy of co-operation with the Congress and giving it a new orientation in accordance with "the spirit and ideal of the Muslim nation."

The resolution passed by the Committee places the blame for the communal riots on the "Fascist Congress leadership." It accuses the Congress of having set out on "a pre-planned programme of aggression" in order to coerce and intimidate the Muslim majority into submission and incapacitate it for its legitimate role in the Province. The resolution asserts that "the gruesome happenings in B-har and Noakhali and the other parts of the country were the results of the Fascist mentality of the Congress and states that this aggressive attitude of the Congress has forced the Majlis-e-Ahrar to revise its policy of co-operation with

the Congress." The Working Committee has also appealed to come together for a joint effort to achieve the emancipation of the Indian Muslims.

By another resolution, the Working Committee opposed the partition of the Punjab as proposed by the Congress. A sub-committee was also set up to contact other Muslim political organisations and formulate a common programme of action.

All India Depressed Classes League

Tenth Session—Patna—7th. April 1947

Alignment with Muslim League Mean Political Harakiri

A clarion call to the Harijans of India to align themselves wholly with the Congress during the critical days when power was being transferred by the British Government and not to commit political harakiri by co-operating with the Muslim League was given by *Sj. H. J. Khandekar*, M.L.A. (O.P.) and a member of the Constituent Assembly, presiding over the tenth annual session of the All-India Depressed Classes League held at Patna on the 7th. April 1947.

Sj. Khandekar, after analysing the drawbacks from which the Scheduled Castes were suffering and after scanning the political situation of India, said :

"Those of us who are still flirting with the Muslim League in the hope that something will turn up by such co-operation, have, to put it mildly, cast off wisdom to the winds." "If Mr. Jinnah say to us", he emphasized, "that we should not seek Quilings in Muslim camps, we must be equally emphatic in our demand that he should seek none among the Harijans."

"I am convinced," he continued, "that the future of the depressed classes lies in the establishment of socialism in this country but we cannot be oblivious of the immediate situation and it is this that notwithstanding the march of science and machine, religion will play a dominant role in our life and is a forceful factor to be reckoned with rather than to be brushed aside as insignificant or useless. I am looking forward to the day when we shall think more in terms of economics than religion or community. The growth of industries and elimination of semi-daridies will naturally shift the emphasis from the communal to the economic problem but this will take some time. Elimination of religious or communal bias in our body politic must be preceded by levelling up of those who form the exploited and downtrodden masses of our population and of these the Harijans or the Depressed Classes form the bulk. It is fortunate that we Harijans are recognised as an important political element in India and safeguarding of our rights in the future constitutional arrangements is an essential plank in the constitutional fabric."

Until that day when the religious or communal bias disappeared from the political life of this country, he went on to say, the Harijans had to take decisions as to how they were going to conduct themselves in the period of transition.

"If India as a whole," he remarked, "cannot forget the Jallianwalla Bagh, the Harijans can never forget Noakhali and Tipperah. A Burke, a Sheridan, a Fox or a Pitt will find himself unable to adequately describe the horrors through which the Harijans of Noakhali and Tipperah had passed.

"Those of us who are still flirting with the Muslim League in the hope that something will turn up by such co-operation, have, to put mildly, cast off wisdom to the winds. To co-operate with the Muslim League while its present character and composition subsist is to commit political suicide."

"By manipulation and exaggeration," he continued, "the Muslim League claims to represent 100 million Muslims of India. We are asked to believe that we are only 60 millions and as such our numerical inferiority is sought to be brought out in bold relief. I contest this statement and am convinced that our numerical strength is almost equal to, if not greater than that of the Muslims, and hence I demand that an immediate census of the members of the Scheduled Castes should be taken all over India including the Indian States so that we will have definite and reliable data on which to work out the details of our position vis-a-vis constitutional development."

Elaborating on this point he said: "It is well-known that the League Ministry in Bengal deliberately mishandled the whole question of enumeration of the scheduled castes. In many places they were counted as a part of the Muslim population and in other cases they were simply omitted. In the same way in various other provinces persons who ought to be legitimately included among the Scheduled Castes were classified as Caste Hindus with the result that the ultimate census figures disclosed a very much depleted number of Harijans.

"It is of the utmost importance to the future of our community that a fresh census should be taken and I urge upon the Central Government with all the emphasis at my command that they should direct the taking up of such a census forthwith."

Discussing political and economic rights for which they should fight, S. J. Khan-dekar said that the disturbances in Noakhali and Tipperah which wrought untold miseries to Harijans, about 40,000 of whom were, according to my information, still homeless, had brought to the forefront the question of partition of Bengal into East Bengal with a predominant Muslim population and West Bengal which consists predominantly of non-Muslims. He, then, referred to the Delhi Resolution of the Congress Executive which favoured partition of the Punjab and said it was clear that a redistribution of provinces on cultural and linguistic basis was inevitable. It was satisfactory that allotment of quota of Harijan representatives on the constitution making body on the population basis had given a decent burial to the Lucknow Pact and helped the Harijans to come into their own. There was no doubt that in any future arrangements, Harijan representatives would ensure adequate protection to the interests of their own community.

INDIAN STATES AND HARIJANS

With regard to the Indian States, he said that they must demand that in as much as the Harijans number one crore they were entitled to 10 seats out of the quota of 93. It must be distinctly understood that the Harijan members of the Constituent Assembly would not be a party to any constitutional arrangement in respect of Indian States if this demand was overlooked.

Lastly, he referred to the question how untouchability could be removed. If the social tyranny, he said, which was inherent in it, was not ended, it would give rise to worse type of economic tyranny. The only way to end tyranny in every form was to reorganize society on economic and occupational basis.

If the Hindus want to save themselves from Muslim aggression, as I do believe they want to, they must fix a dead line for the abolition of untouchability. If June, 1949 is the day of India's deliverance, is it too much to ask that the same day should also be fixed by the Caste Hindus and leaders of political thoughts as the day of our deliverance from social tyranny? Mahatma Gandhi has declared times without number that the stigma of untouchability has no place in the free India and let us earnestly hope that his followers will carry this wish of his to its fulfilment on the same day as they want their long cherished freedom."

All India Manufacturers' Organisation

Annual Session—New Delhi—4th April 1947

Pandit Nehru's Call to Manufacturers

The need for rapid industrialisation of India was stressed by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru when he inaugurated the annual session of the All-India Manufacturers' Organisation in New Delhi on the 4th April 1947.

Referring to the demand for a declaration of the Government's attitude towards nationalisation, Pandit Nehru said she could not fix any date for such an announcement because they were now in a peculiar state of transition and crisis and were confronted with hundreds of urgent problems requiring solution. Pandit Nehru, however, agreed it was high time that the Government clarified their position and hoped it would be done before long.

Pandit Nehru also disclosed that the Government had decided to set up a "Scientific Man-power Committee" to ensure that no scientific or technical talent in the country was wasted.

Pandit Nehru said that there was no further need to emphasise that India should be industrialised. That was well realised, but India to-day was in a peculiar position. Politically, India was still a dependent country and yet one saw at the same time that she was functioning as an independent country which in history had not happened to other dependent countries.

"We function more and more not only as an independent country, but in a sense as a leading country in the world", he said.

"I have no doubt in my mind that in theory, complete nationalisation is desirable", Pandit Nehru said. "But practically it is difficult. Control by the Government may be one hundred per cent in some cases, ten per cent in others, but some measure of control is bound to come in when there is a planned economy. I do not want to interfere with private industry; but if you are going to plan, even private industry must function within that plan."

In regard to the nationalisation policy, Pandit Nehru said, "I think it is high time, the Government clarified their position. But I cannot fix any date because we are in a peculiar state of crisis and transition."

Urging the need for rapid industrialisation, Pandit Nehru declared: "We have to cover in five to ten years what other countries have taken generations to do."

Everyone with the least foresight, Pandit Nehru said, knew what India of to-morrow was going to be. India of to-morrow would be not merely politically a powerful country, but industrially a progressive country. (Cheers). Others were realising it and they could see it in the way other people behaved towards India. The troubles which India was facing to-day were indeed minor ones. In India to-day, force of vitality were generating and they would take her far. Perhaps, all the present troubles were due to an excess of that vitality.

"Let us not bemoan our lot", Pandit Nehru said. "See what happened at the Asian Conference. Did we function there as a down-and-out nation? Where is the question of our bemoaning? I looked round with pride at all those countries which were represented, including great industrial countries. I am going to copy from them because I know they have much to teach us. I shall learn everything they have got to teach us. But my learning will not be a slavish imitation and, therefore, if you have to industrialise this country, it is not going to be a replica of what England and the U.S.A. have achieved. But it is going to be Indian."

"We all blame others for our lot, but let us not cast the blame any further. That is why we have struggled all these years. Essentially, no good can come without political freedom and all other freedoms flow out of political freedom. That political freedom was denied to us, but now it is coming. Now that we are on the verge of political freedom, we shall run and bounce towards economic freedom. What type it will be or what kind it will be, it is not easy for me to say. It is right that we must give full thought to it because it is a question involving 400 million people."

"I do not want industrial development if 400 million people are going to be in a bad way", Pandit Nehru continued. "Progress must bring progress to all the people and not to a chosen few. We have to think in terms of the masses of this country. Their standard of living must be raised. The industrial progress and the prosperity of the 400 million people, and not merely of a ten or a hundred thousand people, are inter-related. The position to-day in the U. K. and the U.S.A. is the product of 200 years of industrial growth. They passed through various phases and there was frightful abuse in the factories and elsewhere following the Industrial Revolution for the first generation or two. Are we going to cover that frightful abuse and must it be repeated?"

Nonetheless, Pandit Nehru said, we must cover in five or ten years what other countries had taken generations to do and at the same time, carry millions with us, not by compulsion or in any authoritarian way, but with their consent.

Referring to the question of nationalisation, Pandit Nehru said that it had been suggested that the Government should make clear its economic policy. While he agreed that it was high time that the Government clarified their position and hoped it would be done before long, he could not fix a date because they were in a peculiar stage of transition and crisis and hundreds of problems faced them which had to be solved just now. It was extremely difficult to do hundreds of things at the same time. They would, however, face them and solve them.

While he could not bind down the Government in what he said in regard to nationalisation he would ask them to consider the question from the point of

view of the masses. The general view-point expressed at the conference was that the Government must help industries in every way by tariffs finance etc. At the same time, it was urged that the Government must keep away and not interfere, but just provide the sinews of industries. That was not a logical position to take up. "I might inform you," Pandit Nehru said, "that the Government are going to do no such thing. But what they are going to do I do not know. The Government are anxious that India should produce more wealth and raise the standard of her people—through means of all industries small, big and cottage industries—and utilise every individual for efficient production. The question is how to achieve it. Supposing relations between the employers and employees were so bad and there was continued industrial trouble, then we cannot get moving. One might compromise here and there, but the whole background was that production would be hampered. We would have to find some co-operative working—some measure of adjustment on both sides".

Pandit Nehru said that labour unrest was not an exclusively Indian phenomenon. It was much more so in America and Britain. "We are passing through a certain phase after the war and possibly, we are passing through it because the old economic foundation is not suitable for the modern world. If you in India are going to think in terms of an out-of-date economy and try to build up a structure just thinking of what took place in the U. S. A. or the U. K. in the previous ages, you will be out of date and building on shifting sands. In fact, production and economic growth must be based on social contentment. Without that, there is no great future for India."

Referring to Sri M. Visweswaraya's remarks that the public were anxious to know what the Government policy was in regard to nationalisation, Pandit Nehru said that an over-whelming majority of the people passionately desired nationalisation—may be without knowing it or analysing it. Why did they want it so? When one talked of the "public", one should beware of what public one referred to. The public criticised manufacturers and industrialists and said that in the course of the war, a number of people had made vast sums of money legitimately or illegitimately, probably both. They had accentuated the contrast between the rich and the poor greatly. In considering the question, one should take into account the feelings and urges of millions of people. The millions must be carried, otherwise the best of schemes would simply collapse.

Emphasising that the public must be convinced in giving effect to any plan, Pandit Nehru said that it was a difficult task. It was difficult because the public had little vision and it did not look ahead. It recognised only the troubles of the day. The question of nationalisation should, of course, be discussed in a practical way and not in a theoretical sense. In fact, if the question was looked at from a practical point of view, it was not easy to say 'yes' or 'no' to it. It had to be discussed in the context of to-day and not in an idealistic context. Ultimately, it was a question of their capacity as well. Pandit Nehru said; that he had no doubt in his mind that in theory complete nationalisation was desirable. But in practice how and when they would do it was another matter. At the present moment, they had to consider what was the best way to get over the present economic difficulty and indulge in schemes which might obstruct and delay progress during a very vital part of their existence.

Pandit Nehru said that when one talked of planning, obviously there should be some kind of governmental agency to control. It might be hundred per cent in regard to certain industries and ten cent in regard to others. But all the same some measure of control was bound to come if there was to be any planned economy.

"In the present stage", Pandit Nehru said, "There will have to be inevitably a great deal of private enterprise. I do not want to interfere with them. But if you are going to plan, even these private enterprises must function within that plan." Pandit Nehru referred to the paucity of trained man-power in the country and disclosed that the Government had decided to set up a committee which would perhaps be called the Scientific Man-power Committee to consider particular points. The committee would investigate the question taking into account the available scientific personnel and technicians and, where necessary, send them overseas for further training and ensure that no scientific talent was wasted. There was plenty of talent in India. In fact, India was full of scientific and technical talents, but they needed an opportunity for training.

On the question of scientific research, Pandit Nehru asked what the indus-

trialists themselves had done in this regard. "I think their record is astonishingly poor. We have got a habit here always of relying on the Government. We look to the Government for everything except to be taxed heavily."

He recognised there were some industrial organisations in India which had encouraged scientific research. But as a whole, very little had been done by the industrialists and they should do far more. The Government, however, were keenly conscious of the necessity of the scientific research.

Pandit Nehru referred to the strike in the coalfields at Jharia and appealed to both the sides—capital and labour—to save the situation. His own memories of Jharia were rather distant. He had had in his life some ghastly experiences but none could compare with his visit to the coal mines. He had the shock of his life at the prevailing conditions of work. "For my part", he said, "nothing in the world will make me work there."

"I can quite understand and appreciate the feelings among workers for better conditions in every way. I do not know what changes have taken place in recent years. On the other hand, when I learnt that in the Jharia coalfields a strike had taken place and that it was really endangering the coalfields. I could not help feeling that the workers have taken upon themselves a very heavy responsibility. I do not know the rights and wrongs of the strike. But whatever they may be they are not entitled to endanger lives and irremediably damage the coal mines by any kind of action of the nature of sabotage. It is really against the whole community. We have got in the coalfields a proper Governmental procedure to deal with disputes and certainly no one can say it is a partial procedure". Pandit Nehru, in conclusion, appealed for industrial peace in the coalfields.

The Indian Labour Conference

Eighth Session—New Delhi—21st. April 1947

Government's Five-year Welfare Plan

Improved working and living conditions for workers and increased productivity should be our watchword, said *Sj. Jagjivan Ram*, Labour Member of the Interim Government, opening the eighth session of the Indian Labour Conference, at New Delhi on the 21st. April 1947. "These", he said, "can be brought about only by each recognising not only its rights but its obligations, not only to the other party, but to the community as a whole. For, let us not forget that in the complex economic structure in which we are living, a strike in an important industry is not merely a dispute between an employer and a worker, but involves a stoppage of production which causes serious inconvenience to the community, and in the case of basic industries, paralyses the productive effort of the community. It is because of this that the community cannot stand by as a disinterested spectator when a strike is on in any important or essential industry and has, therefore, provided a machinery for the peaceful resolution of differences between employers and workers".

Sj. Jagjivan Ram said: "It may be that in certain circumstances, where no other remedy is available or where the conscience of the community is not sufficiently roused to bring sufficient pressure to bear upon the parties or authorities concerned to bring about a just settlement of the workers' legitimate grievances, the strike weapon may have to be handled, but it is a weapon which ought to be used with extreme discretion and discrimination and never with any political objective. If the worker has a right to expect assistance from the community and the State representing the community—and nowadays, no abiding improvement will be possible unless the demands of the workers are backed by public opinion and the authority of the State, wherever necessary—the community equally has a right to expect that its normal activity should not be disrupted, except under the gravest provocations. I am mentioning this because our recent experience in several cases has shown that no Government can function if it allows the workers to be made a pawn of political parties interested not in bringing about an improvement in working conditions consistent with the general economic conditions in the country, but to secure a position of advantage for their own parties."

NEED FOR INCREASED PRODUCTION

Sj. Jaggivan Ram then referred to labour unrest in the country during the past months, especially in a few basic or essential industries which resulted in a "go slow" policy adopted by the workers and said: 'I am not suggesting that the workers have no legitimate causes for dissatisfaction. They have been subjected to considerable strain during the war period which has now been accentuated by the continued scarcity of essential goods, an acute shortage of housing and fear of unemployment resulting from the contraction of war-time activity. I have said on many occasions that no industry has a right to exist if it cannot provide decent living standards for the workers. To bring about an improvement in the working and living conditions of workers, various measures are in train and I have no doubt that they will yield results, which will in the near future, be apparent to all. At the same time I cannot emphasise too strongly the need for increased production. A mere increase in wages unaccompanied by increased productivity will be worse than useless, because it will set in train a vicious inflationary spiral of high prices and high wages each trying to catch up with the other'.

A. I. Newspaper Editors' Conference

Annual Session—Madras—18th. to 20th. April 1947

Presidential Address

Presiding over the All-India Newspaper Editors' Conference, which met at the Banqueting Hall, Madras on the 18th. April 1947, Sj. Devadas Gandhi, Managing Editor of the *The Hindustan Times*, stressed the responsibility of the Press in India in the period of transition through which the country was passing. He urged newspapers "to concentrate on printing the word that will soothe and help and eliminate everything which will irritate and hinder." Sj. Devadas Gandhi, in his address said:

Fellow Editors: It is indeed a great honour to be chosen to preside over this august body of the newspaper editors of India. I am deeply sensible of the trust you have reposed in me. I must at the same time confess that I feel care-free in the thought that in any task of responsibility that it may fall to my lot in the course of the year to perform, I shall always be able to count on the guidance and help of colleagues in the profession, many of whom are senior to me both in age and experience.

My mind goes back to-day to November 1940, when the A.-I.N.E.O. was born. The Press then went through what was perhaps the greatest crisis in its history. The Government of the day did not command the ready support or allegiance of the vast majority of newspapers. Their sympathies lay with the nationalist movement for the recognition of India's right to be consulted before being committed to a declaration of war. Lord Linlithgow's Government had planned measures which, if enforced, would have made a mockery of what little freedom the Press could enjoy at the time. Some of us in Delhi, who had a finger on the pulse of the Imperial Bureaucracy, held hurried consultations. Urgent telegrams were sent to the leaders of the profession outside Delhi suggesting an immediate conference. There was wide and quick response. Editors left their stations for Delhi at the shortest possible notice to meet in the now historic Conference of November 9 and 10, 1940. The invitation to Mr. Kasturi Srinivasan to preside at the conference was sent by telegram so as to reach him *en route* at Nagpur. The Conference was a demonstration of solidarity which has done lasting good to the Press of India. The issue involved concerned the elementary rights of the Press, and we were happy to see the British-owned newspapers joining hands with us. Good old Desmond Young, who was then the Government's Chief Adviser on matters pertaining to the press, was quick to perceive the strength of our determination and he did a great service to his Government no less than to the profession to which he belonged by the skillful way in which he negotiated with us the instrument which came to be known as the Delhi Agreement. The essence of the Agreement was that the Government made it clear that they meant no reflection on the Press and withdrew the Order they had passed under the Defence of India Rules on the assur-

ance that the Press had no intention of impeding the war effort. The Government also agreed to the appointment of Advisory Committees of representatives of the Press at the Centre and in the Provinces. That was the foundation of the Conference as a permanent organisation of which the Provincial and Central Committees were integral parts. The Agreement pulled us through the dangerous war years, with our colours flying. While it was an undoubted triumph for the Press, I must say, looking back from this distance of time, that the Government too had reason to congratulate themselves on the results obtained by their tactful handling of the situation. We shall, I think, always be able to cite the case of the understanding between the newspapers of India and the established authority of the time as a good instance of a successful experiment in mutual forbearance. In this connection there is one person whose name we recall almost nostalgically to mind in passing, dear old bureaucratic, Sir Richard Tottenham. Him we shall long remember. We often had harsh things to say about him while he had harsh acts to perform. But may I say to-day, when he will perhaps not even see these words of mine in print, that we have all known and dealt with much worse opponents than the venerable Additional Secretary of the Home Department, whose rough exterior often concealed a soft heart. He was always on the best of terms with the late Mahadeo Desai of hallowed memory whom I often still meet in my dreams.

The Press in India is now adjusting itself to a complete transformation of scene. Does it not seem but yesterday when we were engaged in grimly fighting the battle of the *National Herald* and *Harijan* with little hope of stable success? To-day the *National Herald* is digging its toes under ideal conditions of popularity, prestige and security and *Harijan* is in need of ever-increasing supplies of paper for its expanding circulation in all the languages of the land. On the other hand the old privileged class of newspapers no longer causes the heart burning of the age that has gone by. The problems and duties of yesterday are not valid to-day. We are no longer struggling to maintain a precarious balance between honour and expediency under an alien regime. Freedom is on the horizon. It has appeared sooner than many of us dared expect. We have played a part in its achievement. But it may be true to say that the Press of thirty or forty years ago contributed more to the great consummation we seem to be about to witness than the newspapers of later years. Let us pay that tribute ungrudgingly to our illustrious predecessors. We proudly salute them as we go forward to witness with our own eyes the result of their exertions and sacrifices.

But the change has also wrought a revolution in our problems and responsibilities. The A.-I.-N. E. O. has a new mission. We have now the equivalent of a National Government at the Centre which needs our help and co-operation. The old conflict between the Press and the State has vanished overnight.

I shall not disagree with the view that the Press must keep its powder dry to defend itself against encroachments on its rights which may in due course develop even from the side of popular Governments. We are jealous of our freedom and we shall soon wish to claim a charter from the Government of independent India after it has come into being next year. But it is axiomatic, I am sure, that the leaders who fought for and won the freedom of the people will regard the freedom of the Press inside a free India as a sacred obligation. The Committee appointed by the Government to suggest modification in the existing Press laws is already at work. I recall here what Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel,—the Minister in the Interim Government most closely connected with the affairs of the Press, said addressing the Standing Committee of this Conference in October last in Delhi. "We shall scrupulously respect the freedom of the Press, in fact, we shall help it to exercise its legitimate functions." That is the unalterable position to which all that we, the direct representatives of the Press, need add is that while we have every confidence that the Government will faithfully carry out their intentions to the fullest extent, the Press must ever maintain itself in a condition of organised preparedness to guard and uphold its freedom under any situation that the years to come may unfold.

But we cannot tarry on this theme to-day. Duty beckons us in a different direction. A very grave responsibility rests on our shoulders during this period of difficult transition through which the country is passing. India rightly expects her newspapers to take an active hand at this critical juncture in the shaping of her destiny. As an institution owing its stability and independent means of existence to the continuous support of the people, the Press is in a position of special advantage and has a heavy debt to repay. In the peculiar circumstances of our country the Press may easily be regarded as

coming next perhaps to the army itself as an instrument of order and security. It is no exaggeration to say that we are looked up to in this respect not only by the leaders, to whom we owe so much, but also by the people at large. The written word has magic more potent in India than in many another country. We have, therefore, a positive and negative duty to perform. That duty is to cut across normal notions of journalism to the utmost extent compatible with our fundamental obligations and to concentrate on printing the word that will soothe and help and eliminate everything which will irritate and hinder. I know from daily experience with my own paper how difficult the task is. But conscious and relentless effort in the direction we all know to be the right one must lead to success. Even the least effort helps. In concrete terms, we have the 'Code' of rules framed in October last by some of us and recognised by the Government of India as meeting the minimum requirement of the situation. It is brief enough to be quoted:

The Ad Hoc Committee is unanimously agreed that as long as the present emergency created by widespread communal disturbances lasts, the Press should not deeply refrain from publishing matter calculated to aggravate communal tension but should contribute in a positive way to the restoration of peaceful conditions in the country. To this end, the Committee recommends the following 'code' for adoption by newspapers and news agencies throughout India:

Sources of News and its Treatment:

News of communal disturbances will continue to be received from the following sources:

A. The Central and the Provincial Governments or the local authorities concerned.

B. The recognised news agencies.

C. Newspapers' own correspondents.

In publishing news received from the above sources editors should take steps to ensure that the following principles are observed:

- (i) That the presentation is factual and objective.
- (ii) That the communities of assailants or victims or casualties in particular incidents are not indicated either directly or indirectly.
- (iii) The casualty figures are neither mentioned in headlines nor otherwise prominently featured.

Casualty figures received from any of the three sources indicated above may, however, be mentioned in the text of messages, giving the source in each case. When official figures regarding a particular incident are not available, it should be clearly stated that figures given from other sources have not been officially confirmed.

Photographs:

Great care should be exercised in the publication of photographs in view of the fact that photographs of a sensational character are liable to inflame communal passions. In no circumstances should photographs showing dead bodies of victims of violence be published.

Treatment of Statements:

Statements by individuals or political organisations bearing on the communal situations and/or purporting to be accounts of specific communal incidents shall not be circulated by news agencies or published by newspapers unless passed for publication by a central body set up for the purpose by Government. In constituting this body the Government is requested to consult the Ad Hoc Committee in the selection of its personnel.

This however, will not apply to statements made by Members of the Interim Government or Members of Provincial Governments.

Expansion of Views:

While newspapers should be free to express their views on the political aspects of the communal question, no comments either editorially or otherwise should be published which directly or indirectly encourage or condone lawlessness or violence.

Insulting or abusive language should be avoided, in particular where important leaders are concerned or in references to the various sections of the people.

No cartoon which offends directly or indirectly against the spirit and the letter of the above shall be published.

The precise details of the 'Code' do not seem to take us very far. But the preamble makes up for it. "The Press should not only refrain from publishing matter calculated to aggravate communal tension but should contribute in a

positive way to the restoration of peaceful conditions in the country", it says. No newspaperman who keeps that constantly in mind can go wrong. Some of us may wish the "Code" to be made more precise and even stiffened. That is the way my inclination goes. I would, for instance, make a special case of unrestrained and provocative editorial comment and place it in the same class as baseless or exaggerated "news." And, heretical though it may seem, are we not now passing through times when it has become the duty of newspapers to exercise due discrimination in the publication even of factual accounts of certain types of events? Handled by us in the normal way, a riot or a serious crime of a communal character would first be reported in bare outline. Then would follow in succession an eye-witness' account, an interview or two with victims, and finally a completed story in full detail. These processes may be spread over a fortnight in the course of which the worst passions would be aroused and fresh incidents would occur in other places which may be traceable to the multiplicity of the reports appearing in newspapers. This obviously needs to be remedied if the very object for which we exist is not to become a source of evil. This is no plea for the suppression of news. That does not help. But we see nearly every day how news is often twisted and exaggerated and displayed and emphasised and re-emphasised in a manner which goes beyond all legitimate bounds of discretion. What I should, therefore, readily agree to, under the present emergency, is a specific rule enjoining the exercise of the greatest moderation both in the display and the description of incidents of a communal character. There may be other suggestions. Regarding the prohibition against the naming of communities involved on either side of a conflict, there is a genuine case for a revision of the rule. Conscientious reporters trying to observe the rule have found themselves led into absurdities. But any relaxation should, I feel, aim at a sensible interpretation and not a nullification of the existing provision.

Minor accidental infringements of the Code will happen. The standard to apply in judging newspapers is the trend and temper of Editorial writings and the spirit in which news is generally displayed and selected.

This is all very discouraging from our strict professional point of view. One reason why we are deeply interested in a return to normal conditions is that we ourselves feel stifled in the present situation. We are called upon to conform to conditions and rules which are hard to reconcile with our basic obligation to publish all the news and enable the people to arrive at correct conclusions. But the strange times we are passing through call for strange remedies. The problem, of course, affects the North much more than the South. Many of us know of the conscious efforts made by newspapers to prevent undesirable forms of publicity. But there is scope everywhere for greater vigilance.

It is highly unfortunate that everything should at present be overshadowed by the communal distemper. We of the Press share in the general unsettlement. It seems almost odd that we should be devoting ourselves in this ostentatious fashion to our own exclusive affairs. We do so with due apologies. One of our domestic anxieties relates to the way in which some of the Provincial Governments are treating the Press. I will not enter into details. We shall be discussing the matter at this session. But I do not venture to express the hope that all Provincial Governments, irrespective of party affiliations, will see the wisdom of regarding the Press as one and indivisible throughout India. It will be in the interests of the Governments concerned to do so and to allow this organisation to use the good offices for the promotion of harmonious relations between State and Press.

This brings me to the question of the unity of the Press as such. Ours is a wonderful example of cohesion and strength. It is a tribute to the sagacity of all sections of the Press that the foundation of co-operation and collaboration laid at the 1940 Conference has endured through the stresses and strains of the past six years. But there is a section of Muslim Press which has thought fit to keep aloof. This is surprising; for, if I may say so, our differences are few and common problems and needs many. I hope that the supposed ideological differences will not prevent them for long from joining us on professional grounds.

In the technical and economic spheres newspapers in India have done extremely well during the first decade. May that progress continue! We note with the utmost satisfaction that this double track progress is not confined to the English language Press, which is being fast outstripped by newspapers published in the languages of the soil. This is as it should be. I do not, however, anticipate a black-out of the English language newspapers in this country. The

march of time will not permit that to happen. The two wings will, therefore, co-exist for many a year to come in the service of the people of India. I hope we shall not be slow in using the resources and opportunities at our disposal to the utmost advantage of the motherland. I feel almost obsessed with the thought that we may have greater burdens to bear than we realise to-day. The nation-builders of India will need more and more of our co-operation in the years immediately ahead and it must be ungrudgingly given to the full extent of our capacity. Let us not forget that India does not possess an overabundance of organised talent on which she can readily and implicitly count. The Press cannot, so to speak, afford to go on holiday. We shall soon realise, therefore, that whether it is in the sphere of social reform, education, art, civics, public hygiene, the uplift of women or planning of any kind, the people as well as the leaders of India are going to rely to an increasing extent on the active support we can give them. We shall then be the willing conscripts of the nation and shall have little time or inclination to indulge in the petty mutual professional rivalries so ruinous to our morals.

With all her vaunted heritage, India is pitifully backward in many ways. I do not wish to search for the cause. No feature of that backwardness can be so glaring as the absence of a News Agency which we can call our own. I hardly like to confess to an outsider that we have had nothing in India to correspond to the great well-known channels of news that serve the highest interests of the people and the Press in many advanced countries. Happily there is no obstacle now in the way of our organizing an indigenous News Agency. Some of us have been actively applying our minds to the task during the past three years. Tangible results, I believe, are now at hand and I know that you would wish me to convey your blessings to the Indian and Eastern Newspapers Society in the talks it is engaged in with foreign agencies now operating in India with the object of inaugurating an Indian News Agency in the shortest possible time. It has to be a matter of weeks rather than months.

The world has recently witnessed a remarkable phenomenon in the shape of the Asian Relations Conference, for which it would be difficult to find a parallel in the history of Asia. It was a source of inspiration to many of us to realise that in New Delhi was being brought into existence an organisation which had as its ultimate object the peace of the world. The choice of India as the venue was amply justified by results and it is a matter for satisfaction that the success of the Conference has been favourably commented upon in the West. The Press of the various Asian countries concerned will have to take its due share in the furtherance of the objects of the Asian Relations Conference. There is no conflict between the movement for inter-Asian Press contacts and the concept of world Press unity. In fact the Press of India may well hope to provide the common meeting ground between the Press of Asia and the Press of the rest of the world. Here again it must be one of our recognised functions to devote greater space to news of Asian countries, to interpret with sympathy and understanding developments in those countries and to foster friendly relations among the peoples of Asia.

A word about salaries and wages. The minimum standards laid down by the I. E. N. S. after exhaustive all-round consultations was a good beginning. I am afraid, however, that even these standards are not observed by the majority of proprietors in India, though I do not believe that that applies to registered members of the A.-I.N.E.C. It must be realized that the expected improvement in the cost of living has been long overdue and may never actually arrive. I doubt if it would be possible or feasible to undertake another investigation and to modify the agreed recommendations which were arrived at with considerable difficulty in 1945. But while those who still do not conform to these proposals—and it is important to observe that they are meant to be carried out as a whole—must do so, I would urge individual proprietors to go as far beyond the proposals as they possibly can to satisfy the legitimate needs and desires of those who produce their papers. Let not the maximum be confounded with the minimum. I do not, however, wish to be misunderstood as making any plea for an increase in the salaries of those who already receive handsome salaries and wages on any calculation.

Friends, as we look around us, we see our beloved country passing through a rough transition to independence. I have often during the past months felt a deep echo in my heart of the memorable words uttered by Thomas Paine with reference to a somewhat analogous situation in America: "These are times that try men's souls." When I spoke a few minutes ago of the power and duties of the

Press, I was not unmindful of the limitations of my remarks. We shall not neglect our duties. But let it be understood that the true remedy of the country's ills lies elsewhere. Need I elaborate the point? The joint public appeal just issued by Mr. Jinnah and Gandhiji has come like a heartening whiff of fresh air and has the conscious and earnest support of countless millions. We endorse the sentiments so well expressed by the leaders and send them our best wishes and an assurance of our wholehearted co-operation.

We have talked of independence rising on the horizon. We do not like the crimson streaks that precede it. But they must surely disappear when the sun comes into full view.

Resolutions—Madras—20th. April 1947

The Conference concluded its session this morning after adopting the resolutions passed at the meeting of the Subjects Committee. S. J. Urvadas Gandhi presided. The following resolutions were adopted unanimously by the Conference.

COMMUNAL PEACE

The A.-I.N.E.O. wholeheartedly welcomes the joint appeal for communal peace and harmony issued by Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah and calls upon all newspapers in the country to work for the establishment of cordial relations between the communities.

The A.-I.N.E.O. is grateful to Mahatma Gandhi for the message he has sent to the Conference and assures him of the determination of the Press to do all in its power towards the restoration of peaceful conditions in this country.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

The A.-I.N.E.O. expresses its warm appreciation of the message from Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel that the relations between the Government and the Press must be based on mutual help, co-operation and understanding of each other's difficulties and confidently hopes that the spirit of his message would be observed by the Central and Provincial Governments in their dealings with the Press.

The A.-I.N.E.O. resolves that conventions evolved and accepted to meet emergency conditions be reviewed from time to time by the Standing Committees so as to remove the restrictions on the freedom of the Press with full appreciation of the needs of the situation. Having regard to the co-operation of the Press with the authorities in the publication of the reports and comments affecting internal peace, the Conference is of the view that the Central and Provincial Governments should consult the Press Advisory Committees concerned before imposing any statutory restrictions calculated to hamper the free discharge of its obligations to the public by the Press.

This Conference appoints a Committee consisting of Sir Francis Low, Sits. C. R. Srinivasan, J. N. Sahni and K. Srinivasan (Convener) to draft a memorandum to be submitted to the Press Laws Committee and to give oral evidence on behalf of the Conference, if called upon to do so. The Committee is empowered to co-operate any non-member of the Conference whose help may be considered desirable.

This Conference is of the view that members should pay due attention to the copyright laws in force and help to establish sound conventions and calls upon the Standing Committees to prepare and circulate a comprehensive note for the guidance of the Press.

This Conference strongly protests against the special order issued by the Government of Bengal imposing restrictions on headlines and size of types and requests the Government to withdraw the order immediately.

This Conference considers the order of the Punjab Government asking newspapers to publish matter desired by them as unjustified and objectionable and requests that the order may be withdrawn.

CONFERENCE OF ASIAN PRESS SUGGESTED

This Conference welcomes the contacts established between the Asiatic nations during the Asian Conference held in Delhi and expresses the hope that the conference of representatives of the Asiatic nations may be a precursor of similar conferences of the Press of Asia in the future.

The President stated that the other resolutions would be taken up by the Standing Committee for consideration.

The A. I. States' People's Conference

Annual session—Gwalior—18th. to 20th April 1947

Pandit Nehru's Address

Addressing the All-India States' People's Conference which met in Gwalior on the 18th. April 1947, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru declared that any Indian State which did not come into the Constituent Assembly now would be treated as a hostile State by the country. Such a State, he added, would have to bear the consequences of being so treated. "Our aim at the moment is to liberate whatever part of India we can and we shall then deal with the question of getting independence for the rest. India's march towards freedom would brook no more obstructions."

Pandit Nehru said that the League had not entered the Constituent Assembly in spite of frequent invitations. The door was still open for the League but he wanted to make it clear that the Constituent Assembly would go ahead despite everything. The constitution-making had been necessary even previously but in the present context after the British Government's announcement of the decision to quit India it was all the more urgent.

"If any part of the country wanted to remain out of it, they are welcome to do so and we on our part will decide what sort of relations we shall have with them", he said. He pointed out that the Congress had been opposed to the division of India but out of practical considerations it had to pass a resolution demanding the division of the Punjab. It had done so because there was no way out of the situation.

REFERENCE TO KASHMIR

Pandit Nehru, at the outset, referred to Sheikh Abdullah, who had been elected to preside over the session and said that he could not do so because he was behind the prison bars. "When I think of him behind the prison bars, I hang my head in shame. All I can say now is that Kashmir is like a flame in my heart. Some day it will bring forth some result."

"At this critical juncture", Pandit Nehru went on, "we should not lose our temper as it would only harm our cause. Everything has to be viewed as part of a bigger whole and not individually. There are important decisions to be made. The time is past for passing resolutions and expressing views. We have to chalk out a line of action and then follow it. Mere expression of sentiments is no use at all."

Pandit Nehru referred to the disturbances in the country and said that it was unfortunate that there had been bloodshed during the past few months. "It is our duty to end this bloodshed", he said. But "I repeat that we have to advance in spite of them. They might block our progress but they cannot stop us altogether. But for these strifes, we could have devoted all our attention to vital questions like the removal of poverty."

Referring to the Indian States, Pandit Nehru recalled the declaration made by the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes last year urging the States to initiate popular reforms and said that he had welcomed this declaration even though it did not come up to expectations. But even these limited reforms were put into effect, he said. The declaration remained merely a paper declaration. He added that the Constituent Assembly was now engaged in framing a new constitution for a free India. Acceptance of the Cabinet Mission's plan was—and still is—a step in the right direction.

CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY WILL GO AHEAD

Representatives of Indian States and the Muslim League had not yet participated in the Constituent Assembly, said Pt. Nehru. The League had not entered the Assembly, despite frequent invitations. The door was still open for the League but he wanted to make it clear that the Assembly would go ahead with the task of framing a constitution despite everything. Such constitution-making had been necessary even previously, but in the present context—after the British Government's announcement of the decision to quit India—it was all the more urgent. The Congress made it clear that no part of India would be compelled to join the Union against its wishes and if any part of the country wanted to remain out of it, it was welcome to do so. "We on our part will then decide what sort of relations we shall have with them", he said.

Pandit Nehru said that rightly or wrongly some agreement had been arrived at between the Negotiating Committee of the Princes and the Negotiating Committee of the Constituent Assembly on the method of selecting the States' representatives for the Assembly. He reminded the audience that the Constituent Assembly was part of the Cabinet Mission's plan and had to work within its limitations. He himself wished it had been possible to work on an independent plan of their own. But the question was not what was desirable or desired but what was possible and practicable under the circumstances. It was not possible to ask the Prajamandals in the various States to send up their own representatives to the Constituent Assembly, as the Assembly itself was a creature of the British plan and was bound by the limitations. One of the limitations was that States' representatives could come into the Assembly only through the door held by the Princes.

When the agreement was reached with the Princes' Negotiating Committee, Pandit Nehru said, it had been made clear that final approval would have to come from the people of the States. It was true that certain things were accepted. "Though we did not like them, we accepted them only because we felt it would facilitate the entry of the States into the Constituent Assembly, he said.

The Congress, Pandit Nehru continued, had been very much opposed to a division of India but had recently on practical considerations passed a resolution demanding the division of the Punjab. It had done so because there was no way out of the situation. The question here again was not of desirability but of facing realities. The same thing applied to Bengal.

"We were not satisfied with the method of selecting States' representatives but we had to concede certain points, because we knew that if the States joined the Assembly, the work would be finished more easily. I commend you to accept the agreement arrived at between the Negotiating Committee."

All the Princes did not belong to the same category, Pandit Nehru said. There were some who had done the right thing and declared their willingness to come into the Constituent Assembly. They deserved to be congratulated. Others were moving slowly putting obstacles in every possible way. They were finding all manner of excuses and demanding all sorts of terms and conditions before entering the Assembly. Deploring this "shopkeeper's mentality" Pandit Nehru said that a bargaining spirit would not do good to the Princes. It was a very shortsighted policy which would result in creating enmity between them and the rest of India.

"All those who do not join the Constituent Assembly now would be regarded as hostile States and they will have to bear the consequences of being so regarded. Our aim at present is to liberate as much of India as we can—half or three fourths—and then to deal with the question of independence for the rest. I know we have had to make a lot of concessions. But sometimes one has to pay a high price in the interest of the country's larger interests," he said.

Pandit Nehru declared that it was the duty of the Prajamandals to demand the setting up of Constituent Assemblies in their respective States to frame their own constitutions.

Pandit Nehru referred to the activities of the Political Department which, he said, had succeeded in misleading a number of States. Speaking as a member of Interim Government he wanted to make it clear that the Interim Government was unaware of the activities of the Political Department. Officials of the Political Department acted secretly and mysteriously. Judging by their activities, it would seem that they were interested in dividing the country not into one or two bits but into one hundred or more bits.

Pandit Nehru also referred to the Jamsahab of Nawanager's visit to London and said: "If he thinks the future plans of India are to be laid in London, he is very much mistaken."

Dr. Pattabhi's Address

Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, Working President, addressing the Conference in the absence of the President-elect, Sheikh Abdullah said that the need of the hour was the forthright declaration of immediate responsible Government in the larger States, with a time limit for the fulfilment of the declaration.

He also suggested that a date-line be set for the Princes to join the Constituent Assembly, following the precedent set by the British Government in their statement of February 20, for "it is the time limit that gets things on the move."

Of the larger States, he continued, there were not more than ten or twelve, and they should follow the lead given by one of their number, namely Cochin,

and declare their intention of granting responsible Government at a definite time. Instead of performing this act of justice which would safeguard their dynastic rights, the bigger Princes were dabbling with constitutions which were either ante-diluvian or in any case antiquated. They failed to see that the same independence that reverted to them when the British forces were withdrawn, would also revert to their peoples, and then the Princes would be brought face to face with them. If the Princes wished to preserve their dynastic rights and monarchy, they would have to exploit the lingering sentiment of loyalty for kingship among their people, by the timely surrender of power to their real masters, and should elevate themselves to the position of constitutional monarchs such as the King of England. They would have limited powers and prerogatives but they would have unlimited influence as social heads.

GROUPING OF STATES

Referring particularly to Kashmir and Hyderabad, *Sj. Sitaramayya* said that the situation might be retrieved by timely action. The problems of the two States were analogous and other Princes naturally looked to them for guidance though communalism in Hyderabad so far was not encouraging. Religion must be eschewed from politics and India would be free and independent only when the big States took a nationalist point of view and joined forces with Indian nationalism.

The hundred or hundred-and-fifty smaller States with populations of a few lakhs and incomes ranging between twenty lakhs and one crore of rupees should be grouped together in unions such as the Deccan States Union. Such groups may be made of in the regions of Kathiawar and Gujerat, Central India, Rajputana, the Punjab, the Hill States of Simla and the Eastern Agency States. Instead of doing this, he said, the Princes of some of these groups were hatching fantastic schemes of confederations preserving the individual rights and powers of petty States and Privy Councils and bicameral legislatures. Some Princes were talking of complete independence with no sense of perspective.

There remained hundreds of small States which were no more than mere estates which could only be absorbed into the adjoining provincial areas and their Princes could be accorded equitable compensation. The areas where these States met each other, were centres of corruption and should be eliminated.

There were some other matters relating to the Indian States which required attention. Customs barriers between States led to unnecessary corruption and smuggling. The problem relating to Jagirdars was urgent as they were both powerful and despotic, and they might set themselves up as independent forces and prevent an understanding between the Princes and their people. Their immediate abolition would be a blessing for the Princes and their people, and would promote understanding between the two. He said that in the provincial elections the abolition of the zamindaris was an election plank and that in States elections too, this would have to be adopted unless there was a private settlement between the Princes and the Jagirdars before then. The Ministers too were enemies of the Princes and this was largely due to the fact that they felt they would have no future, and thus tried to stand between the Princes and their people. He assured the Ministers however, that for men of ability there would be plenty of room, and their help and guidance would be invaluable to popular ministries inexperienced in the arts of government.

Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya said he did not accept the excuse put forward by some Princes that lack of experienced officers prevented them from transferring power to popular representatives. Only the practice of self-government could fit a people for self-government.

THE POLITICAL DEPARTMENT

The Political Department which had played such an important part in the affairs of Indian States was going to close down with the disappearance of Paramountcy and there was no need to enter into recriminations at this point. Until the transfer of power took place, the Political Department must become a popular department like others in the Government of India and should be replaced by a committee of representatives of the Princes and the States people to serve as a liaison body in all matters affecting the States.

Referring to the possibility of an all-India Provincial Government replacing the present Interim Government, he said that this must be a representative body on which there should be suitable representation of the States peoples.

Earlier, *Dr. Sitaramayya* gave a brief review of the States' Peoples' Conference and said that the last year had been a period of trial to the people of the States,

The Government of India Act of 1935, the Cripps Mission and the Cabinet Mission had omitted any reference to the people of the States and referred only to the States and the Princes. Nevertheless, the people had forced themselves into the picture and this was recognised by the Chancellor in his speech in January 1946 to the Chamber of Princes, saying that there should be a charter of fundamental rights in all the States for the people. The Princes' attitude during the Cabinet Mission left room for doubt. Although the Chamber claimed to represent the Princes, in part it had representatives of only some of them. Then it had said that it would be the organisation to negotiate on behalf of the States, while each individual State would decide whether or not to join the Constituent Assembly.

REPRESENTATION IN CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY

The problem of the States and States' people had been pushed to the fore following the Cabinet Mission's statement of May 16 and their statement of May 12 regarding paramountcy. So far, he added, negotiations between representatives of the Constituent Assembly and the Princes had gone fairly smoothly but there had come a hitch. Princes as such had no more room in the Constituent Assembly than had Provincial Governors, as the Princes were the future governors of their States. However, a compromise had been reached regarding representation. There still remained the difficulty that in many cases, there were no popular assemblies in the States from which to choose popular representatives and the Princes wanted to fall back on panchayats which were bodies nominated by the *landardars* and had no elective value. In such cases the popular quotas must be furnished by the Regional Councils of the A. I. S. P. O. unless some understanding was reached before them between the Princes and the Regional Council concerned.

Concluding, Dr. *Sitaramayya* said that the time he had looked forward to when the Princes and the people would march not on parallel but on converging lines to the same goal, was within sight. "Let the pomp of royalty and pride of person make room for the sovereignty of the people", who would be "emancipated from the thralldom of centuries and united by the ideals of the ages", he said. Then India could lead Asia to freedom.

The Conference was attended by 800 delegates from all over the country besides prominent leaders including *Acharya Narendra Dev*, *Sj. Shankarrao Deo*, *Mrs. Kamaladevi*, *Sj. V. K. Krishna Menon* and others.

Resolutions—2nd Day—Gwalior—19th April 1947

The plenary session of the Conference, after three hours' debate to-night, decided to accept the agreement arrived at between the Negotiating Committee of the Constituent Assembly and the Princes regarding the method of election of States' representatives to the Constituent Assembly. The resolution recommending to the *Praja Mandals* in the various States, to co-operate in the election of States' representatives was passed by an overwhelming majority. Earlier, the Subjects Committee discussed the draft resolution.

Pandit Nehru who, as Chairman of the Negotiating Committee of the Constituent Assembly, negotiated the agreement with the Princes sponsored the resolution. A number of amendments were suggested by the delegates from different States, but mostly they were either defeated or withdrawn. *Pandit Nehru* accepted two or three minor amendments after which the Subjects Committee passed it.

British Declaration welcomed

The resolution read: "This Conference welcomes the declaration made on behalf of the British Government that British authority will finally end in India by June 1948. It resents, however, repeated attempts of the British Power to ignore the people of the States and treat them as chattels to be disposed of without any reference to them. It wishes to declare clearly and emphatically that no decision or solution of the problem of the States will be binding on the people of the States unless it has their explicit approval.

The Conference, therefore, does not consider itself bound by any of the decisions so far taken without reference to it by the negotiating Committee of the Rulers. In view, however, of the rapid pace of events and the necessity for quick decisions, the Conference is prepared to co-operate where this is feasible and in the interests of people in the work of drawing up constitutions for the States as well as for the Indian Union. The Conference considers the conditions agreed upon between the Negotiating Committee of the States and the Corresponding Commit-

tee of the Constituent Assembly as wholly unsatisfactory and not in keeping with the repeated declarations of the States' People's organisation. Nevertheless because of its desire to co-operate in the rapid framing of the constitution of the Indian Union based on the declared objectives of the Constituent Assembly, it is prepared to advise the Praja Mandals to offer their co-operation in the election representatives for the Constituent Assembly where this can be done with dignity and in the interests of the people.

"The Conference has noted the attempts of many of the Rulers as well as of the Political Department to prevent co-operation of the States with the Constituent Assembly. This obstruction which is patently against the interests of both India as a whole and of the people of States, must be condemned and resisted and it must be made clear that the people of the States as a whole stand for full co-operation with the Constituent Assembly. The Conference congratulates those State Governments which have already taken steps to co-operate with the Constituent Assembly in regard to others, it calls upon them to rise up with their people and declare their partnership in the great work of framing a constitution for the Indian Union. Continued refusal to do so can only mean hostility to the conception of Indian freedom and must be treated as such by the people of the States."

An amendment was moved by Mr. *Ghulam Mohammad Sadiq* from Kashmir suggesting that the people of the Indian States should be asked by the Constituent Assembly to send their representatives directly. Pandit Nehru speaking, on this amendment, pointed out that the Cabinet Mission's plan had not provided for such an entry of States' representatives into the Constituent Assembly. But after two or three months when we knew definitely who were coming into the Constituent Assembly and who were not, then the Constituent Assembly might be compelled to consider such a course of action. The amendment was thereupon withdrawn.

Another amendment sought to replace the word, "hostility" in the last line of the resolution by the word, "opposition", on the ground that the former word was unduly strong and connoted bitterness. Declining to accept the amendments, Pandit Nehru pointed out the question was not one of mildness or otherwise. The proposition was that Princes who continued to keep out of the Union were hostile to the Union. There was no use mincing words. We must say frankly what we felt about it. The amendment was withdrawn.

Pandit Nehru accepted another amendment, moved by *Sj. Sarangadhar Das* (Orissa States), adding a proviso to the resolution stating that where there was no well-established Legislative Assembly in the States, the only suitable machinery for election of representatives was regional councils of the All India States' People's Conference.

Demand for Responsible Government

The Subjects Committee passed another resolution reiterating the objective of full Responsible Government in the States as integral parts of a united and free India. Expressing full agreement on behalf of the people of the States with the objective resolution passed by the Constituent Assembly, the resolution endorsed determination to set up a free independent Republic of India in which all power and authority would be derived from the people.

Paramountcy

A separate resolution on Paramountcy and activities of the Political Department also passed by the Subjects Committee declares that the continuation of the Political Department in its old form with its irresponsible methods of working is an anachronism and is dangerous to the future of the States' peoples. "The Conference reiterates its strong disapproval of the policy of the Political Department which functions in secret and without the knowledge of the people and which appears to aim at the constitution of a large number of independent or semi-independent units in India. This policy of dividing the country into numerous shreds and patches is a menace to the country and must be resisted. While welcoming the approaching end of Paramountcy, the Conference declares again that power and authority must vest in the people. The people of the States have to attain freedom not only from British authority but also from automatic rule at present prevailing in the States with a few exceptions.

"The Conference congratulates some States who have already declared themselves in favour of Responsible Government and take steps to implement these declarations. It calls upon others to follow this example by declaring Responsible Government as the immediate aim in view and organising constituent assemblies freely elected by people in each State or in groups of States to frame a constitution

based on Responsible Government. During the intervening period, popular Interim Governments must be established in the States."

Greetings to Sheikh Md. Abdullah

The General Council this morning passed a resolution sending its warmest greetings to its elected President, *Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah*, who is behind the prison bars. The resolution pledged to work for the freedom of the people of Kashmir for which Sheikh Abdullah is suffering.

Choice of States' Delegates

The agreement arrived at between the Negotiating Committee of the Constituent Assembly and the Princes regarding the method of election of States' representatives to the Constituent Assembly, was accepted by the Conference.

A resolution recommending to the Praja Mandals in the various States to co-operate in the election of States' representatives to the Constituent Assembly was also passed.

Three amendments virtually seeking to scrap the fifty-fifty agreement on the choice of States representatives to the Constituent Assembly (fifty per cent to be Princes' nominees and fifty per cent to the people's elected representatives) were either ruled out of order by the President, Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya or defeated.

Pandit Nehru, who was Chairman of the Constituent Assembly's Negotiating Committee when the agreement with the Princes was arrived at, spoke again to-night on the resolution. The main question, he pointed out, was whether the people of Indian States wanted to strengthen the Constituent Assembly in all possible ways and hasten the framing of the constitution for free India and whether in the circumstances, it was advantageous for them to co-operate with the Constituent Assembly or not. Joining the Assembly now even on a fifty-fifty basis, he thought, would prove more beneficial to the States' People's interests than a more negative attitude of rejecting the agreement.

The session also passed resolutions demanding immediate establishment of Responsible Government in all Indian States and welcoming the Constituent Assembly's objectives resolution declaring its intention to set up a free and independent Republic of India.

WILL NOT AFFECT STATES' PEOPLES' INTERESTS

The resolution accepting the Negotiating Committee's agreement was moved by *Sj. Hiralal Sastri* who agreed that the terms of the State's People's selection provided under the agreement fell much below expectations. But he pointed out that forced by circumstances and with a desire to facilitate the work of the Constituent Assembly, the Congress leaders thought advisable to make concessions. That was the only course open wherein State's people could help the country in her onward march towards independence. People of the States must differentiate between Princes who were willing to co-operate with the Constituent Assembly and those who were showing hostility. Princes who to-day refused to listen to the demands of their people, would soon have to face revolts which would bring about their ruin.

Urging acceptance of the agreement *Sj. Hiralal Sastri* said: "Let us accept the agreement that is best in the circumstances and it will in no way adversely affect the people of the Indian States."

Sj. Mukund Bahari Lal criticised the Nawab of Bhopal's interpretation of the Cabinet Mission's plan "that the States were to join the Constituent Assembly only after the constitution had been framed". Did he think that the leaders would, after taking great decisions about the country's future, be still arguing with the Princes to persuade them to accept those decisions? It was a betrayal by the British Government of the States people that Indian leaders had been compelled to come to terms with the Princes. Indian States might be allowed to frame their own respective constitutions, but he urged that all such constitutions should be democratic.

Mr. Golam Mohammad Sadiq (Kashmir), who had unsuccessfully endeavoured in the Subjects Committee to amend the resolution with a view to calling the upon the Constituent Assembly to invite Praja Mandals in Indian States to send directly their representatives to the Constituent Assembly, again tried to move an amendment to the same effect in the open session. The President, however, ruled out this amendment on the score that it had already been rejected by the Subjects Committee.

Sr. Chaturvedi (Bharatpur), Ramanand Bajpai and Shakir Ali Sahib (Bhopal) opposed acceptance of the resolution.

Mr. *Shakir Ali* said that the fifty-fifty agreement would ultimately lead to the acceptance of the views of the Nawab of Bhopal. No concession should be made to the Rulers, he said, and urged that the resolution should be rejected. The speaker alleged that the Nawab of Bhopal had been putting obstacles in the way of the country's freedom and asked: "With what face can I go back to Bhopal after accepting this resolution which concedes to the Nawab of Bhopal the right to select 50 per cent of his State's quota of members for the Constituent Assembly?"

NEHRU'S REPLY TO CRITICISM

Replying to the criticism, Pandit *Jawaharlal Nehru*, who spoke, reiterated that mere show of temper against the misdeeds of Princes and Nawabs would be of no use to the States' people. The main problem facing the States' people was to decide how to act in the present circumstances. The time for making fiery speeches was over. He himself used to do so when he was young, but the situation obtaining to-day demanded something more positive than mere hurling of abuse. Stating that he was responsible for the resolution under discussion, Pandit Nehru said: "I am a man of dignity and I shall never place before you an undignified resolution."

Pandit Nehru then read out, clause by clause, the terms of the resolution and asked what particular provisions in it were objected to. He admitted that he himself did not like the 50 per cent formula. If he could have had his way, he would have called the representatives of the States' people directly to the Constituent Assembly. But taking into an account the limitations under which the Assembly was working, they had perforce to meet the Princes half way. The Constituent Assembly, he asserted, was a new weapon in their hands. It was a sovereign body in which the British Government had no say at all. Were the States people going to strengthen the Assembly or adopt a negative attitude and throw away that weapon because it was not all to their liking? He would commend acceptance of the resolution as a practical proposition.

Pandit Nehru accepted an amendment moved by *Sr. Sarangadhar Das* (Orissa States) adding a proviso to the resolution stating that where there was no well-established Legislative Assembly in the States, the only suitable machinery for election of representatives was regional councils of the All-India States People's Conference.

The resolution was passed by an over-whelming majority.

Responsible Government in States

The resolution demanding Responsible Government immediately in Indian States and welcoming the Constituent Assembly's objective resolution was moved by *Acharya Narendra Deo* who pointed out that the demand for complete Responsible Government in the States was one on which no compromise should be made. In the present context, anything less than complete self-government would be ridiculous. *Sr. Baijnath Mahoday* supported the resolution.

Resolutions—Third day—Gwalior—20th. April 1947

Reforms in States

The annual session of the Conference concluded to-night after passing all the resolutions as passed by the Subjects Committee. It was decided to hold the next session of the Conference in Hyderabad.

The resolution on constitutional reforms expresses deep regret at the fact that the Indian States' Rulers with a few exceptions had failed to show correct appreciation of the great historic changes awaiting the nation in the near future and had so far taken no adequate steps in the direction of establishing democratic Governments in their respective States.

Referring to the various schemes of reforms announced by different States within the last few months, the resolution says: "All these schemes are characterised by common and calculated disregard to all principles of democracy and freedom. These constitutional reforms and schemes either make no declaration accepting the objective of the establishment of Responsible Government, or if they make any such declaration, it is not only unqualified but lacks all intentions of any immediate or ever remote implementation thereof. The nature and extent of the reforms contained are totally insufficient to fulfil the peoples'

demand, since the composition and powers of the proposed legislatures are extremely defective and restricted and the executive, even the so-called popular element in them, irresponsible. There are also a large number of other States, which so far have kept entirely quiet in the matter of constitutional reforms. The Conference, therefore, express strong disapproval of the present satisfactory policy of rulers in this matter and strongly urges immediate adoption of radically different policy so as to meet the pressing demand of the people for the establishment of full Responsible Government in the States in the immediate future.

Reforms in Travancore

The resolution on Travancore views with concern the "persistent suppression of civil liberties in the State." Labour organisations had been suppressed and Trade Union activities paralysed. Many Trade Unions were kept under ban, advantage being taken of the disturbances created by labour which led to violence under Communist leadership in some areas, where Martial Law was proclaimed and large number of labourers shot dead. The Travancore Government was not inclined to establish a democratic Government, as evidenced by the recent promulgation of the Constitution Act, which was not calculated to transfer power to the people. The Conference approved the stand taken by the State Congress that the reforms were unacceptable, that a Constituent Assembly should be brought into being to frame a constitution for the State and that an Interim Popular Government be immediately established."

In a resolution on Faridkot, the Conference regretted that the Ruler had not kept the agreement between him and Paudit Nehru to have an impartial enquiry by the Chief Justice of Faridkot into the excess committed by the State officials during the Satyagraha Campaign. Condemning this 'breach of agreement', the resolution said that the Conference expected the ruler to implement the agreement without delay.

On the proposed scheme of confederation in Kathiawar States, the Conference expressed the opinion that this scheme initiated by the Jam Sahab of Navanagar was an attempt to obstruct and sabotage the realisation of India's independence based on democratic principles of free democratic grouping. All such attempts at groupings and confederations should be effectively resisted by the people, unless they received free and explicit consent of the people of the areas concerned.

Grouping of States

A separate resolution on grouping of States declared: For competent units the Federal Union will be able to maintain modern and progressive standards of administration. Only those States that have a population of about 50 lakhs of peoples and a revenue of about eight crores of rupees could be considered as fit units for the purpose of Federal Union, provided suitable exception might be made for adequate reasons. In any event, such units must have sufficient resources and be capable of maintaining modern and progressive standards of administration.

"The rest of the States not capable of answering such standards can only exist as suitable groups formed on the basis of geographical continuity, historical tradition and cultural homogeneity and linguistic unity. Such group shall as far as possible come up to standard 'individual States' and be administered as composite units. The rest of the States should be absorbed into adjacent appropriate Provincial areas and cease to exist as Indian States.

Criticism of Reforms in Bhopal

The resolution on Bhopal refers to the recent reorganisation in the Government made by the Nawab of Bhopal and says: "Of the three new Ministers, one is taken from the Muslim League, one from Hindu Sabha and the third from the so-called Congress Committee of Bhopal, which is defunct and not allowed to work in the State. The Bhopal State People's Conference, which is the only representative political body in the State, has been conveniently ignored. The new Government is said to be an interim agreement, which will function during the pleasure of the Nawab. But it has also been made quite clear that the Government will not be responsible or democratic.

"In the declaration, it has been stated that these three Ministers enjoy the confidence of the people as well as of the political parties. The fact is not one of those Ministers enjoy the confidence of the people, but of the Nawab, who has been patronising them for sometime past by nominating them to the various committees appointed by the State.

"The Nawab of Bhopal has refused to implement his declaration of June 1946 wherein he promised to consult all the political parties in the State. He has also failed: (1) to increase the elected elements in the Legislative Council based on adult franchise; (2) to amend the existing laws on democratic lines; (3) to hold fresh elections to the local bodies; (4) to declare fundamental rights and (5) constitute a Public Service Commission.

"The Nawab has, on the other hand, suppressed effectively all civil liberties of the people by the promulgation of Section 144 and enforcement of the public Safety Ordinance and the Defence of Bhopal Rules throughout the State with the active support of the three newly appointed reactionary Ministers.

"The conference, therefore, condemns the attitude taken by the Nawab of Bhopal, who also happens to be the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes and calls upon the people of Bhopal to unite to take such steps as are necessary to realise their political aspirations.

The resolution on Kashmir and Hyderabad views with "deep concern the rapidly deteriorating situation in the two States in respect of internal harmony and progress."

"In Kashmir", the resolution states, "ruthless repression of the people's liberties has been going on for the last eleven months, carrying in its wake mass arrests, shootings and death and the unbalancing of the social and public life of the State. There is an acute shortage of food and other necessities of life. The situation there is more complicated due to the continued detention of Sheikh Abdullah, President of the All-India States People's Conference and his colleagues, which constitutes a standing insult to the people of Indian States.

"In Hyderabad too, civil liberties continues to be stifled more or less as of old particularly in districts where the normal functioning of the State Congress has been made well nigh impossible. Communal bitterness caused by the deliberate encouragement given to communal and other vested reactionary elements is spreading more and more and the State Government have so far taken no effective steps to check it. In the agrarian districts, mass exploitation and victimisation of peasants and tenants continue and recent crisis in the Nalgonda District still shows no chance of solution. Meanwhile, poor peasants are victimised and harassed and no attempt is being made to look into their grievances."

Expressing 'resentment' at the ambiguous stand taken by the Governments of Kashmir and Hyderabad in regard to the Constituent Assembly, the resolution says: "In both the States, popular organisations have boycotted the State Legislatures. These bodies do not thus represent popular opinion and cannot, therefore, be taken to represent the people. Their unsuitability to send representatives to the Constituent Assembly is, therefore, patent. The method of electing representatives from these States, therefore, remains unsettled.

"An impression is, however, sought to be created in the minds of the people at large that Kashmir and Hyderabad can exist as independent entities on the termination of British authority and power. The Conference wishes to make it clear that Kashmir and Hyderabad—as also the other Indian States—cannot be allowed to remain outside the orbit of Independent India, much less can they be allowed to determine their own internal constitutional structure without the sanction of their people. Such an attempt will always be resented by the people and if necessary even resisted."

Conveying greeting to people of these two States, the resolution assured them of complete support of the States peoples.

League Agitation in Punjab & Frontier

Muslim National Guards Declared Unlawful

Lahore—24th. January 1947

Seven top-ranking Muslim League leaders of the Punjab were arrested in Lahore to-day in the course of police raids on the headquarters of the Muslim League National Guards.

They were *Khan Iftikhar Hussain Khan* of Mamdot, President of the Punjab Provincial Muslim League, *Mian Iftikhar-ud-Din*, former President of the Punjab Provincial Congress Committee, *Mian Muntaz Daulatana*, Secretary of the Punjab Provincial Muslim League, *Begum Shah Nawaz*, M.L.A. (Punjab), *Sardar Shaukat Hayat Khan*, former Minister of the Punjab, *Mr. Firoz Khan Noon*, former Indian High Commissioner in London and former Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, and *Syed Amir Hussain Shah*, Provincial Salar of the Muslim League National Guards.

They were arrested on a charge of obstructing the Police in the search of the premises of the National Guards HQ. The search was made under orders of the Punjab Government declaring the Muslim League National Guards and the *Rashtriya Swayam Sewak Sangh* as unlawful bodies under Sec 16 of the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1938.

News of the arrest of the League leaders spread over the city like wild fire, resulting in the suspension of business in the Muslim quarters. Demonstrations were held by Muslim crowds in different parts of the city. They were, however, dispersed by the police after the arrest of their ringleaders.

In the evening, a Muslim crowd staged a demonstration in front of the Civil Lines police station where the League leaders were lodged. The demonstrators were dispersed by the police by resorting to lathi charge three times, resulting in injuries to over a dozen persons.

Protest meetings were held in mosques all over the town after Friday congregation prayers when the action of the Punjab Government in declaring the Muslim League National Guards an unlawful body and arresting the League leaders was condemned.

British Troops Standing by as Precautionary Step

Lahore—25th. January 1947 - British troops were called out this evening and were standing by at Police HQ, in the city as a precautionary measure, while Muslim League followers continued to demonstrate against the Punjab Government's ban on the Muslim League National Guards.

More League workers, including 17 MLAs, were arrested by the police for defying Government's orders. By dusk 51 persons were arrested, bringing the total number of arrests since yesterday to 104. The Provincial League Assembly Party decided to defy the ban on assemblies and processions.

The Punjab Premier, *Malik Sir Khisar Hayat Khan Twana*, who had been in Delhi for the last two days and met the Viceroy and the C-in-C, returned here today. The Punjab Government in a communique today emphasized that they have "no desire to attack the Muslim League or to arrest its members, but they can not permit deliberate defiance of the ordinary law or of emergency orders which were issued solely to maintain communal peace."

In Other Cities

Meanwhile in other cities including Simla, Bombay, Madras, Muslims observed hartal and Muslim students absented themselves from schools and colleges. Elaborate police arrangements were reported from all cities.

In Sylhet day labourers refrained from work. A public meeting presided over by *Maulvi Abdul Hamid*, Deputy Leader of the League Parliamentary Party, passed a resolution condemning the Punjab Government's action and calling upon Muslims to take co-ordinated action.

In New Delhi, Muslim shops were closed in protest against the arrest of League leaders while Hindu shops were closed to protest against the Punjab Government's declaration of the *Rashtriya Sewak Sangh* as an unlawful body.

In Bombay batches of League volunteers went round the Muslim localities from an early hour of the day in motor lorries to ensure complete hartal. All

Muslim shops, business organizations and educational institutions joined the hartal. Tram and bus traffic in Muslim localities remained suspended.

In Karachi, the Sind Government passed orders withdrawing criminal proceedings against 37 city Muslim League National Guards who were arrested after a demonstration at the Sind Secretariat on Jan 8.

Demonstrations and Arrests Continue

Lahore—26th. January 1947.—Six Muslim League MLAs—the Khan of Mamdot, President of the Punjab Provincial League, Mr. Firoz Khau Noon, former Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council, Sardar Shaikat Hayat Khan, former Minister of the Punjab, Begum Shah Nawaz, Mr. Mamtaz Daulatana, and Miao Iftikharuddin—were released from the Lahore Central Jail at 11-10 p.m. today. Two other Muslim League workers, namely Begum Kamaluddin and Syed Amir Husain Shah, provincial organizer of the Muslim League National Guards, arrested along with the MLAs on Friday, were also released.

While League followers for the third day today demonstrated against the Punjab Government's ban of the Muslim League National Guards and took out processions in defiance of the Punjab Public Safety Ordinance, police pickets in the city were strengthened and arrests were continued, the total rising to 139.

Malik Sir Khizr Hayat Khan Tiwana, Premier, held a conference with his Ministers to discuss the situation arising out of the ban on the National Guards and also on the Rashtriya Swayam Sewak Sangh.

IN OTHER CITIES

In Jullundur League followers observed hartal for a second day today. Late last night a public meeting was held inside the Imam Nasruddin Shrine when speeches were made criticizing the arrest of League leaders. A strong contingent of police was posted outside the mosque. After the meeting there was a procession. A few batches of Muslim women also went round the city last evening carrying green flags.

Yesterday the police resorted to a mild lathi charge when a mob attacked the jail premises on the Grand Trunk Road where some Muslim demonstrators, earlier arrested, were lodged. Four persons were reported to have been injured, one seriously. An Assistant Sub-inspector and a constable received injuries.

In Jhansi, a majority of Muslim shops observed hartal. Muslim students abstained from classes and paraded the streets.

In Bombay, the Provincial Muslim League met yesterday and passed a resolution condemning the Punjab Government's action against the Muslim League National Guards and supporting the stand of the League leaders in the Punjab.

In Cawnpore, where a hartal was observed yesterday, a meeting of Muslim students and subsequently a mass meeting held in the Muslim League Hall, Mr. Mohammed Yakoub, MLA, presiding, passed similar resolutions of protest. The police peacefully dispersed a procession organized by the students.

In Madras, while some Muslim shops and business houses remained closed, most of the Muslim students, including students of the Muslim Women's College and the Muslim Girls High School, Royapettah, stayed away from their classes. Most of the students of the Government Muslim College and the High School attached to it met in the college compound and passed a resolution of protest and demanded the unconditional release of the arrested League leaders in the Punjab.

In Rangoon, most of the Muslim shops remained closed. Protest meetings were being organized by League followers.

In New Delhi, a protest meeting was held by League followers at which Mr. Zakir Hussain Mashhadi said that the Lahore arrests marked the beginning of a revolutionary era in the history of the Muslim struggle for independence.

A largely attended meeting of Hindus held in Diwan Hall by the Delhi Provincial Hindu Mahasabha passed a resolution condemning the order of the Delhi Administration banning the annual session of the Rashtriya Swayam Sewak Sangh as an "attack on the civil liberties of the people."

In Aorangabad, all Muslim shops remained closed on Friday. Students of Osmania College and High School left their class rooms. Muslim League leaders addressed a meeting later in the evening.

At Ludhiana 37 Leaguers including Nawab Ehsan Ali were arrested for taking out a procession in contravention of the Public Safety Ordinance. Muslim women also took out a procession but none was arrested. The processionists raised slogans such as "Khizr Wazarat Murdabad" (down with Khizr Ministry) and "Hindu-Muslim ek ho jao". Hindus and Muslims Unite).

Leaders Defy Government Ban

Lahore—27th January 1947—A mammoth public meeting in defiance of the Punjab Public Safety Ordinance was held under the auspices of the Muslim League outside Mochi Gate this afternoon. A detachment of Police was present, but they did not interfere with the meeting. The Khan of Mamdot and Malik Firoz Khan Noon were among the eight League leaders who addressed the meeting.

When the meeting ended, the people came out in a procession led by the League leaders. A police party which accompanied them did not interfere.

Addressing the gathering, Mian Mumtaz Daultana, Secretary, Provincial Muslim League, said that they would fight till the people of the Punjab regained their civil liberties. It was purely a political movement without any communal colour, he said.

Nearly 500 Muslims were arrested in the Punjab to-day in connexion with the civil disobedience launched by the PPML according to reports received from various towns in the Province.

A total of 90 Leaguers were arrested in Lahore to-day for alleged contravention of the Punjab Public Safety Ordinance by leading processions.

A procession of about 50 Muslim women started from Mozang in the morning and wending its way on Temple Road emerged on the Mall and marched towards the Lower Mall. The police did not interfere.

Ban on League Guards Withdrawn

Lahore—28th January 1947—The Punjab Government withdrew the bans imposed on the Muslim League National Guards and the Rastriya Swayam Sewak Sangh on Jan. 24. Announcement to this effect was made today by Sir Khizr Hayat Khan, Premier.

Sardar Shaukat Hyat Khan, Begum Shah Nawaz, Mian Amiruddin, Mayor of Lahore, Mr. Firoz Khan Noon and Miss Zahida Hyat, daughter of late Sir Sikander Hyat Khan, were arrested today for taking out processions. They were taken out of Lahore to different places and released. All others arrested today were similarly let off.

PREMIER'S STATEMENT

The Punjab Premier in his statement withdrawing the ban said: "In my statement of Jan. 26 I endeavoured, on behalf of my colleagues and myself, to make it clear that in declaring the Rastriya Swayam Sewak Sangh and the Muslim League National Guards unlawful associations the Punjab Government was not attacking any political party. The declarations were part of the Punjab Government's policy for the maintenance of communal peace. There has been considerable uneasiness both among Muslims and non-Muslims over the alleged collection of arms by private volunteer bodies and I expected that the declarations would be accepted in the same spirit as other emergency measures which have been necessary during the past difficult months and have undoubtedly saved the Punjab from communal disorder.

"Unfortunately an impression persists that the Punjab Government did intend to attack the Muslim League as a party. The Punjab Government is determined to remove this impression in the interests of communal peace and has accordingly decided to withdraw the declarations against the RSSS and the MLNG. The Government is prepared to take the risk involved in order to set all doubts finally at rest.

"But in the present state of communal feeling no Government can agree to the general withdrawal of emergency restrictions, particularly those on processions and meetings, and the Government intends to maintain and enforce such restrictions as it considers essential. Persons who break the law will be adequately dealt with.

"I appeal to the members of all communities to support the Punjab Government in maintaining order and communal peace."

OFFICIAL PRESS COMMUNIQUE

Lahore—30th. January 1947—"The situation as a whole has shown noticeable signs of improvement both in Lahore and Amritsar," said a Press communique issued by the Punjab Government at 5 p.m. today.

It adds: "The leaders of the movement were arrested at Lahore, last night. Processions of students moved in small groups asking Muslim shop-keepers to observe hartal. The students also organized themselves into a large procession. There were only 10 arrests yesterday while 72 persons were removed outside Lahore

and let off. Reports from Amritsar indicate that processions were ignored except in cases where violence was apprehended. A few processions were of course taken out, but they were smaller than the day before. The hartal has been abandoned and all Muslim shops are open as usual.

"Further reports from other districts indicate signs of returning sanity and local leaders seem inclined to be reasonable. Only sporadic activity in the shape of small processions was shown in some of the other districts and most of the arrested persons were subsequently released. News received from Ambala indicate that adults were not forthcoming for arrest but boys came forward instead.

"Mianwali and Simla are both unaffected to date and in Sialkot also the agitation is quite peaceful. Processions continued to be taken out at Multan but there was no interference with them by the police. Fourteen arrests were made at Rawalpindi on Jan. 29, of whom 12 were released later. No arrests are reported from Campbellpur. The South-East Punjab showed very little activity and only a few arrests are reported," the Note concludes.

In an interview, the Premier of the Punjab said that the Provincial Government had no desire to suppress the Muslim League. At the same time his Government would not yield to any threat intended to lead the province into political chaos. He made it clear that his Government was determined to preserve the Punjab from communal strife, by which other provinces had been torn.

The Punjab Government had no desire, he said, to damage any political party. He had taken the risk to withdraw the ban on the MLNG and the RSS. The Provincial League leaders, however, in their statement after the withdrawal of the ban had become known, seemed to have made it clear that they attached relatively little importance to the removal of the ban.

He appealed to all political parties to support him in defending democratic principles and maintaining communal peace.

Sir Khizr Hayat alleged that the League, unable to secure a majority to form a Ministry, thought itself justified to dislodge the Coalition Ministry by a show of force.

Clashes in Amritsar and Jullundur

Lahore—24th. February 1947—Muslim League demonstrations in the Punjab today were marked by clashes between the police and demonstrators at Amritsar and Jullundur.

An official announcement this evening described the situation in Amritsar as "exceedingly serious." There had been firing on several occasions by the police and troops had been called out to help the police in restoring order.

Meanwhile, the acting President of Provincial Muslim League, Maulana Dawood Ghaznavi, returned to Lahore this afternoon by air from Karachi, bringing with him a sealed cover from Mr. Jinnah to be delivered to Mian Ittihar-ud-Din at the Kasur jail.

It was stated that Mr. Jinnah had left the decision about a settlement of the Muslim League-Punjab Government dispute to the provincial League leaders, subject to the condition that the understanding and compromise reached should be honourable.

League Agitation in Punjab Called off

Lahore—26th. February 1947.—A compromise between the Punjab Government and the Muslim League in connexion with the 34-day-old agitation in the Punjab was announced this afternoon.

The Khan of Mamdot, President of the Punjab Provincial Muslim League, called off the Muslim League civil disobedience following the compromise.

The following are terms of the compromise: (1) The ban on public meetings to be removed, (2) Government to bring forward such legislation as may be considered necessary to preserve peace and public order in place of the present Punjab Safety Ordinance; (3) the release of all prisoners detained, under trial or convicted in connexion with the movement other than those accused or convicted of offences under Sec. 325 or of more serious offences under the Indian Penal Code; and (4) the ban on processions to continue.

The Government, accordingly, passed orders for the release of about 1500 civil disobedience prisoners.

Important leaders including Khan of Mamdot, Malik Firoz Khan Noon, Sardar Shaukat Hayat Khan, Mian Mumtaz Daulatana and Mian Ittihar-ud-Din, were released from this afternoon.

Punjab Ministry Resigns

Lahore—3rd March 1947—The Premier of the Punjab, Malik Sir Khizr Hayat Khan Tiwana, submitted the resignation of his Cabinet to-day.

Announcing the resignation of the Government, the Premier said: HMG has made it imperative that parties in the Province must be brought face to face with stark realities and must come to grips direct with the problems of the country.

"It is now incumbent on me to leave the field clear for the Muslim League to come to such arrangements vis-a-vis the other parties as it might consider in the best interests of the Muslims and the Province."

He added, "If I were now to continue to lead a Coalition in which the Muslim League is not represented, this might put in serious jeopardy such chances as might otherwise exist of a settlement being arrived at between the communities in the province."

He further said that "the basic fact of the situation is that the province has been suddenly confronted with the main constitutional problem and in conformity with the policy to which I have throughout adhered the responsibility for dealing with this problem on behalf of the Muslims must continue to rest with the Muslim majority party."

Sir Khizr Hayat added: "In view of the step that I have taken, it is needless for me to stress that I shall be ever ready to promote the cause of communal harmony and the chances of communal settlement in the province as far as it might be within my power, and shall not grudge any sacrifice that might help to achieve this much-to-be-desired consummation."

In another statement late on Sunday night the Premier said: "In the course of my statement issued on Feb 26 I said that HMG's announcement of Feb. 20, had created an entirely new situation in which the leaders of all parties in the Punjab must decide how the province should face the future: I have since given most anxious consideration to the situation with which the country is now faced, and after mature deliberation have arrived at certain conclusions which take the opportunity of making public."

"Last year, when on the invitation of H. E. the Governor, I took upon myself the responsibility of forming a Coalition Government, I was convinced that the best interests of the province and of all parties would be served by the administration being run by a non-communal party or coalition."

Disturbances in Lahore

Lahore—4th. March 1947—Thirteen persons were killed and 98 injured in disturbances which occurred in Lahore today following the resignation of the Punjab Coalition Ministry. The police had to resort to firing and lathi charge to disperse unruly crowds several times.

The demonstrations, which were staged to mark resentment against the proposed League Ministry in the Punjab, culminated in a riot in the afternoon in the walled city of Lahore resulting in many casualties. The trouble later spread to other parts of the city and there were pitched battles in the streets.

Military were called out towards the evening to assist the civil police in controlling the situation. Curfew was also enforced from 8 p. m. to 7 a. m.

Earlier in the day, a pitched battle took place between students of local schools and colleges and a police force. The students hurled brickbats at the police and the latter fired several rounds. About 30 policemen and 20 students sustained injuries.

The police held up a procession in a main business centre of the city, but later allowed it to proceed after hurried telephonic consultations between leaders and the authorities.

Lala Bhimsen Sachar, Finance Minister in the Tiwana Cabinet, led a procession to the Punjab Assembly Chamber where it terminated. Addressing a huge crowd, Mr. Sachar said: "I, as a member of the Government, hereby declare that you have every right to take out processions. But remember at the same time that you have to be perfectly non-violent in carrying on your political activities." Mr. Sachar warned the majority community in the province against any attempt at "usurping" the rights of the minorities and urged the League leaders "to place their cards on the table so that the minorities should know the sort of Ministry they are going to form in the province." He said: "We do not want to undermine the strength of the majority community or to reduce it to the status of a minority. But the fact still remains that they cannot allow the installation of a purely communal Ministry."

Section 93 Proclaimed in the Punjab

Lahore—5th. March 1947—The Governor of the Punjab issued to-day a proclamation under Sec 93 of the Government of India Act, 1935.

The Punjab Assembly was prorogued by the Governor since no alternative Ministry could be formed.

In a statement the Governor said: "The decision of the Coalition Ministry to leave office forthwith, the prorogation of the Punjab Legislative Assembly and the issue of a proclamation under Sec 93 of the Government of India Act, 1935, have been formally announced. It may help the public to understand the situation if I explain it less formally.

"Constitutionally, no province can be without a Government for any appreciable time. When a Ministry resigns, the normal course is for its members to remain in office until their successors are ready to take over from them. On this occasion the Coalition Ministers, for reasons which they have made public, have decided not to remain in office. The gap caused by their departure must be filled, and the only possible method of filling it immediately is by a proclamation under Sec 93 of the Government of India Act, 1935, which transfers all responsibility to the Governor.

"This is the first proclamation of the kind ever made in the Punjab and I hope that it will not have to remain in force for very long.

"While attempts to form an alternative Ministry continue, my first task must be to restore and maintain order in Lahore and elsewhere and to prevent further disorder. Communal rioting causes nothing but misery and does not advance the interests of any community.

"Severe restrictions on meetings, processions and gatherings will be needed in Lahore for some days. These restrictions are essential if order is to be maintained, and I trust that leaders of all communities will co-operate with the authorities in enforcing them."

Meanwhile, after a quiet night, there was a recrudescence of communal trouble today in Lahore and clashes occurred in various parts of the city. The police had to open fire on several occasions to bring the situation under control.

There were stray cases of stabbing in different parts of the city. Mobs made attempts to set fire to shops and buildings in one of the business centres of the city. Business was practically suspended and traffic came to a standstill in the affected areas.

The A.P.I. said that 17 persons were killed and 89 injured in today's disturbances and police firing.

OFFICIAL COMMUNIQUE

The Punjab Government issued the following communique this evening on the situation in Lahore:—

"The trouble in Lahore on March 4 originated with the taking out of a procession through Anarkali Bazar at about 10 a. m. Some 200 to 300 men walked through the bazar shouting slogans and forcibly hauling down flags from shops. The Station House officer, New Anarkali police station, broke up the procession. Later it became apparent that most of the crowd intended to make for the district courts. The officer deputed a police force to go ahead and bar their entrance. It had hardly taken up its position when the crowd arrived and went straight for them: one of the assistant sub-inspectors fired three revolver shots, but he and the others were injured and quickly over-powered.

"In the meantime the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Lahore, had received information that a procession was moving in the direction of the district courts and telephoned the Inspector in charge of the reserves posted inside the Secretariat to proceed to the courts at once with two police reserves. As the reserves alighted from their lorries they were set upon by the crowd. Most of them were badly injured and an attempt by the inspector to restore the situation by using his revolver failed. The crowd marched to the police office some 150 yards away, where it joined the students of a college who were engaged in throwing stones at the office gate entry. The Deputy Superintendent of Police, Lahore, was obliged to direct the office guard to open fire. Seven rounds were fired with results as yet unknown, but it is believed that two of the rioters were injured. At this stage reinforcements arrived. Large crowds barred their passage and it was necessary for them to fire two rounds to enable the party to get through. The D. I. G. received a brick injury and the window screen of his truck was smashed.

"Finding the situation at the police office under control the D.I.G. proceeded to the district courts where he was informed that a large crowd had assembled in the Ghal B. gh area some 500 yards away and had assaulted two constables. He immediately proceeded there with a police force and dispersed the crowd. So far

as can be ascertained, some 40 policemen received injuries in the course of the morning events.

The crowd at the Goal Bagh area comprised mainly of college students. After the meeting had been broken up, a procession was formed and marched to the Assembly shouting slogans. From the Assembly it went to the office of the League Party and dispersed.

In the afternoon, leaders including Master Tara Singh, Giani Kartar Singh and Dr. Gopichand Bhargava met and were reported to have decided that only slogans should be shouted.

Rioting broke out in different parts of the town on the afternoon of March 4. The immediate cause appears to have been the shouting of slogans by a small group of persons in the Rang Mahal area.

The two areas immediately affected by the rioting were Sitla Mandir which is between Shahi and Lahori Gates and Chowk Mati which is near Lahori Gate. The police were soon on the scene and succeeded in localizing the trouble.

"Curfew was imposed with effect from 8 p. m. to 7 a. m. on March 4, and the night passed off peacefully except for an alarm in the Mozang area."

Curfew in Multan

5th. March 1947:—A number of persons were killed and many injured in a clash here today. The District Magistrate imposed curfew in the city from 6 p.m. to 7 a.m. and banned all public meetings and processions for one month under the Punjab Public Safety Ordinance.

A Government communique on the situation in Multan and Gujranwala says: "Outside Lahore the areas affected so far are stated to be Multan and Gujranwala. A message received at 2 p.m. on March 5 from Multan stated that rioting on a large scale had broken out there and that casualties were heavy. In Gujranwala, about 5,000 persons attended a meeting on March 4. About 500 men of the minority community of Kamoke Mandir went to the railway station on March 4 where they broke down the fences and placed girders and barrels on the railway lines. Signal wires were damaged and the signal cabin was set on fire. Doors and windows of the quarters occupied by employees were smashed. The police managed to disperse this crowd and trains were safely passed.

"The conduct of Sikh and Hindu crowds in Lahore on March 4 was noticeably anti-police, presumably because of the early firing on a crowd without full knowledge of the circumstance that necessitated the firing. Processions during the course of the day seemed to make a point of picking out solitary police officers and assaulting them. Islamia College students were instructed to see that Muslims kept away from demonstrations, and the Muslim League Working Committee issued instructions to all district and city League committees in the province to remain calm and on the defensive. Muslim League National Guards are to be assembled and not to assume the offensive. Muslim women have been forbidden to leave their houses.

"The District Magistrate, Lahore, has imposed a ban on meetings and processions in Lahore. Curfew imposed last-night is to run for a period of ten days in the first instance."

Improvement in situation in Lahore

Lahore—6th. March 1947.—The communal situation in Lahore was stated to have considerably improved. There were some scattered cases of stabbing and a few isolated clashes this morning, but the situation had been quiet since midday. Military pickets had been posted in the worst affected areas and troops and police were patrolling the streets. A strict curfew was enforced between the hours of 5 p.m. and 7 a.m. and was extended to cover the Sadar Bazar area of the cantonment.

A peace committee, consisting of the Khan of Mamdot, Master Tara Singh, Lala Bhimsohn Socher, Malik Firoz Khan Noon, Sardar Swaran Singh, Dr. Gopichand Bhargava, Mian Itikharuddin, Mian Mumtaz Daulatana and Mr. C. E. Gibbons, was formed. It held a meeting this morning and decided that members of the committee should tour the city exhorting the people to maintain peace and order.

Arson and looting in Rawalpindi

Lahore—6th. March 1947.—While the situation here, according to a Punjab Government communique, showed "considerable improvement," Multan and Amritsar were brought under 24-hour curfew. The Amritsar curfew, imposed

at 2 p.m. to-day, continued for 68 hours. Two battalions of British troops arrived in the city.

Amritsar passed a sleepless night last night. Fires raged throughout the night and continued unchecked this morning. Four main bazars had been razed. The number of casualties up to a late hour today was unofficially given as 40 dead and 121 injured. A large number of people were evacuated to the Golden Temple or the Civil Lines.

In Multan, fires were brought under control and military pickets were posted all over the town. A large number of shops were completely barned. The number of casualties was unascertainable.

Latest reports from Rawalpindi said that 27 persons received fatal injuries in rioting and 175 were admitted into hospital. Cases of arson and looting were also reported.

The Down Frontier Mail was held up today and attacked at Taxila, and some passengers were wounded, it was officially announced this evening.

A Punjab Government communique said: "There has been considerable improvement in the situation in Lahore and no serious disturbances have been reported during the morning and afternoon of March 7.

"Attempts were made on the night of March 6 inside Shahalmi Gate to defy the curfew and shots were fired at the police, who returned the fire. Both communities were apprehensive of attack during the night, and the early hours of the morning of March 7 produced seven incidents of which three were fatal. One man detected in the act of fatally injuring another was shot dead by the police in Sua Bazar.

"The death roll reported up to date is about 35 and about 160 persons are being treated in the Mayo Hospital.

"The situation in Amritsar deteriorated steadily throughout March 6, arson and looting taking place on an extensive scale and numerous crowds were armed with weapons.

"Many were in steel helmets. A strong force of troops was sent to Amritsar, and it was announced that a 24-hour curfew would be imposed from 2 p.m. on March 7. Amritsar had quietened down considerably. Looters encountered by the police were fired on, and this action had excellent effect.

"No new fires have started and conflagrations which had already started are under control. Up to the evening of March 6, reported casualties were 27 dead and 90 injured. Fires had affected electric supplies, but arrangements for emergency feeding are in hand.

"In Multan, the trouble which started on March 5, was brought under control late in the afternoon of the same day and no incidents took place during the curfew hours. As soon as curfew was lifted on March 6 morning, looting started and curfew was again imposed from 2 p.m. on March 6 to continue until 9 a.m. on March 7 and then again from 11 a.m.

"There have been about twelve cases of arson on March 6 and most of the fires were brought under control.

"More than 90 bodies have so far been found but more are still to be recovered from burnt houses; 115 people have been admitted to hospital. Latest reports are that the situation is under control.

"In Rawalpindi, rioting started on March 5 and lasted throughout the afternoon and evening of March 6. Cases of arson were reported from several bazars and rioting took place on the morning of March 7. Up to midnight on March 6 six persons were killed, over 60 injured, including the Civil Surgeon.

"The Down Frontier Mail on March 7 was held up and attacked at Taxila and some passengers were wounded.

"Elsewhere in the province, there was some apprehension of trouble at Lyallpur and Rohtak, where large crowds assembled, but no incidents took place.

"There have been 14 incidents in Sialkot, but curfew has not been imposed.

"The rest of the province is generally quiet."

Quiet in Riot-Affected Areas

Lahore—March 8th & 9th 1947.—No incidents were reported in Lahore since this morning. The night passed off peacefully, but there were two incidents in the early hours.

Amritsar had a peaceful night. There was strict enforcement of the curfew by British troops and police. The curfew was lifted this morning at 10 for four hours to enable people to obtain rations. The Ration Department said that it

had arranged for adequate rations for several over-crowded areas which had become, in effect, refugee camps.

The situation in Multan also quieted down but military and police were continuing ceaseless vigilance. Elaborate police precautions were taken in Jullundur following some stray cases of assault yesterday in different parts of the city. The situation had since been quiet, although tension continued.

Tension continued also in Rawalpindi, although the general situation was the same as last night.

Raiders from rural areas who attacked some Mohallas on Friday night, and were yesterday morning reported as being on the outskirts of Rawalpindi, were stated to have set fire to some villages. The loss of property and life could not be ascertained.

Reports had been received of the destruction of several buildings in Taxila about 18 miles from Rawalpindi. Official casualties were given as 60 killed and 150 injured. The Punjab Governor, Sir Evans Jenkins, flew to Rawalpindi today to study the situation.

Lahore:—In view of the improvement in the situation curfew hours in the Civil Lines area from today till March 17 will be from midnight to 7 a.m.

The District Magistrate of Lahore issued an order today under Sec. 144 Cr.P.C. prohibiting the beating of drums, tom-toms or vessels, ringing or striking of bells or gongs, blowing of horns or trumpets, or sounding of loudspeakers, sirens, whistles or similar instruments within the limits of Lahore Cantonment during the hours of curfew for a period of eight days. The order will not, however, apply to the use of such instruments at any place of worship in the usual manner.

The District Magistrate also imposed curfew from 8 p.m. to 7 a.m. in the British Infantry Bazar area within the limits of Lahore Cantonment for eight days.

Amritsar.—Patrols opened fire several times to enforce curfew. An attempt to set fire to a lorry stand in the city was foiled.

It was announced that in case of any fresh outbreak of rioting, looting, arson or any other offence at any time during the exempted hours, those found guilty will be immediately dealt with and 24 hour curfew will be reimposed without further notice. The exempted hours tomorrow will be from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m. Twenty-five more arrests were made for offences committed during the disturbances. Several goondas were rounded up.

The District Magistrate banned for a week from today processions, meetings and assembly of five or more persons in the municipal limits of Jandiala Guru and Tarn Taran.

It was announced in the Civil Lines area that the curfew order had been extended in this area for a further period of three days and would remain operative each day from 3 p.m. to 7 a.m.

The Chief Engineer, Hydro-electric Department, and the Chief Engineer, P.W.D. visited Amritsar today and offered their help to the local municipal committee in repairing damage to the electric feeders and in cleaning the debris which had blocked drains, endangering public health.

Multan.—According to travellers reaching Lahore over 100 persons were killed during the disturbances and about 50 injured. Many families were reported to have perished in the conflagration which raged in the city for a couple of days. The loss was estimated at about Rs. 50,00,000.

Murree.—According to unconfirmed reports, the major portion of Murree town was completely gutted by fires.

COMMUNIQUE

A Punjab Government communique on the situation in the province, said: "There were one or two incidents last evening in Lahore. The night, however, despite some shouting, was reasonably quiet. Today the town is quiet generally, people are moving about and shops are opening. The atmosphere in the railway area has also improved today. During the day a few incidents were reported.

Peshawar.—There was the usual picketing of courts in Peshawar on Sunday. About 33 persons were put under temporary arrest when three batches of Muslim League volunteers attempted to picket the district courts. A procession was held in Peshawar city. The police made a mild lathi charge to disperse the crowd when the processionists attempted to break the police cordon. There was also a procession in Mardan, which came from the Kalpani area. The crowd was dispersed by the police.

Syed Mir Ahmad Shah, President of the Campbellpur Muslim League, in a statement today assured the non-Muslim minorities in the city of "protection of their life and property at all costs" by the city Muslim League.

Multan and Amritsar Still Disturbed

Lahore—10th. March 1947—The Punjab Government issued the following communique at 5-45 p.m. today on the communal situation in the province:—

"There have been no incidents in Lahore during the day or the night preceding. Yesterday a tongawala and two others were killed and two persons were injured. There was slight panic in the Cantonment on account of a false rumour. Many shops resumed business during the day.

"Amritsar was also quiet last night. One person was shot dead for breach of the curfew. Property looted during the disturbances is being recovered from several places through police searches.

"In Multan the curfew has prevented many fresh incidents. The police repulsed some vagrants coming in from Muzaffargarh district. The Military are patrolling the suburbs and many arrests of suspicious persons have been made.

"Rawalpindi city is now encircled by a military cordon. There were very few fresh incidents in the town. The position in the surrounding area is still serious. There have been many raids on bastis and villages, where considerable loss of life and property is feared. There has been incendiarism in the Kahota, Gujarkhan and Mandra areas.

"Fresh trouble is reported from Attock, but all necessary measures are being taken to prevent trouble from spreading.

"Nothing particular is reported from any other district.

"The Hindu-Sikh decision to desist from demonstrations and processions on Anti-Pakistan Day has helped to allay anxiety to a considerable extent."

Yesterday's communique said: "In Amritsar on March 8 all the main gates and street crossings were held by police pickets, and apart from shots fired at looters or persons breaking curfew, there was no incident of importance. Arrangements were made to round up goondas and out of 85 arrested 22 were found in possession of looted property. All reports indicated that there was more confidence in the city but there was considerable anxiety about food supplies. The knowledge that British troops were operating in the city is having a very steadying effect.

"The city has been much damaged and there has been looting in practically every part. Arson and damage to telephone and electric wires have been very widespread and many streets are blocked by fallen debris. The total casualties known on March 8 were 88 dead and 149 injured but these figures have not been officially confirmed. The night of March 8-9 passed without any disturbances.

"Curfew was lifted at 10 this morning. No incidents of any sort took place during its removal and everybody returned to their homes 15 minutes before it was on again. Most people were able to draw rations and a large number of people from outside who had been caught in Amritsar when riding broke out got to the railway station and were able to leave by special trains.

DAMAGE IN MURREE

"The situation in Rawalpindi city itself is under control, but in the surrounding areas conditions are not so satisfactory. People from Hazara district have invaded the Murree region. In Murree itself a brewery and a hotel have been burnt to the ground.

"The Governor and Sir John Bennett, Inspector-General of Police visited Rawalpindi by special plane on Sunday morning and returned shortly after 2 P.M. They reported that they saw smoke rising from about half a dozen villages. The situation generally, they added, was being brought under control and troops were out and prepared to take the strongest action against persons seen with arms or collected in parties of more than five. All troops had been informed to shoot on sight on the slightest disobedience to orders.

"While Multan city itself has remained quiet further reports have come in from the surrounding villages of attacks and looting.

"There are no reports of incidents in other districts and it appears they are all quiet."

Government girls' schools in Lahore will remain closed till March 14. It was officially announced. The middle standard examination for Ludian girls conducted by the Punjab Education Department will not be held in Lahore centres from March 11 to 13. In places other than Lahore the school authorities were

directed to close schools and centres for the middle standard examinations for Indian girls in consultation with the local civil authorities.

Disturbances Continue in Multan and Attock

Lahore—11th. March 1947—The Punjab Government issued the following communique at 4-14 p.m. today on the situation in the province:—

"In Lahore, the night of March 10-11 was without incidents except for an isolated attempt at incendiarism in one area where the prompt arrival of police averted trouble immediately.

"Practically all the shops are closed and traffic on the roads is thin. Efforts at the formation of peace committees in the town were not entirely without effect. The police are searching pedestrians and others for weapons and the results have been excellent. 40 persons were arrested for carrying knives and two for possession of swords. One student was arrested for possessing an unlicensed revolver.

"Five bodies were discovered in different areas, four of which appeared to be some days old.

"On the whole, the situation does not give cause for alarm, and Anti-Pakistan Day has not caused any particular incident.

Amritsar—"In Amritsar, patrolling by troops has had an excellent effect and public confidence has been generally restored.

"During the four-hour break in the curfew people went about freely to obtain rations.

"There was incendiarism in a handloom factory. A riot was prevented when two head constables fired on an armed crowd and arrested seven of them on the spot. Lorries coming into the town are being checked and suspicious passengers arrested. Searches are also being made by the police for hidden arms.

Multan—"Although the situation in Multan town was well in hand and there were no fresh incidents, the rural areas give cause for anxiety. Looting and burning of villages are still taking place but the troops are doing their job. A large number of persons have been arrested by the police and troops in rural areas.

"The situation in Rawalpindi city is under control and there were no incidents except in the Sadar Bazar where the police fired on a mob attempting to burn a house. Houses were searched and some arms recovered. One person was shot dead and one wounded for breach of the curfew. Some snipers were fired at by the police, killing two and injuring five.

"Looting and burning of villages are reported from several places in Attock district. Damage to life and property is not yet estimated but it is feared to be considerable. Troops have been sent to cope with the situation.

"Gujranwala and Sialkot are quiet. There is nothing particular to report from any other district."

Lahore—12th. March 1947.—Yesterday's Government communique stated: "The position in Lahore is improving rapidly. There have been no fresh incidents and most shops have resumed business. People are moving about freely and the majority of employees in Government offices and Moghalpura workshops have reported for duty. Thirty persons were arrested yesterday for carrying weapons.

"In Amritsar, the past 24 hours have been reported quiet except for one isolated case of arson. Curfew restrictions have been relaxed and there is a free period from 9 a.m. to 8 p.m. daily. No incidents have been reported from Tarn Taran, Jandiala and Majitha, where military patrols are making constant visits. Local leaders are holding daily meetings in the kotwali for communal peace. Police searches for weapons and looted property continue and recoveries are being made. No fresh incidents occurred last night.

"Although there was considerable shouting from housetops during the night at Sialkot, no fresh incidents are reported and the situation is well in hand.

"No fresh incidents are reported from Rawalpindi town, where refugees from the rural areas are arriving. There seems to be more loss to property than life. Some shops have actually opened in the town, which shows definite signs of improvement. The rural area still gives cause, or anxiety, but there was distinct improvement in the north-east, where troops are moving about on a wide scale.

"The situation in Attock district does not show any sign of improvement yet, but more and more military aid is being provided and bands of persons moving about are being intercepted. Looting and arson has been reported from several areas.

Military Fire on Crowd in Peshawar

Peshawar—March 11th 1947—One person was killed and 10 others injured when soldiers fired on a crowd which blocked the railway line near Peshawar, tampered with the track and stoned the troops when asked to disperse, said a NWFP Government communique.

The communique adds: "Seventeen stabbing cases took place in the afternoon, three of which proved fatal. An assistant sub-inspector of police, who was fired at, is lying in a precarious condition in hospital.

"Troops were called out last evening and are standing by in the city Kotwali.

"The District Magistrate yesterday imposed a 12 hour curfew for three days in Peshawar city from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m.

"There were no incidents during the night.

"On the Kohat Road, there have been some incidents near Mammi. The Assistant Commissioner of Peshawar has gone to the spot with orders to evacuate distressed families.

"Reports have also been received of some cases of stabbing in Nowshera and Pabbi. All telegraph and telephone wires leading out of Peshawar were cut on Sunday night and land communications have not yet been restored.

"In Hazara District, one person has been killed and two places of worship have been burnt. Troops are standing by in Abbotabad and Haripur. Curfew has been imposed in Haripur, Havelian, Mansherah, Abbotabad, Baffa, and Shinkariari."

The Frontier Government also issued the following communique on the rioting in the province as on March 12:—

"The situation in the southern half of Hazara district has deteriorated. A bazar was set on fire by a mob from surrounding villages. Some houses had to be demobilised to stop the fire from spreading. About nine persons were killed in the rioting.

"Civil armed forces had to fire 100 rounds to disperse the mob. The Deputy Commissioner of Hazara and the superintendent of police, with detachments of troops, went to the bazar area to control the situation. Twenty-one arrests have been made and 33 persons have been evacuated. Fires were also reported from a neighbouring village."

"A party of evacuees from a place in Haripur tehsil were ambushed on Wednesday and six persons were killed and their property burnt or looted. Military and Frontier Constabulary reached the place in time to rescue 53 persons. An order under Sec. 144 CrPC has been promulgated in Haripur and Abottabad.

"There is no truth in reports that people from Hazara district were responsible for the destruction in Murree and its neighbourhood.

"A military column was sent to Bannu city to restore confidence. An order under Sec. 144 CrPC has been promulgated.

"In Peshawar Cantonment yesterday, curfew was imposed for one night following incident in a bazar area. There were several attacks on individuals, one being fatal.

Punjab Government's Estimate of Riot Casualties.

Lahore—15th March 1947 A official statement, issued to-day, places the number of persons killed during the disturbances in the Punjab, up to March 15, at 1,036. The number of seriously injured is given as 1,110.

Commenting on the general situation in the Punjab, an official communique said that in Lahore, the night of March 14-15 was uneventful. All was quiet in the town to-day also. Total arrests of goondas in Lahore now numbered 169. There had been no incidents of importance either in Amritsar City or in the rural area during the last 24 hours. Nervousness still existed but to a lesser extent than formerly.

So far 82 persons were arrested for murder and looting. Property valued at Rs. 25,000 was recovered.

Referring to other centres, the communique said that Sialkot, Gujranwala, Sheikhupura and Gurdaspur were quiet. There was one case of arson in Jullundur City on the night of March 13-14, but the fire was detected in time and brought under control. The city had been free from assaults for the last three days.

Continuing, the communique said that a military patrol accompanied by police had been visiting villages, on the Kapurthala-Jullundur border. Military

patrols had also visited villages in the Sadar Jurisdiction. Sixty-four goondas had so far been arrested and the search for weapons continued.

There had been no further incidents in Ludhiana since 10 a.m. on March 14. A 22-hour curfew was imposed for a period of one week. Hoshiarpur, Kangra and Ferozapore remained quiet.

MULTAN QUIET

All districts in Ambala division remained quiet although there was a certain amount of tension.

All was quiet in Multan City and Cantonment. There had been no further incidents in the rural areas and the damage done appeared to have been exaggerated. Ten villages and 75 shops and houses in all had been looted or burnt. In the rural area, 75 persons had been killed and 46 injured. These figures included five persons killed by the police and two by troops.

There was considerable panic in Muzaffargarh and in an effort to restore confidence detachments of troops were patrolling the rural area.

Apart from false rumours and alarms, Montgomery, Lyallpur, Jhang and Dera Ghazi Khan remained quiet. Rawalpindi City was now back to normal. The arrival of troops restored the situation there. Thirty-four houses had been burnt in a village of P. S. Gujrat Khan.

In Attock, the situation in the larger towns like Campbellpur and Hassan Badal was easier although tension continued very high. Another brigade of troops was arriving for work in the southern part of the district.

JHELUM QUIET

Jhelum itself was quiet. The situation in Khushab suddenly took a turn for the worse on the evening of March 13. Reinforcements were at once sent to Khushab and the situation was brought under control. In Gujrat, all was reported quiet but the rural areas showed good deal of uneasiness.

DEPLOYMENT OF TROOPS

"Over 4000 British and Indian troops were engaged in the task of restoring peace and order in the Punjab between the Chett River in North Punjab and Rohtak district in South Punjab," said *Maj-Gen. Bruce*, GOC, Lahore Area, at a Press conference at Lahore Cantonment yesterday afternoon.

Maj-Gen. Bruce, who commanded an area in the Punjab roughly equal in size to the whole of France said: "I am making the best use of the troops at my disposal and their deployment in the various riot-affected parts of the Punjab has produced a steady and stabilizing effect on the situation."

He reiterated a Press report that troops had been requisitioned from South India and said that so far the military authorities had been satisfied with local readjustments of the position and posting of troops.

Replying to a question, he said that he did not foresee the possibility of communalism penetrating into the ranks and leading troops to take sides in an inter-communal conflict. He said: "Whenever the troops have been asked to do a certain job they have done it admirably well."

Gen Bruce explained that the deployment of troops in the riot-stricken areas had led a certain section of the public to think that martial law had been enforced in those areas. "It is a wrong notion," he said. "The Army so far is acting in aid of the civil authorities for the restoration of communal harmony and order. We are equally ready to help them in the prevention of fire, reconstruction of devastated quarters, and other tasks."

He revealed that at present only two companies were employed in Lahore city, while two battalions and a brigade headquarters were stationed in Amritsar. There was only one battalion in Multan before the riot broke out and consequently two battalions and a brigade headquarters were despatched.

The situation in Multan he said, was under control, but in the region south of the town disturbances still continued. There were good prospects of the situation quietening down within the next few days.

He told Pressmen that Rohtak and Gurgaon districts were dealt with by the Area Commander of Delhi, while Rawalpindi Division was under the command of Rawalpindi area.

Lahore—16th March 1947.—A Government communique issued at 5 p.m. stated: "Lahore continues to be peaceful and there has been no further outbreak either in the city or in the rural areas to date."

"There is nothing to report from Gurdaspur, Sialkot, Gujranwala or Sheikhupura where everything remains quiet."

"Jullundur itself has been free from all trouble for six days. Police and military parties are still patrolling the city and rural areas. Yesterday these patrols visited Maharakpur, Adampur, Alawalpur, Goraya, Kurka Kalan, Bilga and Lasara.

"There have been no further incidents in Ludhiana and the 22 hour curfew is still in force. Troops during the day yesterday visited Samrala, Machhiwara and other villages.

"The position in the rural areas generally is satisfactory, though new events in other parts of the province are having a disturbing effect.

"Ferozepore, Hoshiarpur and Kangra remained completely peaceful."

Pandit Nehru's Impressions of Punjab Tour

Lahore March 17.—Pandit Nehru returned to Lahore this afternoon after paying a visit to the riot-affected areas in Amritsar. Before his departure for Delhi, Pandit Nehru gave Pressmen in Lahore an account of his three-day tour of the riot-affected areas. He said that "the situation is more or less under control", adding: "I think the present disturbances will end completely within a very few days. So far as I have been able to see, the military are acting efficiently and with rapidity." He expressed the opinion that all that had happened in the Punjab was intimately connected with political affairs.

Pandit Nehru described some of the sights he had seen as "ghastly." He said: "I have heard of behaviour by human beings which would degrade brutes. The first thing to be done is to put an end to every kind of disorderly action. The second thing is to protect and rescue people who may be threatened or are in danger. More especially must women who have been abducted or moved by force be brought back to their homes. Then other problems like the care of refugees and rehabilitation have to be tackled.

"There is never need for panic, whatever happens, much less today when the situation is more or less under control. The man who is panicky is a useless citizen and a danger to others.

"I propose to say nothing about the political aspects except this that if politics are to be conducted in this way, then they cease to be politics and become some kind of jungle warfare which reduces human habitation to the state of a desert. If there is a grain of intelligence in any person he must realize that whatever political objective he may aim at, this is not the way to attain it. Any such measure must bring, as it has in a measure brought, ruin and destruction.

"Let people struggle for their political aim if they want to, but they must do so as human beings, with dignity.

I am not enamoured of slogans anywhere. The Punjab is specially fond of slogans. There may be times when slogans are useful and good, but when we are up against the hard facts which we face today, they cease to have any meaning. Slogan-shouting, cursing and denouncing others are particularly unbecoming and objectionable. Slogans containing the word 'murdabad' indicate the mentality of the coward and bully.

He added: "India will go on along her destined path to her destined end of independence and nothing that has happened is going to stop this. So, I am sure, will the Punjab as a part of India, in spite of everything that has happened and that is likely to happen. Mighty historic forces are at work driving us all in that direction in spite of our own follies. It is up to us, however, to march with dignity and heads erect and not crawl like animals in the field.

"The Punjab has had a hard lesson. Let it learn from it and not lose itself in a sea of hatred and reprisal which can only lead to mutual destruction and infamy. Let us all build together and prepare ourselves for the great things to come."

Concluding, Pandit Nehru referred to the relief fund that has been started and said: "An appeal has been issued on its behalf. I hope that this fund will be liberally subscribed to, and that it will give help to the large number of sufferers of these disturbances, regardless of creed or any other distinction."

Casualties in Punjab Disturbances

Lahore, March 20.—It is officially announced that 2,049 persons have so far been killed and 1,103 seriously injured in the disturbances in the Punjab. The figures for cities and towns are 511 dead and 944 seriously injured, while those for the rural areas are 1,538 and 159, respectively.

A Punjab Government communique issued at 5 p.m. today stated: Lahore continues quiet except for another attempted case of arson last night in the

town. The case is very similar to the one that occurred the previous night and is obviously a deliberate attempt by someone to create fresh trouble in Lahore.

All was quiet in Amritsar yesterday and today.

Gujranwala, Sheikhupura, Sialkot, Gurdaspur and all the districts in Jullundur, Ambala and Multan divisions report all quiet.

Rawalpindi continues quiet but tension still exists in Gujran Khan tehsil.

The D. I. G., Rawalpindi, reports that all is now quiet in Campbellpur district, but there is acute tension in Fatehjang tehsil.

Gujrat, Shahpur, Jhelum and Mianwali are similarly all quiet though a certain amount of tension exists. The situation is being carefully watched by the district authorities and the military."

Fires in Dera Ismail Khan Villages

Peshawar April 17.—A communique issued by the Frontier Government today stated that, while the situation in Dera Ismail Khan is under control, fires have been seen in six other villages in the district. Details are not yet available.

It adds that Muslim League processionists at Bannu yesterday caused damage to the court of the senior subjudge and the municipal office. Today Muslim Leaguers entered the court of the Political tahsildar and damaged Government property and judicial records. Although there is tension the situation is reported to be well in hand.

One person was killed in his shop in Peshawar Cantonment this afternoon.

According to unofficial reports received here from Dera Ismail Khan, about 400 shops and houses were burnt in Tuesday's fires.

The NWFP Government issued the following communique at 9-45 p. m. on the 18th. April on the situation in the province.

Disturbances continue in the *Dera Ismail Khan* district. The situation is serious in the town of Tank where up to midday today troops had inflicted over 90 casualties in enforcing the curfew. Looting and burning has been extensive and several civilians have been killed.

Other disturbed places in the district are: Gomal Bazar which was raided by tribesmen last night; Paharpur where 32 shops and 60 houses were burnt and three persons were killed and three wounded while three are missing. Kotkal, where 12 shops were burnt and one person wounded; Kotla, where 10 houses and shops were burnt, three women killed and one wounded; Musa Zai, where about 25 shops were burnt, one person killed and one wounded; Jatta Jalwa, where 10 houses and five shops were burnt.

The situation is under control in the town of Dera Ismail Khan. The latest casualty figures are 16 dead and 48 wounded. It is estimated that in the fires which were started on Tuesday about 900 shops were destroyed.

The casualties at Baroa now total four dead.

The railway line near Peshawar was damaged by a bomb this morning but has been repaired. There was minor riot in Haripura jail yesterday.

The situation in the interior of D. I. Khan District is still acute, said a communique issued by the Government on the 21st. April. Reports of arson, loot, murder and forcible conversions have been received from certain villages. Arson is reported from a village in Hazara district where six houses and tea shops were gutted.

In Bannu district, the communique adds, a village was raided on Saturday night and five shops were burnt. The police encountered raiders and compelled them to withdraw. No casualties are reported from either side.

"A bomb exploded near Bannu but the damage was slight. A Frontier Constabulary outpost was ineffectively sniped on Saturday night. Two persons were arrested."

Ghaffar Khan Suspects "Big Plot"

Peshawar—27th. April 1947—"The present disturbances in the country naturally lead me to suspect that there is a big plot and conspiracy behind them," said *Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan*, addressing a public meeting at Oharadda to-day.

"It is not the love of God, Islam, or love of their country, but it is the love of their departing English masters whom their friends do not want to go from India. There seems to be an organised attempt to create a situation so that Indians themselves may request the British people to remain in India."

He added that the stage had come when India must be free. "We are passing through very critical times. It is the time of the acid test through which all nations, sooner or later, have to pass. But only those nations can successfully stand the test of time who face it with patience."

"This is the time when we should be united and have conferred among ourselves for the betterment of our nation and country. In co-operating among ourselves we would not only have saved our country but also ourselves from destruction. On the other hand we have set fire to our country, a fire from which we ourselves cannot escape. These things can neither help Islam nor the Muslim League nor Pakistan. The crop of freedom is now ripe. Let us prepare ourselves for the harvest and serve our country with united force."

Khan Sahib's Views

Dr. Khan Sahib, the Frontier Premier, at a Press conference at Rawalpindi on the 27 April said: "Mr. Jinnah does not exist in the Frontier Province. If the people remain peaceful to-day, the credit goes to the Frontier Government."

Replying to questions, he said the staging of any demonstrations by Red Shirts had been stopped by their leader, as desired by the Governor.

Asked why so many people had turned up in Peshawar to-day, he said they had come simply to see the Viceroy. "If anybody could deliver the goods, it is the present Viceroy."

Dr. Khan Sahib added: "We had general elections in the Frontier on the issue of Pakistan a year ago. No new situation has arisen to call for another election. After 13 months, when India becomes free, a revolution is inevitable, and it will be against vested interests. Then there will be no question of Congress and League organisations. The Congress has done its job and served its purpose in getting freedom for India."

Dismissal of Frontier Governor Urged by Congress

Acharya Jugal Kishore, General Secretary of Congress and Dewan Chamaniai, who had gone to the NWFP to report on conditions there at the request of Pandit Nehru, issued a statement from New Delhi on the 4th. May.

They state that "a Governor should be appointed in the place of Sir Olaf Caroe, who is prepared to guarantee protection to the minorities in full sympathy and harmony with the present Ministry" and that "it is not the Ministry that should be dismissed but the Governor and the officials who look to him for support."

"We have recently returned," the statement says in part, "from a tour of the Frontier Province and what we have seen has shocked us beyond measure."

"We have no doubt that what we may call the Governor's part has given direct or indirect encouragement to the law-breakers."

"The Frontier Ministry is unshakable. It has the support not only of the minorities to a man, but also of an imposing majority of the elected legislators representing the Frontier Pathans. All wishful thinking on the part of inspired agitators, wanting fresh elections or a Sec. 93 Government, is utter nonsense."

"It is an open secret that the present Governor does not favour the Ministry. A man in his position who is also the head of the Political Department can seriously hamper the work of the Ministry since a large number of administrative officers play a dual role being civilian administrators as well as Political Agent."

"Special responsibility rests upon the Governor for the protection of the minorities and yet attempts made by well-meaning administrators and the Ministry to protect the minorities have been frustrated. Representatives of the minorities met us and told us that they had complete confidence in the Red Shirts and yet a scheme for the provision of home guards have been unnecessarily held up by the Governor thus robbing the minorities of confidence in his impartiality."

"The happenings at Dara Ismail Khan were an eye-opener to us. The League agitation had practically fizzled out until it became difficult to find more than four persons to offer themselves for arrest although on previous occasions the figures had been very high. It was obvious that the back of the agitation had been broken and all was peaceful."

"In this situation secret meetings were held and people were imported from the Punjab and other areas."

"Repeated orders were issued by the head of the civilian administration for the arrest of ringleaders and repeatedly these orders were disobeyed by police officials. Indeed, even the orders of the Inspector-General of Police, under the inspection of the Ministry were flouted. The police had ample forces at their disposal. Not a single platoon was brought into action, not a tear-gas bomb thrown, not a lathi charge made, not a shot fired even in the air. The Governor of the Province was fully aware of the orders given for the arrest of ringleaders and yet when he arrived, he asked one of the most prominent of the ringleaders to accompany him

and openly fraternized with him. Quite naturally, the officials who had disobeyed the orders given to them had done so knowing perfectly well that they would not be questioned nor called to order.

"This unnatural state of affairs must cease immediately and a Governor should be appointed in the place of Sir Olaf Caroe, who is prepared to guarantee protection to the minorities and who is in full sympathy and harmony with the present Ministry which is headed by a most unique and superb personality, Dr. Khan Sahib.

"As will be evident from this statement, it is not the Ministry that should be dismissed, but the Governor and the officials who look to him for support; who have failed in preserving law and order and in doing their duty to the minorities. Each one of these officials must be removed and tried for grave dereliction of duty.

"The Public will notice a remarkable similarity in the pattern of the agitation in the Punjab and the Frontier Province. But it is obvious that there is a difference. The Frontier Ministry is firmly installed not only constitutionally, but in the hearts of the people of the Frontier. The whole of India will resist any attempt to tamper with the constitutional position of the Ministry.

"We wish to add that the people of the Frontier and the Punjab were very much cheered to know that H.E. the Viceroy and Lady Mountbatten were visiting them in their hour of great distress. Lady Mountbatten's visit to the stricken women and children will always be cherished by the victims as a gesture of great nobility.

Mr. Jinnah Accuses Ministry of "Ruthless Policy"

Mr. M. A. Jinnah, in statement issued from New Delhi on the 7th. May, accused the NWFP Government of a "ruthless policy of crushing the Muslims and the Muslim League organisation" and agreeing with the Frontier League leaders' decision, taken on May 1, not to call off the movement.

He has, however, appealed to every Muslim, especially Leaguers, to remain peaceful. "It is against all canons of morality and civilization and the teaching of Islam that we should harm the weak," he said.

After defining direct action, the statement goes on to say that the public has lost faith in the present Frontier Ministry and that there is a province-wide demand for fresh elections. The following is the full text of the statement:—

I have the opportunity of fully discussing with the Frontier League leaders the situation in the NWFP, and the developments that have taken place recently.

The League movement in the Frontier was started because the people and especially the Muslim Leaguers and the League organisation in the province were sought to be crushed by the Khan Sahib Ministry, by fair means or foul, ever since the Ministry was formed. The victimisation, persecution, suppression and oppression on the part of the Government knew no limits. Every vestige of civil liberties had ceased to exist. Ordinances, Sec. 144 and other repressive provisions of the law were being freely and ruthlessly used to deprive the people of their rights of political expression and criticism of the Ministry.

These were the conditions prevailing in the province when leaders of the Muslim League were arrested for asserting their right of civil liberties, and the resentment caused among the people assumed the character of mass civil disobedience. It is absolutely false and complete misrepresentation of the facts that the All-India Muslim League ever decided to actually resort to direct action. The Bombay resolution of July 29, 1946, merely indicated a change of policy. By it we declared that we would no longer be restricted to constitutional methods which had been scrupulously followed by the Muslim League up to that time.

The Congress creed, on the other hand, not only permitted them to resort to unlawful means, but it was of the very essence of the organisation that they were free to resort to mass civil disobedience at any time they considered proper for the achievement of their objectives through coercive methods.

This Sword of Damocles was kept continually hanging over the Muslims and the British Government, and the Congress has repeatedly launched movements and used the weapon of mass civil disobedience since 1921 on various occasions, creating grave situations in the country. The last time they decided to launch the movement was in 1942 and we all know with what disastrous consequences. The attitude of the Congress towards perpetrators of acts of violence in connexion with movements launched by it is evident from what the Congress Ministers have been doing since their return to power in their provinces. Acts of violence

committed during the 1942 movement have been hailed by Congress leaders as acts of heroism and patriotism.

As against the policy and record of the Congress, the Muslim League by its resolution of July 29 only made it clear that it was now free to launch a movement of mass civil disobedience as and when it was thought necessary, and it was in this sense that the phrase "direct action" was used. It was quite obvious that the meaning of direct action which is attributed to us maliciously, namely, that it is based on the principle of force, violence and bloodshed, is without any foundation and is absolutely untrue. Direct action means social pressure, strike or revolt, constituting moral pressure upon the authority in power to redress our grievances and meet our demands.

The present movement in the NWFP developed because the situation had become intolerable and the Ministry could not be allowed to continue its ruthless policy of crushing the Muslims and Muslim League organisation in particular. The entire public has lost its confidence in the Ministry and there is a province-wide demand for the application of Sec 93 and fresh elections. Dr. Khan Sahib and his colleagues were challenged to seek the verdict of the people, which they, in their extreme obstinacy, still refuse to do.

From all information that is available to me, and I have gone through this matter most carefully, I cannot disagree with the facts as they exist and as a result of the situation carried by the Frontier Ministry, thousands of people have been arrested, sentenced to various terms of imprisonment and detained and clamped into jails under the Frontier Crime Regulations. The only honourable course for Dr. Khan Sahib and his co-Ministers is to resign and seek fresh elections. I note that the Frontier Government subsequently issued a communique on April 19, in which they said: "The Government have for their part decided unconditionally to release, as soon as conditions permit, all political prisoners who are not charged with offences of violence. The Government have no intention of interfering with the freedom of expression of political opinion or with peaceful meetings, but they must impress on all in the province that processions and picketing have in the past proved an incitement to acts of lawlessness, and that they cannot be permitted until moral conditions return." But the root cause still continued. I had hoped that better counsels would prevail and I do still hope that the situation will be examined dispassionately and in its true perspective by those concerned. The provincial Muslim League had on May 1 before the Frontier leaders came to Delhi to meet me, after full consideration, came to the conclusion that the steps so far proposed by the Frontier Government in no way met the demands of the Muslim League and were, therefore, not acceptable to the League. They, therefore, decided not to call off the movement. The Frontier leaders could not also agree to their being released for they had not gone to the jails merely to be released. I sympathize with them and I am unable to disagree with them in the decisions that they have taken.

Nevertheless we must recognize that the question of the Frontier in all its aspects, is now before HMG and Lord Ismay is in the U.K. now, and in my opinion it is a question of a few weeks when decisions concerning the whole of India are likely to be announced.

It is quite obvious that the people of the NWFP must be given a chance to express their verdict and the root cause of popular resentment must be eliminated. There is not the slightest doubt what the verdict will be and the present Ministry cannot possibly thereafter continue. Therefore, as I have always said, let us hope for the best and be prepared for the worst.

In these circumstances, I most earnestly appeal to every Muslim, especially Leaguers, to do all in their power to remain peaceful. Without any reservation I say that on our side there should be no resort to violence or force and we must bear up with fortitude and show tolerance despite the gravest provocations. We should not depart from the strictly peaceful path which we are determined to follow. In no circumstances should the movement be allowed to take a communal turn. Our fight is not against the Hindus or Sikhs: we are fighting for a true verdict of the people of the province to be obtained by fair and free methods. It is against all canons of morality and civilisation and the teachings of Islam that we should harm the weak. On the contrary, it is the duty of every Mussalman to protect the minorities in spite of whatever provocation there may be. I know it can be said that it takes two to keep the peace, but on our side I say, "Keep the peace at any cost" and to the other side I may say the "Don't provoke and keep the peace."

The Partition of Bengal

Hindu Leaders' Demand—New Delhi—4th. April

On behalf of the Hindu members of the Central Legislature from Bengal, Pandit *Lakshmi Kant Maitra* M. L. A. personally submitted at New Delhi on the 4th April 1947 a signed statement to the Viceroy, Mahatma Gandhi, Acharya Kripalani, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Mr. O. Rajagopelachari and other Interim Government Members and the Members of the Congress Working Committee now in Delhi.

The statement demands the formation of a separate autonomous province in Bengal within the Indian Union. It also called attention to the immediate need for the introduction, as a transitional measure, of two Regional Administrations with separate Ministries under a common Governor for the two parts of Bengal. This was necessary, it added, for the avoidance of further bloodshed.

Pandit Maitra had further discussions on these points to-day with the leaders who, according to him, were impressed with the reasonableness of the demands.

Bengal Congress Executive's Call—Calcutta 4th April

The Executive Committee of the Bengal Provincial Congress Committee in Calcutta on the 4th April 1947 resolved that "if His Majesty's Government contemplate handing over its power to the existing Government of Bengal, which is determined to ensure the formation of Bengal into a separate sovereign State and which, by its composition, is a communal party Government, such portions of Bengal as are desirous of remaining within the Union of India should be allowed to remain so and be formed into a separate province within the Union of India."

The resolution further said that while framing the constitution of Bengal even as a province with the Union, if it was not found possible to provide joint electorates and adult franchise with essential minority safeguards as the basis of the constitution, Bengal should be divided into two provinces and such portions as were desirous of framing the constitution on that basis should be allowed to form a separate province of their own.

Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherjee, S. J. K. O. Neogy, M.L.A. (Central) Dr. B. C. Roy and S. J. Nalin Ranjan Sarker attended the meeting of the Committee by special invitation.

The Committee expressed the view that India had a fundamental unity geographically, culturally, ethnically and politically and that in the present international setting, the maintenance of this unity was vitally necessary for the defence of India and for her proper future development. This unity would be ineffective unless there was a strong Centre, and so the Committee considered that the Cabinet Mission's decision of allotting to the Centre only the three subjects of Defence, Foreign Affairs and Communications, had been inadequate. At any event, the Union Constitution should contain clear and definite provisions giving effective authority to the Central Government to implement its directives in matters concerning Fundamental Rights and the protection of minorities and of backward tribes, and these subjects must be made a Central responsibility.

The Committee considered that joint electorates with adult franchise should be the basis of the future constitution of the Union of India and all its component parts.

While welcoming H.M.G.'s decision to transfer power to the people of the country by June 1948, the Committee insisted that power as a whole should be transferred to the Central Government. It recorded its disapproval of the clause in the statement of February 20 that His Majesty's Government may transfer power even to the Government of some of the existing provinces, as this would break up Indian unity and cut off Bengal from the rest of India and was likely to result in handing over power to some communal party in Bengal.

By another resolution, the Committee noted that certain portions of Eastern and South-Eastern Bengal, the Garo Area, the Chittagong tracts etc., were determined to remain within the Union of India. Having contiguous connection with other parts of the Indian Union, such portions had their inalienable right to remain within the Union. So the Committee expected that in the new Constitution, effective facilities would be provided for these portions to remain within the Union, if necessary by incorporating them in any other province within the Union, contiguous to them.

The Committee also favoured the setting up, immediately, of Regional Ministries functioning in two different regions of Bengal in the interim period, pending the final transfer of power. It recorded with regret that the Bengal Government had failed to give protection to law-abiding citizens and particularly to the minority community, as also to maintain law and order within the province. The Government, as at present functioning, had forfeited the confidence of the law-abiding and peaceful citizens of the province. A Government guided and dominated by a communally composed party could not discharge its obligations towards the citizens, irrespective of class and community. The communal nature of the Government now functioning in Bengal was mainly responsible for the social disorder, defiance of law and order and the general lack of efficiency and integrity usually expected in governmental institutions and offices. Hence, the Committee considered that in the interim period, pending the final transfer of power, the only other alternative was to set up immediately Regional Ministries functioning in two regions according to the desire of the people inhabiting those regions, as had been suggested for the Punjab.

Bengal Hindu Conference—Tarakeswar 4th April

"As the Muslim League persists in its fantastic idea of establishing Pakistan in Bengal, the Hindus of Bengal must constitute a separate Province under a strong National Government. It was not a question of partition but one of life and death for the Hindus", declared S_r. N. C. Chatterjee, presiding over the Bengal Provincial Hindu Conference which began at Tarakeswar, 35 miles from Calcutta on the 4th April 1947.

Mr. Chatterjee said that the anti-partition movement in the Swadeshi days was a fight against an imperialism which wanted to cripple the greatest nationalist force working for the independence of the country by making the Hindus an ineffective minority in both the provinces. The demand for partition to-day was prompted by the same ideal and the same purpose, namely, to prevent the disintegration of the nationalist element and to preserve Bengal's culture and to secure a home-land for the Hindus, which would constitute a national State as a part of India and would afford real protection to the minority in Eastern Bengal. Those who glibly uttered the soothing words that communalism was a passing phase, should witness the havoc that had been done.

They should remember that even after the great efforts of *Mahatma Gandhi* in his peace mission, the minority community was still being subjected to loot, arson, torture and oppression and the Bengal Government seemed to be supremely unconcerned and was unable to discharge its primary obligations of maintaining law and order.

Referring to the British Government's statement of February 20, Mr. Chatterjee said that its implications would incite those who were putting obstacles in the way of India achieving full freedom, to persist in their unreasonable attitude. The qualifications and restrictions put by H. M. G. were calculated to impede the transfer of power in a peaceful and orderly fashion from Britain to India. Hindus were definitely opposed to the alternative suggestion of transferring power to the provincial Governments in the areas which were not fully represented in the Constituent Assembly, as the Muslim League was thereby indirectly being assured of sovereign Pakistan States in the Muslim majority areas.

Mr. Chatterjee added that no Hindu of Bengal wanted to go outside the Indian Union except a few henchmen of the League. Every Bengali Hindu, whatever might be his political belief or party affiliation, wanted to remain a citizen of the Indian Union and resented the very idea of being the subject of a theocracy, namely, a Muslim Pakistan State. Having regard to the realities of the situation they were agreeing to the partition of Bengal and the Punjab for the time being, although they wanted all the Provinces to be units of the Pan-Indian Federation, including Eastern Bengal and Western Punjab.

According to their scheme, concluded the Hindu Mahasabha leader, nothing stood in the way of the Presidency Division, Burdwan division, Calcutta, Jalpaiguri and Darjeeling along with portions of Malda, Dinajpur, Faridpur and Barisal remaining in the Indian Union. The new Province would thus have an area of about 84,000 square miles out of the total area of 77,000 square miles of the whole of Bengal and a population of two and a half crores, out of which the Muslims would be about 80 lakhs. The proportion of the Muslim minority in the new Province would be about 30 per cent and the corresponding proportion of the Hindu minority in East Bengal would also be about 30 per cent. Thus the parity between the minorities

would be an effective safeguard against any kind of communal oppression or discrimination.

Over 60 per cent of the members of the Scheduled Castes would be in the new Province. The economic and agrarian problems of the new Province were materially different from those in Eastern Bengal and it would have a population bigger than that of many Indian provinces and of many states in Europe. The Hindus of Bengal must fix a date from which the new Provinces of Western Bengal should begin to function and from that date they would owe allegiance to no other body except to their National State and to the Union of India.

Council of Action Proposed—5th April

The Conference, on the next day, the 5th, April authorised Dr. *Shyama Prasad Mookherjee* to constitute a Council of Action for the establishment of a separate homeland for the Hindus of Bengal. It also decided that 100,000 volunteers should be enrolled by June 30 this year, and that local committees should be formed in each village, union and district to carry on an incessant campaign in support of the move.

Outlining the plan of action for the establishment of such a province, the Conference said that a Committee of Experts should be appointed to delimit its boundaries. The Constituent Assembly should be asked to appoint a Boundary Commission to settle the frontiers and frame a constitution which would include the new province as an integral part of the Union of India. The new province must be constituted before the British Government transferred power, and arrangements should be made for setting up a Provisional Government which would take over power from the British Government immediately the area of the new province was settled. Hindu members of the Legislative Assembly representing this area should be called upon to demand as representatives of the electorate that this territory should be constituted into a new province. If necessary, they should come out of the Legislative Assembly and form a separate legislative body.

In its resolution outlining this plan, the Conference emphasised that the creation of the new Bengal province did not mean the acceptance of Pakistan. It wanted both the new Bengal province and the Eastern Bengal province to remain within the new Indian Federation but in view of the adoption of the Two-Nation Theory by the Muslim League and in view of their demand for Pakistan for the whole of Bengal, and in view of their refusal to remain within the Indian Union and having regard to their adherence to communal electorates, the Conference considered that the scheme for the creation of a new Bengal province was the best means to prevent the destruction of the fabric of Bengal's national life and provide the best possible safeguard for the protection of the minority in the eastern districts.

By another resolution the Conference declared that the Muslim League Ministry in Bengal had completely forfeited the confidence of the Hindus and that any further continuance in power of this Ministry was bound to lead to far more disastrous consequences and province-wide chaos and confusion. The Conference, therefore, asked that the Ministry be immediately removed.

It further demanded the formation of two regional Ministries, one for the Hindu majority areas and the other for the rest of Bengal, as an immediate step to restore peace and order and secure the life and property of the minorities of the Province. This measure was necessary pending the creation of an autonomous State for the Hindus and all others in Bengal, who desired to remain within the Indian Union.

The Conference invited the co-operation of all groups and parties that were opposed to "the suicidal policy of the League Ministry" in this work.

In a resolution on the developments in Assam, the Conference said that the Muslim League had threatened to invade the province both from inside and outside and the very existence of the Hindus of the province would be endangered. The Conference urged the Assam Government to "take up a bold attitude against the conspiracy of the Muslim League to incorporate Assam in the Eastern Pakistan by the use of force and violence", and said that any concession to the League on this vital question would mean a death-blow to the Hindus of Assam.

Memorandum to the Viceroy—New Delhi—11th April

Eleven representatives from Bengal to the Central Legislative Assembly, in New Delhi in a memorandum submitted to the Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten, on the 11th April 1947 for the constitution of a "separate autonomous province in

West and North Bengal within Indian Union says:—"We the undersigned members of the Indian Legislative Assembly and the Council of State from Bengal, deem it our duty to make the following statement on the proposed creation of a separate autonomous province in Bengal.

"We have carefully considered the situation in the country as it has developed during the last ten years. The absolute majority of the Muslim members in the Bengal Legislature has enabled them to completely communalise the entire field of administration in the province, with the result that the cultural and economic life of the minorities has been systematically undermined. Besides, the Muslim League Ministry, by adopting the most inefficient, corrupt and reckless methods, has well nigh brought the Administration of the Province to the verge of collapse and disaster.

"The events which have taken place since August last have brought things to a head. Criminal misdeeds on an extensive scale, such as arson, murder, plunder, rape, abduction, forced conversion, marriage under compulsion, desecration of places of worship, and destruction of property, committed by supporters of the Muslim League in Calcutta and various places in the countryside, with the consent or connivance of the communal Government in power, have brought us face to face with the outstanding realities of the situation. The time has, therefore, come for us to consider what measures are necessary to be taken immediately for protecting the life, honour, liberty, religion, education, culture, language and economic interests of the Hindus and other nationalists of Bengal.

"The urgency of the matter has been further emphasised by the announcement of the British Government of February 20 last to the effect that British rule would come to end by June 30, 1948; and that power would be handed over before that date either to some form of "Central Government for British India or in some areas to the existing Provincial Governments or in such other way as may seem most reasonable and in the best interests of the Indian people." As the Muslim League has repeatedly declared that nothing short of a sovereign Pakistan would be acceptable to it, the demand includes the transfer of the whole of Bengal to its administration as an independent State outside the Indian Union. This can never be agreed to by the nationalists of Bengal, as it is bound to lead to their abject subjection, total loss of freedom and complete cultural effacement. Such a fate for the Hindus and other nationalists of the province who have contributed so largely to the advent of freedom in India can never be contemplated with equanimity.

"We are, therefore, confronted with the question, namely, whether to live in freedom or slavery. There is no patriotic or sensible man who will hesitate for a single moment to give the right answer. In our view, the only solution of the problem lies in the creation of a separate autonomous province in the West and North Bengal within the Indian Union.

"We have ascertained public opinion on this momentous issue and are convinced that the overwhelming majority of the patriotic and thoughtful men not only in Bengal but in the rest of India is in favour of such a solution. We are, however, aware that there is some objection to this proposal in certain quarters. After having given the most careful consideration to their views, we feel bound to say that their opposition is based on untenable grounds. They have not so far put forward any alternative suggestions of a concrete nature, and the few hints thrown out by them are wholly impracticable in the present context of things.

"We desire in this connection to invite the attention of the public as well as the Government to the formation in Bengal of an organisation known as the Muslim National Guards which is assuming the character of a private army and is fast becoming a menace to the peace and tranquility of the province. Another disquieting development is the creation by the Muslim League Ministry of an armed police force consisting of Muslims recruited from outside the province. A third serious feature of the situation is the posting of Muslim police and magisterial officers in key positions with the object of terrorising the people and crushing any resistance that may be offered by the minorities to the oppressive rule of the majority.

"We fervently hope that the various aspects of the question, as pointed out by us, will be fully appreciated by all. It is our firm conviction that the emergence of a new province would prove beneficial to the inhabitants of both East and West Bengal and that it will foster and strengthen the nationalist forces.

"We, therefore, request His Excellency the Viceroy and the Interim Government as well as the Constituent Assembly to take without delay such measures as may be necessary for constituting a separate autonomous province in West and North Bengal as a willing part of the Indian Union.

"Further, in view of the recurrence of communal disorder and violence in Calcutta and other parts of Bengal, it is imperative to take immediate steps to prevent more bloodshed and chaos. With this object in view, we request that His Excellency the Governor-General be pleased to install immediately as an Interim and transitional agreement, two Regional Administrations with separate Ministers under a common Governor for the two parts of the existing province of Bengal.

SIGNATORIES

The signatories to the memorandum included, Pandit Lakshmi Kanta Moitra, Sita. Nagendra Nath Mukhopadhyaya, Debendra Lal Khan, K. C. Neogy, Dhirendra Kanta Lahiri Chaudhury, Ananda Mohan Poddar, Devendra Mohan Bhattacharya, Sushil Kumar Roy Choudhury, Surput Singh, Satyendra Kumar Das and J. Ghosal.

Dr. Mookerjee's Demand—New Delhi, 22nd April

Addressing a rally of Bengal Hindus in New Delhi on the 22nd April 1927, Dr. *Shyama Prasad Mookherjee*, the Hindu Mahasabha leader, urged that the principle of partition of Bengal must be accepted with the least possible delay.

Dr. *Mookherjee* said: "To-day, opinion is practically unanimous among the Hindus including Scheduled Castes and other minorities in Bengal that both for ending communal strife and for self-development of the two major communities, Bengal must be divided into two provinces, comprising the predominantly Hindu and Muslim areas respectively. Apart from all communal considerations, Bengal with more than 80 million of her population may well be divided for administrative reasons into two homogeneous and self-contained provincial units. This separation must not be dependent on Pakistan. Even if Pakistan is not conceded and some form of a weak and loose Centre as envisaged in the Cabinet Mission scheme accepted by the Muslim League, we shall demand the creation of a new province composed of the Hindu majority areas in Bengal. To-day, Bengal is included within one India and yet the Central Government has found itself unable to prevent either lawlessness or flagrant acts of discrimination which have been rendered possible on account of the breakdown of the provincial machinery. Our fate will be even more tragic in future if we have to live in a so-called united Bengal under a still weaker Central Government."

Dr. *Mookherjee* added: "I have been in close contact with different sections of public opinion in Bengal during the last two months and I can emphatically assert that the Hindus of Bengal will refuse to recognise any system of administration which does not give them a chance to live as free men in the land of their birth and participate fairly and equitably in the Government of their Province. One thing, however, must not be overlooked. Partition offers a long term solution. Undoubtedly this principle must be accepted with the least possible delay, but its actual execution may naturally take considerable time to be given full effect to. Meanwhile Bengal must not be left in the hands of a one party Government swayed by the fanatical and totalitarian doctrines of the Muslim League.

"From what has happened in Bengal during the last few months, one may unhesitatingly assert that to allow the Ministry to remain in power for a single day is to aid and abet crimes. The Muslim League will not readily agree to any plan for partitioning Bengal. Its whole aim at present is to utilise the official party position in every conceivable manner and to utilise the machinery itself for seizing power at the appropriate time. This alone explains the reckless policy of communal discrimination and torture which is being pursued by the Ministry so as to reduce the minority community to a state of complete helplessness before the transfer of power takes place from British to Indian hands.

"This scorched-earth policy of the Bengal Ministry must be prevented at any cost", Dr. *Mookherjee* continued. "Bengal has been made the base of attack by the Muslim League on Assam. The open preparations for this invasion that are going on in Bengal are possible only because the Muslim League Ministry is in office. How can law and order function or any security be maintained in Bengal in this atmosphere of unchecked defiance and lawlessness? I, therefore, lay considerable stress on the short-term relief which must be made available to Bengal at the earliest possible opportunity. This may be achieved either by the formation of

regional Ministries in Bengal or, if that is not possible, by the immediate promulgation of section 93. Once the principle of partition of Bengal is accepted, it is only fair and just to all that Bengal should be administered in the interim period in a manner which may not prejudice the rights and interests of either major community.

Never in the history of Bengal has the crisis been deeper than at present. Bengal Hindus are united to-day in their demand. This demand must receive the support of all Bengalees residing in the different parts of India and indeed of all others who believe in the justice of our cause. We must be able to create the necessary sanction so as to make our demand irresistible. We have no desire to deprive any community of its legitimate rights. All that we legitimately ask for is that we must have allotted to us our own corner within a free India so that we can fully enjoy the freedom that is about to dawn on India to the attainment of which the Hindus of Bengal cheerfully made their sacrifices and indeed gave their very life-blood in the course of India's struggle for political independence."

Dr. Mookherjee's appeal to Sec. of State—Calcutta, 7th May

In a cable to Lord Listowel, Secretary of State for India, and Sir Stafford Cripps, Dr. *Shyama Prasad Mookherjee*, President of the Bengal Provincial Hindu Mahasabha, states that all sections of Bengal Hindus refuse to accept the establishment of Pakistan over Bengal and that they are opposed to the idea of a sovereign independent State of Bengal detached from the Indian Union. Dr. Mookherjee adds:

"Pakistan or no Pakistan, in the interest of peace and harmony and the political and economic advancement of the people, it is essential that a separate Province including Calcutta, which has 75 per cent Hindu population, must be created in Bengal comprising Hindu majority areas which will remain within the Indian Union. We are against the division of India, but if Pakistan is conceded against our will, separation of Hindu majority areas in Bengal is inescapable as indeed suggested in the Cabinet Mission scheme of May 16, 1946. Pending the creation of a separate Province, we urge the immediate dissolution of the Bengal Ministry which has completely failed to maintain peace and security, and has forfeited the confidence of Hindus. We demand the immediate establishment of two zonal Ministries in Bengal for the interim period. We have already urged our view-point before the Viceroy and prominent members of the Interim Government."

Partition of the Punjab

Sikh Leaders' Demand—Lahore, 5th April 1947

The assertion that on the restoration of normal and peaceful atmosphere, the Sikhs will be prepared to enter into negotiations on the basis of division of the Punjab, which seemed to be the only solution both for long-term and interim arrangements, was made by *Sardar Swaran Singh*, Leader of the Panthick Party in the Punjab Assembly and *Sardar Ujjal Singh*, Member of the Constituent Assembly, in a rejoinder to the statements of the Muslim League leaders on Ministry-making in the Punjab.

In an interview to the Associated Press of India at Lahore on the 5th April, *Sardar Swaran Singh* and *Sardar Ujjal Singh* said such negotiations, however, can only be started when the Punjab League leaders have the authority on behalf of their High Command to arrive at a final settlement, which authority they have not been able to produce so far, in spite of Mr. Mumtaz Daulatana's visit to Bombay.

Sardar Swaran Singh and *Sardar Ujjal Singh* said: "While disturbances in the province still continue and the administrative machinery is busy carrying on investigations into the large-scale acts of murder and loot on one side and in actual quelling of disorder and continuance of strict security measures on the other, League leaders are busy coining slogans in the name of democracy and constitutional usage in order to install themselves in power. This sudden love for democracy shown by the Punjab League leaders appears strange in the light of the acts of lawlessness carried on for over a month in the Punjab and in view of the present conduct of the Muslim Leaguers in the N.-W. F. P. and Assam."

On the League proposal for re-elections in the Punjab, they said: "The claim of the Muslim League that they possess absolute majority in the Punjab Legislative Assembly is untenable, and even the League leaders have failed to disclose their full strength in spite of their tall talks. Their proposal for re-election only shows that they do not command a majority in the House. Free elections in the present disturbed conditions are not possible and are bound to add to the existing chaos and confusion. In my case, the result of the elections is not going to solve the problems confronting us."

They continued: "The Muslim League by preaching the cult of hatred and isolation, which have brought in their train the terrible tragedy, has forfeited the right to take charge of the administration. The League leaders talk of a Round Table Conference to settle the outstanding constitutional issues, but they have done nothing to inspire confidence amongst the minorities and have not been condemned the barbarities committed by their co-religionists on innocent and helpless victims."

Sardar Swaran Singh and Sardar Ujjal Singh concluded by saying: "If the League leaders are sincere in what they profess, they should publicly denounce the heinous acts of their co-religionists and withdraw all aid, direct or indirect, to them."

Sikh Leaders Meet Viceroy—New Delhi, 18th April

Sj. Tara Singh, Sardar Baldev Singh and Giani Kartar Singh, Sikh leaders had an hour and three-quarters interview with the Viceroy Lord Mountbatten, at New Delhi on the 18th April and presented to him the Sikh point of view.

The Sikh leaders demanded a division of the Punjab upto the river Chenab as its boundary as a lasting solution to the communal problem.

In the drafting of the constitution, the Sikh leaders urged that the Sikhs should be given the same veto powers in respect of questions affecting Sikh interests as was recognised in the case of Muslims.

The leaders also discussed the present situation in the Punjab and urged for a substantial increase in the percentage of Sikh personnel in the police force.

Partition only Solution

The partition of the Punjab as "the only remedy to end communal strife in the Punjab" was demanded in a resolution passed by the Shiromani Akali Dal at a meeting held at Amritsar on the 17th April. *Giani Kartar Singh*, President of the Dal, presided. The meeting through another resolution demanded the appointment of a Boundary Commission "keeping in view the question of population, property and historic and religious places." The resolution appealed to all Sikhs to unite on this issue.

The Dal passed a resolution condemning the Muslim League and Muslim League papers for demanding a ban on the Kripan—the religious symbol of the Sikhs. The resolution declared the community's determination to oppose any such interference in their fundamental rights. The Dal congratulated the Maharaja of Patiala on giving timely relief to numerous riot sufferers.

Congress-Sikh Demand—Lahore—22nd April

The demand that "immediate steps be taken to divide the Punjab into two and if necessary into three autonomous provinces" went forth to-day to India's Interim Government Vice-President, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, in a joint representation to him by the leaders of the Congress and the Sikh-Panthic parties in the Provincial Legislative Assembly.

The two leaders Sj. Bhim Sen Sachar and Sardar Swaran Singh who were Ministers in the former Coalition Government stated in their representation to Pandit Nehru "to restore responsible Government in the Punjab. We demand that as an interim and transitional agreement His Excellency the Governor-General should instal immediately two or three regional administrations with separate Ministries under one Governor for the two or three zones of the existing province of the Punjab."

"We must make it plain," the Congress and Sikh leaders asserted "that in the existing circumstances we are not prepared to co-operate with the Muslim League or forming a single Ministry for the whole of the Punjab."

Sj. Sachar and Sardar Swaran Singh pinned the responsibility of the recent violence and rioting in the Punjab on the Muslim League and said "these dreadful events of the last month and a half have conclusively proved that any

Government in which the Muslim League is the dominant partner will not inspire confidence and will fail to protect the minorities.

Minority Leaders' demand—New Delhi, 2nd. May

A Convention of Hindu and Sikh members from the Punjab of the Provincial Assembly, the Central Assembly and the Constituent Assembly in session, at New Delhi on the 2nd. May held under the chairmanship of *Chaudri Lahiri Singh*, former Minister, unanimously passed the following resolution regarding the partition of the Punjab.

"In view of the repeated insistence of the Muslim League upon a division of India, and in view of the recent brutal happenings which have caused unheard of sufferings to the Hindus and Sikhs of the Punjab at the hands of those who believe in the creed of the Muslim League robbing the minorities of any sense of security and assurance that their rights, lives and property are capable of protection at the hands of the majority community in the Punjab, this convention of the Hindu and Sikh legislators of the Punjab and members of the Central Legislature and the Constituent Assembly has come to the conclusion that the only solution of the political problem in the Punjab lies in a just and equitable division of the province assuring the non-Muslim population of (A) such territories and assets as they are entitled to according to their numbers and state in the province; (B) such a total area by drawing a line along the river Chenab, including the districts of the three divisions of Ambala, Jullundur and Lahore and one of the contiguous colony districts of Lyallpur or of Montgomery—an area where the non-Muslims are in a substantial majority, and (C) providing for the preservation of the integrity and homogeneity of the Sikh community, the great bulk of whose population is concentrated in this very area.

"The division of the Punjab on the lines suggested by this convention also assures an equitable and just distribution of the irrigation system and of state lands and other provincial assets created out of the common resources of the province.

"This convention declares that no interim arrangement for the administration of the Punjab on a zonal basis should be made which ignores the fundamentals set out above since any such arrangement would affect prejudicially the rights of the non-Muslims in the Punjab.

Zonal Scheme Unacceptable

Explaining the resolution, *Dewan Chamanlal*, Member of the Constituent Assembly from the Punjab said; "From official information gathered by the members of the Convention, it appears that a scheme is now before the Viceroy providing for the temporary zonal division of the Punjab. The scheme, it is stated, contemplates that there should be two such zones, one comprising twelve districts and the other seventeen districts. It is also possible that there will be a neutral area for the interim period. This scheme is totally unacceptable to the legislators, who have assembled in convention here.

"It is well-known that since the census figures are inflated and inaccurate, they do not give a correct picture of the numerical strength of the minorities in the Punjab, which, until the separate electorates were created, were—even according to the census figures—actually in majority. Census officers have commented on these figures repeatedly and said that the figures do not show the correct position.

"Further, even taking the figures at their face value, the scheme suggested by the convention will assure, firstly, that the minorities in the Province would be distributed in the proportion due to them of the area as well as the assets of the province. Secondly, the scheme assures that in the area contemplated by it, minorities will definitely be in a substantial majority, so that the question of adversely affecting the Muslim population does not arise. Thirdly, the Sikh community has no other home except in the Punjab and it is obvious that the Sikh community will never agree to a division of the province which would wreck their unity and break it into two. Whereas under the scheme suggested by the Convention, ninety per cent of the Sikh community will preserve its unity as well as ninety per cent of the Hindu community without doing any injustice to the Muslims of the Punjab. Fourthly, the scheme contemplates handing over to them of what might be described as the Hindu and Sikh areas of the Punjab and at least one colony system without which life in the Punjab which is almost entirely agricultural would come to a standstill.

"It must further be remembered that any temporary makeshift which creates a division of the Punjab will never be acceptable to the minorities because there will

never be any assurance that the boundary commission set up after the temporary division will be able to do justice in getting back any area which such a Commission might suggest should be returned to South Eastern Punjab".

The leaders of the Congress and the British Government have also been appraised of all these facts.

Mr. Jinnah Opposes Partition Move—New Delhi 30th April

Denouncing the demand for a partition of the Punjab and Bengal as "a sinister move actuated by spite and bitterness", Mr. M. A. Jinnah, President of the Muslim League, in a statement from New Delhi on the 30th April said: "I do hope that neither the Viceroy nor His Majesty's Government will fall into this trap and commit a grave error." Mr. Jinnah reiterated his demand for the creation of a Muslim national State consisting of six provinces. "The transfer of power to Pakistan and Hindustan Governments", Mr. Jinnah said, "must mean division of the defences as a *sine qua non* of such a transfer and the defence forces should be completely divided—and in my opinion can be divided before June 1948—and the States of Pakistan and Hindustan should be made absolutely free, independent and sovereign. This is a clear cut road and the only practical solution of India's constitutional problem". The following is the text of Mr. Jinnah's statement:

I find from Press reports that the Congress has now started emphasising that in the event of Pakistan and Hindustan being established, the Punjab will be partitioned; and the Hindu Mahasabha has started a vigorous propaganda that Bengal should be partitioned.

I would like to point out that there is a great deal of confusion created on purpose. The question of the division of India, as proposed by the Muslim League, is based on the fundamental fact that there are two nations—Hindus and Muslims—and the underlying principle is that we want a national home and a national State in our homelands which are predominantly Muslim and comprise of the units of the Punjab, the N. W. F. Province, Sind, Baluchistan, Bengal and Assam. This will give the Hindus their national home and national State of Hindustan, which means three-fourths of British India.

Now the question of partitioning Bengal and Punjab is raised not a with a *bona fide* object but as a sinister move actuated by spite and bitterness, as they feel that India is going to be divided, firstly, to create more difficulties in the way for the British Government and the Viceroy and secondly, to unnerve the Muslims by opening and repeatedly emphasising that the Muslims will get a truncated or mutilated moth-eaten Pakistan. This clamour is not based on any sound principle except that the Hindu minorities in the Punjab and Bengal wish to cut up these provinces and cut up their own people into two in these provinces. The Hindus have their homelands, as I said, consisting of six vast provinces. Merely because a portion of the minorities in the Pakistan provinces have taken up this attitude, the British Government should not now countenance it because the result of that will be logically, that all other provinces will have to be cut up in a similar way, which will be dangerous, as to embark on this line will lead to the breaking up of the various provinces and create a far more dangerous situation in the future than at present. If such a process were to be adopted, it will strike at the root of the administrative, economic and political life of the provinces which have for nearly a century developed and been built up on that basis and have grown and are functioning under the present constitution as autonomous provinces.

It is a mistake to compare the basic principle of the demand of Pakistan and the demand of cutting up the provinces throughout India into fragments. I do hope that neither the Viceroy nor His Majesty's Government will fall into this trap and commit a grave error.

EXCHANGE OF POPULATION

It is obvious that if the Hindu minorities in Pakistan wish to emigrate and go to their homelands of Hindustan they will be at liberty to do so and *vice versa* those Muslims who wish to emigrate from Hindustan can do so and go to Pakistan and sooner or later exchange of population will have to take place and the Constituent Assemblies of Pakistan and Hindustan can take up the matter and subsequently the respective Governments in Pakistan and Hindustan can effectively carry out the exchange of population wherever it may be necessary and feasible.

The Congress propaganda is intended to disrupt and put obstacles, obstructions and difficulties in the way of an amicable solution. It is quite obvious that they have put up the Hindu Mahasabha in Bengal and the Sikhs in the Punjab and the Congress Press is inciting the Sikhs and misleading them. The Sikhs do not stand to gain by the partition of the Punjab but they will be split into two halves. More than half of their population will have to remain in Pakistan even if a partition of the Punjab takes place according to their conception, whereas in Pakistan as proposed by the Muslim League they will play, as one solid minority, a very big part. We have always been very willing to meet them in every reasonable way. Besides, the White Paper of February 20 lays down that power will be transferred to authority or authorities, which will be made in a manner that will be smooth and create the least amount of difficulties and trouble. It power is to be transferred to various Governments, it can only be done successfully to the Pakistan group and Hindusthan group which will establish stable, secure Governments and will be able to run these Governments peacefully and successfully.

DEMAND FOR DIVISION OF DEFENCE FORCES

The transfer of power to Pakistan and Hindusthan Governments must mean a division of the defences as a *sine qua non* of such a transfer and the defence forces should be completely divided—and in my opinion, can be divided before June 1948—and the States of Pakistan and Hindusthan should be made absolutely free, independent and sovereign. This is a clear-cut road and the only practical solution of India's constitutional problem."

Dr. Prasad speaks out—New Delhi, 30th April

Dr. Rajendra Prasad, President of the Constituent Assembly, in an interview in New Delhi on the 30th April declared that if there was to be a division of India then it should be as complete and thorough as possible, including the division of the Punjab and Bengal, so that there might not be left any room for contention or conflict. "If that requires division of the defence forces, that should also be brought about, and the sooner the better", he said.

Dr. Rajendra Prasad asserted that the demand for the division of the Punjab and of Bengal was in terms of the League's Lahore resolution.

Dr. Rajendra Prasad said: "Neither the Congress nor the Hindus nor the Sikhs ever wanted a division of India. It is the Muslim League and Mr. Jinnah who have been insisting on it. By the resolution of the League passed at its Lahore session which is still their resolution demanding the division of India into Muslim and non-Muslim zones, they have demanded that "geographically contiguous units should be so constituted, with such territorial adjustments as may be necessary, that the area 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 constituted units shall be autonomous and sovereign". In terms of their own resolution, they cannot demand any areas to be included in the Muslim zone which are not contiguous and in which Muslims are not numerically in a majority. If the areas of the Punjab and Bengal, where Muslims are not in a majority, demand a fulfilment of the League's resolution, how does it lie in the mouth of Mr. Jinnah to accuse them and abuse them? He cannot have it both ways. Either he wants division or he does not. If division is insisted on by him, as evidently it is, then it can only be on a basis which suits both and not him alone.

Mr. Jinnah speaks of the administrative, economic and political life of the provinces being disrupted by their division. He forgets that he is responsible for disrupting these and many more valuable ties which have been forged in the course of centuries, by seeking to divide India. If exchange of population has to take place, its magnitude will be reduced immensely if the provinces are divided and the distance to be travelled by the exchanged population of these provinces will also considerably cut down.

THE MINORITY PROBLEM

"The problem of minorities is not solved by the creation of Pakistan as now demanded by Mr. Jinnah as the non-Muslim minority in the north-western zone comprising the Punjab, Sind, N. W. F. P. and Baluchistan will be 38.4 per cent, and in the eastern zone comprising Bengal and Assam it will be 48.3 per cent. If the non-Muslim majority areas are cut out and separated from the Muslim majority areas, the non-Muslim minority in the North-western and Eastern zones will be 246 per cent and 305 per cent respectively, and the Muslim minority in the rest

of India will be 13·2 per cent, and the magnitude of the minority problem will be proportionately reduced.

"The Sikhs know and understand their interests and do not need to be instigated by anyone, and so do the Hindus of Bengal as also of the Punjab. It is not without reason that they have taken up the attitude of demanding partition of their respective provinces. Recent happenings have given a foretaste of things to come and have left them no choice. Hindus and Sikhs have reconciled themselves to a division of the country, and demand that they shall get the same treatment that is given to the League and that their areas should be also separated. If division has to come, and Mr. Jinnah insists that it should come, then it should be as complete, and thorough-going as possible, so that there may not be left any room for contention or conflict. If that requires division of the defence forces, that should also be brought about, and the sooner the better."

Transfer of Power to Indian Hands

Viceroy Invites Leaders

On the 10th May, H. E. the Viceroy summoned a conference of Congress, Muslim League, and Sikh leaders at New Delhi on Saturday, May 17, to announce the plan of the British Government for transfer of power to Indian hands. Announcing this a Pre-Communique stated:

"His Excellency the Viceroy has invited the following leaders to meet him at the Viceroy's House at 10·30 a.m. on Saturday the 17th May:

"Pandit J. S. Sahasrabudhe, Mr. M. A. Jinnah, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, Mr. Liaqat Ali Khan and Sardar Baldev Singh.

"He has also invited the representatives of the Indian States who were on the States' Negotiating Committee to meet him on the afternoon of that day.

"The purpose of these meetings is to present to them the plan which His Majesty's Government has now made for the transfer of power to Indian hands."

The Conference however was postponed to June 2, which, it was explained, was due to Whitsun recess of the British Parliament. A communique issued from the Viceregal Lodge, Simla, said:

"Owing to the imminence of the Parliamentary recess in London, it has been found necessary to postpone His Excellency the Viceroy's meeting with the Indian leaders announced to begin on Saturday, May 17, until Monday June 2."

Mountbatten to Visit London

A communique issued from the Viceroy's House at New Delhi on the 15th May said:—

"During the past ten days, His Majesty's Government have been giving the most earnest consideration to the proposals for the transfer of power that have been submitted to them by His Excellency the Viceroy. They find themselves in general agreement with these proposals, but in view of the importance of these arrangements to the future of India, the British Commonwealth of Nations and the whole world, His Majesty's Government feel that they should have final discussions with the Viceroy, before an announcement is made. They have, therefore, invited Viscount Mountbatten to come to England on a short visit as soon as possible so as to enable him to return by 2nd June."

Departure from Delhi

Accordingly H. E. the Viceroy, accompanied by Viscountess Mountbatten and Mr. V. P. Menon left New Delhi for England on the 18th May. The party reached London on Monday the 19th May.

Staying in London for ten days the Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten left for India on Thursday the 29th May after securing the approval of the British Government to his plan for transfer of power.

Viceroy Communicates British Plan

The Conference of Leaders with the Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten, began at the Viceroy's House, New Delhi, at 10 p.m. on Monday the 2nd June, and adjourned

at 12-5 p.m. These leaders were shown the British Government's announcement regarding transfer of power. The announcement was released on Tuesday night, the 3rd June. The Viceroy, Sir Nehru, Mr. Jinnah and Sardar Baldev Singh broadcasted.

The Conference was attended by three Congress representatives including Acharya Kripalani, the Congress President, three League representatives including Sardar Abdur Rab Nishtar.

Mr. Jinnah remained with the Viceroy for 20 minutes after the Conference adjourned. The three Congress leaders drove to Sardar Patel's residence where they conferred together. On receiving a telephone from the Viceroy, Gandhiji went to the Viceroy's House and had a talk with Lord Mountbatten.

A Press communique issued from the Viceroy's House on the 2nd June, said:—

"His Excellency the Viceroy's meeting with the seven Indian leaders, which was announced yesterday, took place at 10 a.m. and lasted two hours.

"The Viceroy gave the meeting a full account of his discussions both in India and in England which had led up to the formulation of His Majesty's Government's plan, and of the arguments which had resulted in the adoption. Copies of the announcement were then handed round to the leaders.

"The conference adjourned until 10 a.m. to-morrow June 3, to enable the respective Working Committees to consider the plan.

"Mr. Jinnah remained for a brief interview with His Excellency after the meeting.

"At 12-30 p.m. His Excellency had an interview with Mr. Gandhi until 1-15 p.m.

"At 4 p.m. to-morrow, His Excellency will meet the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes and the fourteen representatives of the Indian States, who formed the States Negotiating Committee.

"At 7 p.m. to-morrow, His Excellency will broadcast, immediately after which the text of His Majesty's Government's announcement will be relayed over all stations of All-India Radio. Thereafter Pandit Nehru, Mr. Jinnah and Sardar Baldev Singh will broadcast.

"At 10 a.m. the following morning June 4, His Excellency will hold a Press conference in the Council House."

Decision Communicated to Viceroy

The British Government's proposals for transfer of power to Indian hands, as communicated to the seven Indian leaders who met the Viceroy on Monday, were considered by the Congress and League Working Committees on Monday night, the 2nd June.

The Congress Working Committee gave broad support to the proposals. An emergent meeting of the All-India Congress Committee was being convened by the middle of June to ratify the decision of the Working Committee. A meeting of the Council of the All-India Muslim League was also called for June 9 to consider the British Government's statement.

The Conference of Leaders reassembled at Viceroy's House on Tuesday the 3rd June and adjourned after discussions lasting two hours. The representatives of the Congress, the League and the Sikhs intimated the Viceroy of the acceptance of the proposals.

H.M.G.'s June 3rd Statement

His Majesty's Government's proposals for the transfer of power to Indian hands was announced on the 3rd June, 1947 in which H. M. G. proposed to introduce legislation during the current session of Parliament for such transfer of power on a Dominion Status basis to one or two successor authorities.

According to H. M. G.'s plan, there will be two Constituent Assemblies. Bengal and Punjab will be divided and a referendum will be taken in North-West Frontier Province to decide whether it will participate in the existing Constituent of representatives of area participating in the existing one.

In announcing their plan, H. M. G. make it clear there is nothing in it to preclude negotiations between communities for a United India. (For text see p. 143)

The Viceroy's Broadcast

The following is the text of the Viceroy's broadcast at New Delhi on the 3rd. June:—

A statement will be read to you to-night giving the final decision of His Majesty's Government as to the method by which power will be transferred from British to Indian hands. But before this happens, I want to give a personal message to the people of India, as well as a short account of the discussions which I have held with the leaders of the political parties and which have led up to the advice I tendered to His Majesty's Government during my recent visit to London.

Since my arrival in India at the end of March, I have spent almost every day in consultation with as many of the leaders and representatives of as many communities and interests as possible. I wish to say how grateful I am for all the information and helpful advice they have given me.

UNIFIED INDIA BEST SOLUTION

Nothing I have seen or heard in the past few weeks has shaken my firm opinion that, with a reasonable measure of goodwill between the communities a unified India would be by far the best solution of the problem.

For more than a hundred years, 400 millions of you have lived together and this country has been administered as a single entity. This has resulted in unified communications, defence, postal services and currency; and absence of tariffs and customs barriers; and the basis for an integrated political economy. My great hope was that communal differences would not destroy all this.

My first course, in all my discussions was, therefore, to urge the political leaders to accept unreservedly the Cabinet Mission Plan of May 16, 1946. In my opinion that plan provides the best argument that can be devised to meet the interests of all the communities of India. To my great regret, it has been impossible to obtain agreement either on the Cabinet Mission Plan, or on any other plan that would preserve the unity of India. But there can be no question of coercing any large areas in which one community has a majority, to live against their will under a Government in which another community has a majority. And the only alternative to coercion is partition.

PARTITION OF PROVINCES

But when the Muslim League demanded the partition of India, Congress used the same arguments for demanding in that event the partition of certain Provinces. To my mind, this argument is unassailable. In fact, neither side proved willing to leave a substantial area in which their community have a majority under the Government of the other. I am, of course, just as much opposed to the partition of Provinces as I am to the partition of India herself and for the same basic reasons. For just as I feel there is an Indian consciousness which should transcend communal differences, so I feel there is a Punjabi and a Bengali consciousness which has evoked a loyalty to their Provinces. And, so I felt it was essential that the people of India themselves should decide this question of partition.

The procedure for enabling them to decide for themselves whether they want the British to hand over power to one or two Governments is set out in the statement which will be read to you. But there are one or two points on which I should like to add a note of explanation.

It was necessary in order to ascertain the will of the people of the Punjab, Bengal and part of Assam to lay down boundaries between the majority Muslim areas and the remaining areas. But I want to make it clear that the ultimate boundaries will be settled by a boundary commission and will almost certainly not be identical with those which have been provisionally adopted.

POSITION OF THE SIKHS

We have given careful consideration to the position of the Sikhs. This valiant community forms about an eighth of the population of the Punjab, but they are so disturbed that any partition of this Province will inevitably divide them. All of us who have the good of the Sikh community at heart are very sorry to think that the partition of the Punjab, which they themselves desire, cannot avoid splitting them to a greater or lesser extent. The exact degree of the split will be left to the boundary commission on which they will of course be presented.

LEGISLATION FOR TRANSFER OF POWER

The whole plan may not be perfect, but like all plans, its success will depend on the spirit of goodwill with which it is carried out. I have always felt that once it was decided in what way to transfer power the transfer should

take place at the earliest possible moment but the dilemma was that if we waited until a constitutional set-up for all-India was agreed, we should have to wait a long time, particularly if partition were decided on. Whereas if we handed over power before the Constituent Assemblies had finished their work we should have the country without a Constitution. The solution to this dilemma, which I put forward, is that His Majesty's Government should transfer power now to one or two Governments of British India, each having Dominion Status as soon as the necessary arrangements can be made. This, I hope, will be within the next few months. I am glad to announce that His Majesty's Government have accepted this proposal for introduction in Parliament this session. As a result of these decisions, the special function of the India Office will no longer have to be carried out, and some other machinery will be set up to conduct future relations between His Majesty's Government and India.

I wish to emphasise that this legislation will not impose any restriction on the power of India as a whole, or of the two States if there is partition, to decide in the future their relationship to each other and to other member States of the British Commonwealth.

Thus the way is now open to an arrangement by which power can be transferred many months earlier than the most optimistic of us thought possible, and at the same time leave it to the people of British India to decide for themselves on their future, which is the declared policy of His Majesty's Government.

I have made no mention of the Indian States, since the new decisions of His Majesty's Government are concerned with the transfer of power in British India.

APPEAL FOR CO-OPERATION

If the transfer of power is to be effected in a peaceful and orderly manner, every single one of us must bend all his efforts to the task. This is no time for bickering, much less for the continuation in any shape or form of the disorders and lawlessness of the past few months. Do not forget what a narrow margin of food we are all working on. We cannot afford any toleration of violence. All of us are agreed on that.

Whichever way the decision of the Indian people may go, I feel sure any British official who may be asked to remain for a while will do everything in his power to help implement that decision. His Majesty as well as his Government have asked me to convey to all of you in India their sincere good wishes for your future and the assurance of their continued good will.

Pandit Nehru's Broadcast

Following is the text of the broadcast by *Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru*, the Prime Minister:—

Nearly nine months ago, soon after my assumption of office, I spoke to you from this place. I told you then that we were on the march and the goal had still to be reached. There were many difficulties and obstacles on the way and our journey's end might not be near, for that end was not the assumption of office in the Government of India but the achievement of the full independence of India and the establishment of a Co-operative Commonwealth in which all will be equal sharers in opportunity and in all things that give meaning and value to life.

Nine months have passed, months of sore trial and difficulty, of anxiety and sometimes even of heart-break, yet looking back at this period, with its suffering and sorrow for our people there is much on the credit side also, for India has advanced nationally and internationally, and is respected to-day in the councils of the world. In the domestic sphere something substantial has been achieved though the burden on the common man still continues to be terribly heavy and millions lack food and cloth and other necessities of life. Many vast schemes of development are nearly ready and yet it is true that most of our dreams about the brave things we were going to accomplish have still to be realised.

You know well the difficulties which the country had to face, economic, political, and communal. These months have been full of tragedy for millions and the burden on those who had the Governance of the country in their hands has been great indeed.

My mind is heavy with the thought of the sufferings of our people in the areas of disturbance—the thousand who are dead and those, especially our womenfolk, who have suffered agony worse than death. To their families and to innumerable people who have been uprooted from their homes and rendered destitute, I offer my deep sympathy and assurance that we shall do all in our power to bring relief. We must see to it that such tragedies do not happen again. At no time have we lost faith in

the great destiny of India which takes shape, even though with travail and suffering. My great regret has been that during this period, owing to excess of work, I have been unable to visit the numerous towns and villages of India, as I used to do, to meet my people and to learn about their troubles at first hand.

ACCEPTANCE OF PLAN RECOMMENDED

To-day I am speaking to you on another historic occasion when a vital change affecting the future of India is proposed. You have just heard an announcement on behalf of the British Government. This announcement lays down a procedure for self-determination in certain areas of India. It envisages on the one hand the possibility of these areas seceding from India; on the other, it promises a big advance towards complete independence. Such a big change must have the full concurrence of the people before effect can be given to it, for it must always be remembered that the future of India can only be decided by the people of India and not by any outside authority, however friendly. These proposals will be placed soon before representative assemblies of the people for consideration. But meanwhile the sands of time run out and decision cannot await the normal course of events. So while we must necessarily abide by what the people finally decide, we had to come to certain decision ourselves and to recommend them to the people for acceptance.

We have, therefore, decided to accept these proposals and to recommend to our larger committees that they do likewise.

DECISION RIGHT ONE

It is with no joy in my heart that I commend these proposals to you, though I have no doubt in my mind that this is the right course. For generations we have dreamt and struggled for a free and independent united India. The proposal to allow certain parts to secede if they so will is painful for any of us to contemplate. Nevertheless, I am convinced that our present decision is the right one even from the larger viewpoint. The United India that we have laboured for was not one of compulsion and coercion, but a free and willing association of a free people. It may be that in this way we shall reach that united India sooner than otherwise and that she will have a stronger and more secure foundation.

There has been violence, shameful, degrading and revolting violence, in various parts of the country. This must end, we are determined to end it, we must make it clear that political ends are not to be achieved by methods of violence, now or in the future.

On this, the eve of great changes in India, we have to make a fresh start with clear vision and a firm mind, with steadfastness and tolerance and a stout heart. We should not wish ill to anyone but think always of every Indian as our brother and comrade. The good of the four hundred millions of India must be our supreme objective.

We shall seek to build anew our relations with England on a friendly and co-operative basis forgetting the past which has lain so heavily upon us.

TRIBUTES TO GANDHI AND VICEROY

I should like to express on this occasion my deep appreciation of the labours of the Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten, ever since his arrival here at a critical juncture in our history.

Inevitably, on every occasion of crisis and difficulty we think of our great leader Mahatma Gandhi, who has led us unflinchingly for over a generation through darkness and sorrow to the threshold of our freedom. To him we once again pay our homage. His blessing and wise counsel will happily be with us in the momentous years to come, as always.

We are little men serving great causes, but because the cause is great something of that greatness falls upon us also. Mighty forces are at work in the world to-day and in India, and I have no doubt that we are ushering in a period of greatness for India. The India of geography, of history and tradition, the India of our minds and hearts cannot change.

On this historic occasion each one of us must pray that he might be guided aright in the service of the motherland and of humanity at large. We stand on a watershed dividing the past from the future. Let us bury that past in so far as it is bad and forget all bitterness and recrimination. Let there be moderation in speech and writing. Let there be strength and perseverance in adhering to the cause and the ideals we have at heart. Let us face the future not with easy optimism or with any complacency or weakness, but with confidence and a firm faith in India.

With firm faith in our future, I appeal to you to co-operate in the great task ahead and to march together to the haven of freedom for all in India—Jai Hind.

Mr. Jinnah's Broadcast

Following is the text of Mr. *Mohammad Ali Jinnah's* Broadcast:—

"I am glad that I am afforded an opportunity to speak to you directly through this radio from Delhi. It is the first time, I believe, that a non-official has been afforded an opportunity to address people through the medium of this powerful instrument direct to the people on political matters. It argues well, and I hope that in the future I shall have greater facilities to enable me to voice my views and opinions which will reach directly to you, life-warm rather than in the cold print of the newspapers.

The statement of His Majesty's Government embodying the plan for the transfer of power to the peoples of India has already been broadcast and will be released to the Press to be published in India and abroad to-morrow morning. It gives the outlines of the plan for us to give it our most earnest consideration. We must remember that we have to take momentous decisions and handle grave issues facing us in the solution of the complex political problem of this great sub-continent inhabited by 400 million people. The world has no parallel for the most onerous and difficult task which we have to perform.

"MAINTAIN ORDER"

Grave responsibility lies particularly on the shoulders of Indian leaders. Therefore, we must galvanize and concentrate all our energy to see that the transfer of power is effected in a peaceful and orderly manner. I most earnestly appeal to every community and particularly to Muslim India to maintain peace and order. We must examine the plan, its letter and spirit and come to our conclusions and take our decisions. I pray to God that at this critical moment, He may guide us and enable us to discharge our responsibilities in a wise and statesmanlike manner, having regard to the *sum-toto* or the plan as a whole.

It is clear the plan does not meet in some important respects our point of view; and we cannot say or feel that we are satisfied or that we agree with some of the matters dealt with by the plan. It is for us now to consider whether the plan as presented to us by His Majesty's Government should be accepted by us as a compromise or a settlement. On this point I do not wish to prejudge the decision of the Council of the All-India Muslim League which has been summoned to meet on Monday the 9th of June; and the final decision can only be taken by the Council according to our constitution, precedent and practice. But so far as I have been able to gather on the whole, the reaction in the Muslim circles in Delhi has been hopeful. Of course, the plan has got to be very carefully examined in its pros and cons before the final decision can be taken.

I must say that I feel that the Viceroy has battled against various forces very bravely and the impression that he has left on my mind is that he was actuated by a high sense of fairness and impartiality and it is up to us now to make his task less difficult and help him as far as it lies in our power in order that he may fulfil his mission of transfer of power to the people India, in a peaceful and orderly manner.

FRONTIER MUSLIMS URGED TO WITHDRAW MOVEMENT

Now that the plan that has been broadcast already makes it clear in Paragraph 11 that a referendum will be made to the electorates of the present Legislative Assembly in the North-West Frontier Province who will choose which of the two alternatives in Paragraph 4 they wish to adopt; and the referendum will be held under the aegis of the Governor General in consultation with the Provincial Government. Hence it is clear that the verdict and the mandate of the people of the Frontier Province will be obtained as to whether they want to join the Pakistan Constituent Assembly or the Hindustan Constituent Assembly. In these circumstances, I request the Provincial Muslim League of the Frontier Province to withdraw the movement of peaceful civil disobedience which they had perforce to resort to; and I call upon all the leaders of the Muslim League and Mussalmans generally to organize our people to face this referendum with hope and courage, and I feel confident that the people of the Frontier will give their verdict by a solid vote to join the Pakistan Constituent Assembly.

I cannot but express my appreciation of the sufferings and sacrifices made by all classes of Mussalmans and particularly the great part the women of the Frontier played in the fight for civil liberties. Without apportioning blame,—and this is already the moment to do so, I deeply sympathise with all those

who have suffered and those who died or whose properties were subjected to destruction, and I fervently hope that the Frontier will go through this referendum in a peaceful manner, and it should be the anxiety of every one to obtain a fair, free and true verdict of the people of the Frontier. Once more I most earnestly appeal to all to maintain peace and order. Pakistan Zindabad.

Sardar Baldev Singh's Broadcast

Sardar Baldev Singh, Defence Member and Sikh leader, in a broadcast said:—"To-day we enter the heritage that was ours—the heritage of freedom we have claimed as our birthright". It would be untrue, if he said, we were altogether happy. "Our common quest for freedom need never have divided and torn us asunder from one another. This has actually taken".

"The plan that has now been announced," he said, "steers a course obviously above the conflicting claims. It is not a compromise. I prefer to call it settlement. It does not please every body, not the Sikh community anyway, but it is certainly something worthwhile. Let us take it at that".

"I believe with all my heart", *Sardar Baldev Singh* said, "that the divisions that tend to keep us apart now, will not last long. I believe also that even though we should choose to remain apart at present, we have so much in common—economically, geographically and even spiritually—that the blueprint of our plan, as soon as we view it with care, will bind us together."

"You have just heard the broadcasts of His Excellency the Viceroy and two of our distinguished countrymen, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Mr. Jinnah," *Sardar Baldev Singh* said. "You now also know the terms of the plan, which His Majesty's Government have formulated to end the long-drawn political deadlock that has baffled us these many months and years."

HERITAGE OF FREEDOM

"It is a great day to-day", he said. "The occasion is historic. We have closed a dreary chapter. A few leaf is now turned. We seem to see gleaming on it the fulfilment of what till yesterday was but a dream. To-day we enter the heritage that was ours—the heritage of freedom we have claimed as our birthright."

"It will be idle for me to pretend", he observed, "that the day is bright and joyous, as indeed we might well have hoped it would be. It will be untrue if I say we are altogether happy. Seldom perhaps has a fulfilment like this been tarnished with so much of fear and sorrow. I say, seldom, because, even though we struggled and even though the struggle was long and heavy, our common quest for freedom need ever have divided and torn us asunder one from another. This has actually taken place. The shadow of our differences has thrown its gloom over us"

"We have let ourselves be rent apart", *Sardar Baldev Singh* stated. "We witness to-day—even on the day of our freedom—scenes of mutual conflict and all the horrors that conflict brings in so many parts of India. Neighbour has risen against neighbour. Thousands of innocent lives have been lost. Men, women and children roam from one place to another, homeless without shelter. Untold losses, financial, cultural, and spiritual, have been inflicted in wide areas. We look as if we are a house divided against itself. The day indeed finds us an unhappy people."

It is not necessary for me to-day to probe into the reasons for this affliction. We each have our faults. Let us own it. We each laid a price on what is priceless—the willing surrender of our best for the common good of us all. This is why we fall foul of one another.

"SETTLEMENT NOT A COMPROMISE"

But that was yesterday. Till yesterday, we were pre-occupied with our little selves. The plan that has now been announced steers a course obviously above the conflicting claims. It is not a compromise. I prefer to call it a settlement. It does not please everybody, not the Sikh community anyway, but it is certainly something worthwhile. Let us take it at that.

Taken in that spirit, this plan should halt the dismal gloom that stalks our dear motherland in so many of its stricken spots to-day. In that spirit, we should find in it the many tasks that await us in every sphere of our national life—tasks that need doing not only to repair the damage we have inflicted on ourselves, but to raise us in stature before the nations of the world.

Proceeding Sardar Baldev Singh said: "We are poor. Let us not forget that we have no apology to let poverty continue to afflict our people, now that we shall be masters of our affairs. We have tasks, big and small, of reconstruction on our hands. Let us remember that it is only when the mind of our leaders is not deflected by internal quarrels that they can effectively handle these tasks for our common good. Our people have many needs that have lingered unmet for years. Let us settle down to meet these needs and relieve the distress that haunts us. In a word, whatever our own preferences, let us grow above our petty outlooks and work together to put our country on the way to greatness that certainly belongs to it."

"We do have to live as brothers or as neighbours", he said. "We want to live in peace and strive for a modicum of ease and comfort in our homes, whether in villages or in towns. We have had enough of quarrels and troubles. Let us now turn from an ugly past and help one another build a great and glorious future."

BRIGHT FUTURE

This is my counsel to men and women of goodwill, Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, Christians, and others. For thousands of years, our ancestors lived together in this land with tolerance and neighbourly relations. Let us restore the old glory of our traditions, in order, as I have said, that we may equip ourselves to face the bright future that now opened. I believe with all my heart that the divisions that tend to keep us apart now will not last long. I believe also that, even though we should choose to remain apart at present, we have so much in common—economically, geographically, even spiritually—that the very blue-print of our plans, so soon as we view it with care, will bind us together. We have to forget the unhappy past to see this precision. Let us concentrate on our common interests.

I say this with all my earnestness. I will add that, while making this appeal, I am not unaware of the existence in our midst of these discordant elements who are inhuman enough to imagine that their prosperity lies in the misfortune of their fellow-men and women. Such people should be shunned. They will in fact soon meet their fate. As you must have heard, we have taken the strongest measures to enforce law and order and to apprehend the mischief-makers wherever we can lay our hands on them. During the last few weeks, large contingents of armed troops have been deployed in various parts of the country to aid the Civil Government. These troops consist of trusted men. They will give succour to those in need and act also as stern keepers of peace in troubled areas. I want you to look upon the soldier as your friend. He will not fail you.

"And to you, sailors, soldiers and air-men also," Sardar Baldev Singh said, "I must say a few words. You are obviously not uninfluenced by the great events that are taking place in India to-day. These include many political and administrative changes which will concern you. As men seasoned in life by discipline and fortitude, you will undoubtedly not allow yourselves to be needlessly perturbed. Let me say with all authority I can command that your interests will in no circumstances be allowed to suffer. You have earned a name for yourselves throughout the world by your valour and high tradition. India will not and cannot forget the debt it owes you. Some of you to-day are having to perform unpleasant duties on internal security work. No one is more conscious of it than I."

"Our motherland," Sardar Baldev Singh stated, "is passing through a period of transition and strain. Your patriotism and high sense of loyalty will help you to steer clear through these difficult times. Do not forget that India's honour is your honour. Serve India now in her hour of trial with good conscience and to the best of your ability and remain confident that we stand by you to-day, as we have done in the past. The Commander-in-Chief will, in the next few days, broadcast a special message to you. He will deal with some of the specific problems that may now be engaging your mind. Meanwhile, I have no doubt, whatever political considerations may shape the future of India, your interests will be protected by all sides."

Master Tara Singh's Statement

Sikh leaders continued their informal discussions on H. M. G.'s plan at New Delhi on the 3rd June. At the end of the discussions in which Sardar Swarn Singh, Sardar Ujjal Singh, and Baba Harkishan Singh took part, Sj. Tara Singh issued the following statement:—

"The British Government plan is unsatisfactory and disappointing. Even his

Excellency the Viceroy in his broadcast has felt obliged to admit that the solidarity of the Sikhs will be impaired. No doubt there is the saving feature that the plan has conceded the principle of partition of the Punjab but the whole thing depends on the terms of reference of the Boundary Commission. Again, there is a total lack of any positive provision for giving the Sikhs any power or status anywhere, or for safeguarding their position and interests. I must make it clear that the ultimate acceptance or rejection of the plan by the Sikhs depends a good deal on the terms of reference of the Boundary Commission. The Sikhs and for the matter, the Punjab Hindus cannot be satisfied unless the dividing line is River Chenab. We will continue our struggle till our objective is obtained. For the Sikhs, the question is not merely one of political power but that of their very existence. I am sure that Khalesa will soon realise the gravity of the situation and will prove to the world that the spirit of Guru Govind Singh still lives in them."

Mahasabha Resolution on H. M. G.'S plan

The all-India Committee of the Hindu Mahasabha, which was called to consider H.M.G.'S announcement of June 3, met in New Delhi on the 8th June and reiterated its opposition to partition of the country and declared that "there will never be peace unless the separated areas are brought back into the Indian Union and made its integral parts."

The following is the text of the resolution which was moved by Mr. N. C. Chatterjee and seconded by Dr. Gokul Chand Nairang :-

The cardinal principle of the Hindu Mahasabha has always been the unity and integrity of India, and under no circumstances could it be a party to the vivisection of India in any shape or form. This Committee deeply deploras the fact that the Indian National Congress, after having given a solemn assurance to the Hindu electorates that it stood by the unity of India and would oppose the disintegration of India, has betrayed the country by agreeing to the partition of India without a referendum. The Committee declares that Hindus are not bound by this commitment of the Congress. It reiterated that India is one and indivisible and that there will never be peace unless the separated areas are brought back into the Indian Union and made its integral parts.

WARNING TO HINDUS

The Committee considers it its duty to warn the Hindus that unless they are more careful and vigilant in future and take immediate and effective steps to build up a real and powerful Hindu State, not only will their interests under the new proposed arrangements be unsafe but they may lose even what is left to them of India.

While this Committee recognises that the partition of Bengal and the Punjab will rescue millions of Hindus and Sikhs from the clutches of the Muslims League, it is strongly of the opinion that the tentative allocation of territories to Hindus and Muslims in Bengal and Hindu-Muslim-Sikhs in the Punjab is unjust and unfair to non-Muslims and that in view of the economic, religious and cultural interests of the communities concerned the Hindus in Bengal are entitled to claim considerable additional territories.

This Committee demand that the same principle on which referendum is proposed in respect of Sylhet in Assam be adopted with respect to the Hindu majority areas of Sind and the Chittagong hill tracts of East Bengal.

This Committee urges the Constituent Assembly to devise a constitution for India with a strong centre with residuary powers vested in it, with joint electorates and no weightage in any shape or form.

This Committee appeals to the Indian States to join the Indian Union without delay.

SEC. 93 FOR BENGAL URGED

In view of the fact that the principle of partition has been accepted both for Bengal and the Punjab and that the communal Ministry in Bengal has been pursuing a policy detrimental to the culture and interests of Hindus, this Committee urges the Viceroy to immediately dissolve the Ministry and promulgate Section 93 of the Government of India Act pending the appointment of two regional ministries. Without this the free exercise of suffrage on the partition issue will be difficult.

PROTECTION OF HINDUS

In as much as millions of Hindus and Sikhs will remain outside the Indian Union, it will be the sacred duty and responsibility of this Union, and indeed of every Hindu living in Hindustan to afford effective protection to them. It should be definitely declared that any torture or oppression of the Hindus in Hindu

minority areas, shall be treated as an act of hostility against the Indian Union and shall be dealt with as such.

The Committee resolves that July 3 next be observed as a day of protest throughout India by peaceful hartal and complete suspension of business and by holding public meetings wherever possible.

Muslim League Council accepts June 3 Plan

The Council of the All-India Muslim League at New Delhi on the 9th June accepted "as a compromise" the British Government's plan of June 3, only one member dissenting. The plan provides for the partition of the Punjab and Bengal and conferment of Dominion status.

The resolution, *inter alia*, deplored the partition of the two provinces, but recommended its acceptance in the interest of peace and tranquillity.

Mr. Jinnah was authorized by the Council to conduct such negotiations as might be necessary for the division of the defence forces, assets and liabilities and other cognate issues arising out of partition.

When the Council met in the evening, Mr. Jinnah, at the outset, asked whether the house wished to conclude its deliberations or continue until the following day. Most of those present favoured closure.

Mr. Jinnah, in a short speech, was reported to have said that the May 16 plan was dead and, in taking the new plan as the basis of a compromise, the position was whether it should be accepted or rejected.

He said he reciprocated the feelings of Muslims in the Muslim-minority provinces. The United Provinces, representing the heart of Muslim India, had given the lead since 1937 to the Pakistan provinces.

Coming himself from a Muslim minority province, he could better realize the arguments that had been advanced during the morning session. The salvation of Muslims in the Hindu-majority provinces, he thought, lay in the establishment of Pakistan. As Muslims had fear in the Hindu majority provinces, the same was true of Hindus in Muslim-majority provinces.

Mr. Jinnah was reported to have said: "I have done my job. It is up to you now to establish Pakistan. Remember, the form of Government now will be civilian and not military, so you are expected to do your job putting your best efforts, labour, toil and sincerity."

Maulana Hasrat Mahani, who continuously interrupted Mr. Jinnah, sprang to his feet and said: "I emphatically oppose this plan," but he was shouted down.

Mr. Jinnah had just resumed his seat when the noise of shots caused excitement. A Khakkar who had succeeded in forcing his way into the meeting hall, was pounced upon by volunteers and members, who were stated to have beaten him. Mr. Jinnah sat composed during the excitement which lasted nearly half an hour.

Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan then read out the resolution which was passed by an overwhelming majority.

Of the eight members who spoke at the morning session, six favoured unequivocal acceptance of the plan "though it fell far short of their demand," and the other two pleaded for conditional acceptance. About 450 people, including about six women, attended. Mr. Jinnah read certain important paragraphs from the June 3 statement by HMG and said that it was for the Muslim nation to decide which Constituent Assembly they wished to join. It was also for them to accept the plan or reject it. Dominion status, he held, was the most practical and the quickest way to transfer power to Indian hands. There would be a complete division of everything, including Defence, Communications, Currency and all the assets. It was for the Pakistan Constituent Assembly to decide whether they wished to remain in the British Commonwealth or not. He did not wish to influence the Council's views.

A barrage of questions followed. A member asked what safeguards were intended for Muslims in the Hindu majority provinces. Mr. Jinnah is reported to have replied that it was for the Pakistan Constituent Assembly to decide.

The first Speaker, Mr. Abdul Rahim (Bengal) attacked the Plan. Division of Bengal, he maintained, would weaken Pakistan. If Calcutta was divided, the loss to Muslims would be great. Until Chittagong harbour could be developed, Pakistan would have no outlet for its exports.

Mr. Ghulam Hussain Hidayatullah, Premier of Sind, said that until a few days ago, Pakistan was a mere dream. He congratulated Mr. Jinnah on his leadership and great achievement. As a practical man, he said he had no hesitation in saying that Pakistan in every respect will be self-sufficient and strong. Their effort should be to give concessions to the minorities in all walks of life as best as they could,

Mr. Z. H. Lari (U.P.) was the severest opponent of the plan. The League, he pointed out, first accepted the May 16 Statement but later rejected it on the plea that they were not prepared to lose Assam. Now it was not a question of losing Assam alone, but also of big pieces of the Punjab and Bengal. Applying the same argument he could not understand how his colleagues could support the new plan. He thought the time had come for two separate Muslim organizations in the country, one in the Hindu majority provinces. He referred to the treatment meted out to the minority community in the U. P. which, he maintained, was the result of what had happened in Sind.

A representative of the Punjab opposed Mr. Lari's two Leagues theory, and said that they could remain one in spite of being in two countries. He was all for acceptance of the Plan.

The *Pir Sahib of Zakri*, an impressive figure, felt ashamed of his brethren who had supported the Congress Ministry in the N.W.F.P., but he assured Mr Jinnah that the conditions prevailing in the Frontier were different now, and he did not have the slightest doubt how the Pathans would vote in the referendum. Muslims in the Hindu majority provinces, he said, need have no fear of ill-treatment. The Pathans were there to safeguard their interests.

Mr. *Mohammad Ismail* (Madras) said that it was apparent that the British were bent upon transferring power and that, if the Muslims rejected the new plan, they would have no alternative but to transfer power to willing hands, and they all know what that meant. While it was true that the terms offered in the plan were anything but attractive, he felt the Council should accept it.

Representatives from Assam and the C. P. and Bihar also advocated acceptance of the Plan.

League Resolution Forwarded to Viceroy

New Delhi, June 10:—The League Council's resolution accepting HMG's Plan "as a compromise" authorized its President, Mr. Jinnah, to work out details of the plan. On the 10th June, Mr. Jinnah forwarded the resolution to the Viceroy. The following is the text of the resolution:—

"The Council of the All-India Muslim League, after full deliberation and consideration of HMG's statement dated June 3 1947, laying down the plan of transfer of power to the peoples of India, notes with satisfaction that the Cabinet Mission's Plan of May 16 1946, will not be proceeded with and has been abandoned. The only course open is the partition of India as now proposed in HMG's statement of June 3.

"The Council of the All-India Muslim League is of the opinion that the only solution of India's problem is to divide India into two—Pakistan and Hindustan. On that basis, the Council has given its most earnest attention and consideration to HMG's statement. The Council is of the opinion that, although it cannot agree to the partition of Bengal and the Punjab, or give its consent to such partition, it has to consider HMG's plan for the transfer of power as a whole.

"The Council, therefore, hereby resolves to give full authority to the President of the All India Muslim League, Qaid-e-Azam Jinnah, to accept the fundamental principles of the Plan as a compromise and to leave it to him, with full authority, to work out all the details of the Plan in an equitable and just manner with regard to carrying out the complete division of India on the basis and fundamental principles embodied in HMG's Plan, including Defence, Finance and Communications.

"The Council further empowers the President, Qaid-e-Azam Jinnah, to take all steps and decisions which may be necessary in connexion with and relating to the Plan."

The resolution was considered by critics to be satisfactory in content but rather grudging in tone and hedging in phraseology.

The Council does not say that it accepts the June 3 Plan and disagrees with the partition of Bengal and the Punjab, but it authorizes the League President to accept the "fundamental principles of the Plan as a compromise." The "compromise" is the alternative to the "settlement" which Mr. Jinnah mentioned in his broadcast.

The League interpretation of the resolution was as follows: The Council, while disapproving of the partition of the two provinces, has considered the Plan for the transfer of power as a whole and decided to leave it to the President to work out the details of the Plan. In short, the Council has given the President special powers, as it did earlier last year, when the Cabinet Mission

was in India. Mr. Jinnah will thus be empowered to take any decision he chooses in working out the details of the Plan. Once the task is accomplished, he will submit the result to the League Council, which will then indicate a more forthright acceptance of the Plan.

Until then the League President will frequently consult his Working Committee, which has been instructed to be readily available.

A meeting of the Committee was held in the evening of 10th June. It was understood that the Committee discussed the Khaksar demonstration which marred the proceedings of the League Council yesterday. It also gave a hearing to a Muslim deputation which earlier today had met Dr. Prasad, President of the Indian Constituent Assembly. The deputation, representing Muslims from non-Pakistan areas, had, it was understood, informed Dr Prasad of their intention to attend the next meeting of the Indian Constituent Assembly. The deputation was led by Mr. Ismail Khan (U.P.).

About 40 senior Muslim officials from various departments of the Government also called on the League President and Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan. The question of division of departments and how it could best be effected speedily was the main subject of question.

Socialists Party's Criticism

The National Executive of the Socialist Party of India at New Delhi on the 10th June 1947, in a resolution on H. M. G.'s plan, expressed its disapproval of and grief at the proposed division of the country. The following is the text of the resolution:—

The National Executive of the Socialist Party expresses its disapproval of and grief at the proposed division of the country. At the same time, the Executive cannot fail to notice that a decision of such tremendous import was not surprised or shocked the people inasmuch as it has led them into a mood of reluctant acceptance. Through a series of successive acts, the people have slipped into accepting the decision to divide as inevitable and the only way out.

Each act of surrender, perhaps not of much import by itself, was of great effect as a link in the chain, and the refusal of Congress leadership to prepare the positions and hold on to it have brought us to this fateful situation. The Socialist Party must also record its own failure and that of the wider revolutionary movement in working out an alternate and positive policy.

The proposed division of the country is not yet a fact nor will it have been finally accomplished with the formal establishment of two Dominions. In the belief that Ulsters once created are difficult to destroy, the search for possibilities to avoid a division must continue and no effort should be spared to undo the mischief at any stage of its career. In fact, the division of the country can at no stage be final and must never be accepted as such. The first essential in the fight for a United Republic of India is never to surrender in mind to the idea of division and its applications. No matter what temporary arrangements may have to be accepted, our people are one and our mind shall never set its seal on their break-up.

With this firm faith in the unity of India, the Socialist Party must however warn the people against negative and futile reactions. The country is yearning for positive policies. We shall seek to mitigate the consequences of division by encouraging unifying tendencies and developing common policies for both the States. Should division unfortunately have to be suffered for some time, we invite our countrymen to become aware of certain necessary results of the present policy. To avoid being caught again in the network of successive acts of surrender, we must know what position we have to prepare as a result of the present policy, and resolve not to yield to them.

It should be realised that the coming into being of two Dominions is a stop-gap arrangement of a defined duration. Under no circumstances must we allow our eyes to falter away from independence; now that it is so near, there will be many temptations on the way and all kinds of benefits in the Military and other spheres will be held out before us to lure us away. The people in what may be known as the Dominion of India must ever be watchful and whatever benefits of foreign alliances are sought must be on the basis of independence. To ensure that, the Dominion as soon as it comes into being must do away with both the trappings and the reality of foreign authority, whether it is the flag or the military staffs. At the same time, it is necessary to point out the dangerous possibility of the seceding areas continuing as a Dominion and also to warn

Great Britain that acceptance of this position would be regarded as an unfriendly act.

The people of Pakistan must never allow their Government to accept any status for their country that falls short of independence.

The position of the Princely States and their people is still obscure. Some Princes are planning to declare their States independent of India. The Constituent Assembly will be within its right if it sends for people's representatives from all such States as fall within the area of the Indian Union if their Princes are unable to make up minds. The State people must prepare to join up with the main stream of national life a united and democratic India, even if that entails a clash with their little potentates. The people of the Indian Union will have to face another danger which may well poison the springs of their thought. No matter what provocations may come from the neighbouring Government, they must not deflect from the course of setting up the strong secular State under which all persons, Hindus, Muslims and others have common citizenship and enjoy equality before the law. The Indian Union might well ban all organisations with a religious basis, which engages in political work. Secular democracy and socialism are the two main pillars of the State we are striving to create and nothing should ever make the people strike at either of these.

To the Muslims in the seceding zone, the Socialist Party sends a special message. It expects them to free their Government of all control by any foreign authority and, what is more, to be alive to the danger of irredentism. Unable to solve the problems, their leaders will not visit their difficulties on the unwisdom of their creation but seek expansionist adventures through strife and war.

The Socialist Party cannot subscribe to the view that the solution of the political problem must precede that of the economic. The urge to freedom and security and the urge to better living are so inter-woven that only at our peril can we separate them. The Government of the Indian Union, as of the seceding areas, will be tested by their capacity to secure improved living for the masses.

In this work to secure improved living, is inherent the struggle for social justice and the economic freedom of the masses. It has been the privilege of the Socialist Party to have struggled for these ends. With the advent of freedom but with the communal difficulty reducing our unity and strength, the struggle for social justice acquires added importance.

The Executive warns the people of the country everywhere not to be led, in the name of religion or community, to surrender their freedoms and deliver themselves to vested interests that might hide their true nature under patriotic or revivalist garbs. It will be the duty of the Socialist Party, irrespective of partition, to lead the toiling masses to their destiny, to the establishment of a peasants' and workers' State. The Executive is confident that in the course of the fulfilment of this destiny, communal illusions will vanish and fevers cool down and the toiling people of the land will realise their oneness and join together to march forward to higher goals of progress and happiness.

Congress Acceptance of Plan

For Resolution and Proceedings see page 128

Communist Party's Criticism

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of India, at the end of ten-day session at New Delhi on the 29th June 1947 in a resolution on H. M. G.'s Plan on June 3, said :—

The Mountbatten Award does not give India real independence but is the culmination of a double-faced imperial policy which, while making concessions to the national demand to transfer power, sets in motion disruptive and reactionary forces to obstruct the realisation of real independence. The British policy of divide and rule, exploiting Hindu Muslim differences, produced an unprecedented civil war and has now culminated in the final act of partition of the country into two hostile States which they plan to control by entering into new alliances with reactionary forces in the different partitioned areas."

While the Plan provides "new opportunities for national advance" and the Dominion Governments and the Constituent Assemblies could be strategic weapons to realise that aim, the resolution warns the people that "the strategy of British Imperialism is to exploit all the weakness in our national and social life, disrupt the unity of our national forces and forge a new alliance with

Princes, landlords and Indian Big Business to be able to control through them the Indian States of the future as also Indian economy and thus manoeuvre the transition from direct to indirect rule."

"The procedure outlined by the Mountbatten Plan", said the resolution, "is as disruptive as the Plan itself and calculated to ensure the fulfilment through a series of British awards. Further intensification of Hindu-Muslim-Sikh conflict is provided for through the Boundary Commissions and a series of commissions on financial and other assets and on division of the armed forces, so that the British arbiters can give their awards in such a way as to keep up the conflict."

The Committee assures the national leadership its full co-operation in the task of building the Indian Republic on democratic foundations and paving the way for Indian unity. It asks that immediate steps be taken to formulate a five-year plan based on the abolition of landlordism, nationalisation of key industries and a planned economy through co-operation between popular Governments, expatrias and popular organisations.

The resolution gives a similar programme for campaign inside the Pakistan State where the Muslim League would be the major political party. But it warns the Muslim masses that they will be faced with a very difficult and dangerous situation if the intrigues of reactionary elements inside the League succeed in making Pakistan a British Dominion or an American subsidiary through loans."

Calling for the establishment of a non-communal democratic State based on the recognition of the national self-determination of Sikhs, Pathans, Bengalees, etc, it appeals to all anti-imperialist progressive Muslim Leaguers that "democracy in Pakistan can be won through unity with the non-Muslim masses and friendly relations with the Indian Republic."

The Committee calls for total repudiation of the League leadership's present policy of support to princely autocracy."

Sikh Joint Conference Resolution

The joint conference of Sikhs, held at Lahore in the 1st week of June passed a resolution accepting H. M. G.'s plan for the partition of the Punjab with the reservation that the Sikhs would countenance no move to split the community.

The scheme of notional division of the Punjab, the resolution stated, was inequitable and unjust to the Sikhs and was designed to carve out a sovereign Muslim State.

While accepting the principle of partition of the Punjab, the Sikh community would not accept any partition of the Province which did not preserve their solidarity and integrity.

This was the gist of a resolution passed by the Panth Assembly Party and the Working Committees of the Shiromani Akali Dal and the Pradivudhi Panthi Board at a joint conference held at Lahore earlier in the week to consider H.M.G.'s latest proposals.

The text of the resolution, released for publication at New Delhi on the 12th. June said:—"This joint Conference disapproves of the scheme for the division of India into two sovereign States. In its opinion, the only redeeming feature of the plan is the acceptance of the principle of partition of the Punjab.

"The basis of the notional division of the Province is, however, inequitable and unjust to the Sikhs. While the plan is designed to carve out a sovereign Muslim State to satisfy Muslim demands, it fails to provide for the Sikhs any position of power or status or any means for the protection of their interests in the constitution-making machinery.

"The Sikhs, therefore, feel perturbed that according to H. M. G.'s plan they are likely to be split up under two sovereign States."

"The question of splitting the Sikh community, according to the broadcast of His Excellency the Governor-General, is to be determined by the Boundary Commission.

"This Conference, therefore, while accepting the principle of the partition of the Punjab, places on record its considered view that no partition of the Punjab which does not preserve the solidarity and integrity of the Sikh community will be acceptable to the Sikhs."

States' People's Standing Comm. Resolution

The Standing Committee of the All-India States' People's Conference, in a resolution on H. M. G.'s statement, declared at New Delhi on the 12th June

1947 that "on the lapse of Paramountcy, sovereignty resides in the peoples of the States and the Princes can only be constitutional rulers embodying the peoples sovereignty."

The resolution added: "Any Ruler declaring his State independent will thereby express his hostility not only to the Indian Union but to his own people and such an act will have to be resisted. The Committee trusts, therefore, that all remaining States will join the Constituent Assembly of India in terms of the agreement arrived at between the Negotiating Committees. In the event of only State refusing to do so, the Standing Committee requests the Constituent Assembly to allow the people of such a State to elect their own representatives to the Assembly, so that the State may be properly represented and the people's views might prevail."

In another resolution the Committee says:

"It is the considered opinion of the Standing Committee of the A.-I.S.P.C. that, on the termination of Paramountcy, sovereignty should, as a matter of course, rest in the people of the States. In view of this, the attempt of the Rulers of States in certain agencies at the instance of local residents, to form Councils of Rulers of States to annex to themselves certain administrative functions of Paramountcy is indefensible and constitutes a serious encroachment on the sovereign rights of the people. So long as the States are not sufficiently democratised to enable the people of the States to exercise their sovereignty, the administrative functions of Paramountcy should continue to be exercised by the Interim Government of India which commands the confidence of the people of the States as well.

"The Committee further calls upon the States that during the intervening period popular Interim Governments should be established in the States or groups of States and that steps should be taken for setting up a suitable machinery in each State or group of States for framing the Constitution on the basis of full Responsible Government through a Constituent Assembly composed of the duly-elected people's representatives."

ELECTION OF STATES' REPRESENTATIVES

Election of popular representatives from the residuary groups of States.—

"This Committee has considered the procedure approved by the Joint Sub-Committee of the two Negotiating Committees for the election of the popular representatives from the Residuary groups of States. Looking to the number and dispersed character of these States and Estates as also the total absence of representative institutions in them, it is the considered opinion of this Committee that the Joint Sub-Committee itself should select the two popular representatives from a panel of names submitted by popular organisations in the areas concerned, thus adhering to the original proposals of the Joint Sub-Committee in this behalf.

The Committee also passed the following resolutions on Travancore and Hyderabad:

TRAVANCORE:—"The recent developments in the State of Travancore have demonstrated the utter irresponsibility of the Government there. The State Government, through its Dewan, declared repeatedly that Travancore would join the Constituent Assembly of India. This statement was made again to the Negotiating Committees by the Dewan and it was further added that at least four, and possibly five representatives out of six, would be elected by the Travancore Legislature. In spite of these assurances and commitments, the State Government not only has not joined the Constituent Assembly but has suddenly dissolved the Legislature thereby making it impossible for any elections to take place through that Legislature. This action of the State Government, acting through the Dewan, is an affront both to the Constituent Assembly and the people of the State, who have clearly declared in favour of joining the Assembly. The Dewan has been acting more than ever as the supreme autocrat of the State and in a manner which is strongly reminiscent of what was done in a bigger way by the Fascists and Nazis. He has recently, on his own authority, declared that Travancore will be independent, thereby meaning that the Travancore Dewan will continue to function independently of all canons of Democracy and decency.

"Meanwhile the Dewan has been making other political and financial commitments without any reference to the people and the Working Committee of the Travancore State Congress has protested against this. The Legislature having been dissolved, there is no means left for checking these extravagant pretensions and commitments. Having put an end to the Legislature with all its limitations, the Dewan is attempting to rush through his scheme of constitutional change, which has been condemned all over India as being undemocratic and reactionary and which cannot be accepted

"The Standing Committee are in agreement with the Travancore State Congress that this systematic deprivation of the fundamental rights of the people and repeated affronts to the people's dignity cannot be tolerated. If the Dewan has any doubts about the will of the people this Committee invites him to have a referendum on the question of joining the Constituent Assembly of India and the Indian Union.

"This Committee trusts that the Travancore State Government will not persist in its disastrous and reactionary policy. Any such persistence will lead the people of Travancore to resisting by all legitimate and non-violent means, the deprivation of their basic rights in regard to joining the Indian Union and the introduction of Responsible Government in the State."

"HYDERABAD:—The Standing Committee notes with regret that Hyderabad, the premier State of India, has not yet declared its willingness to join the Indian Union. It has, by its conduct, given rise to widespread reports that it is going to declare its independence. That no State can remain independent on the British withdrawal from India has been made sufficiently clear from the standpoint of International Law, as well as historical precedence. The Committee earnestly hopes that Hyderabad will respect the wishes of the vast majority of its people and decide to join the Indian Union ere long and that, in the meantime, a Constituent Assembly, duly elected on wide popular franchise, would be set up and that an Interim Government would be formed pending the preparation of a new Constitution designed to establish responsible Government in the State."

THE BRITISH PLAN

The following is the text of the Committee's resolution on the position of Indian States in regard to H. M. G's statement of June 3:—

"A. The declaration of the British Government, dated June 3, 1947, states that the position in regard to the States remains the same as it was under the Cabinet Mission's statement of May 16, 1946. The States' People's Conference have previously declared their policy in regard to and interpretation of this scheme. It has been pointed out that implications of the Cabinet Mission's scheme were that the people of the States must have an essential voice in determining their future. Because of this, representation was given to the States as to the rest of India on the population basis of one per million.

The Standing Committee has never accepted the recent interpretation of the theory of paramountcy. In any event, if paramountcy lapses, it cannot mean that the Princes should function as autocratic and despotic Rulers with full power to dispose of their States as they will. The Cabinet Mission's statement of May 16, 1946 made it clear that the States would form parts of the Indian Union and it was not open to any State to go out of the Union. On the lapse of paramountcy it does not and cannot follow that any State is free to go out of the Union. Any such conception would lead to fantastic results and India would be reduced to a state of anarchy. It is well known that none of the States was completely independent at the time of the advent of the British power. In some way or other, they recognised and submitted to the suzerainty of the Mughul Empire, the Mahratta supremacy, the Sikh Kingdom or later the British power.

"B. The Committee is informed that as a consequence of the British withdrawal from India, the Political Departments and the Agencies in the States are being wound up. While welcoming the ending of a system in the end of the Department which has done great harm to India and the States, the Committee disapproves of the steps being taken, which are likely to lead to administrative chaos all over India. The Political department and the Residencies and Agencies were not only the agents for carrying out the functions of paramountcy but also represented the central authority of the Government of India in numerous matters of common concern. It is necessary and inevitable that some central agency should exist for carrying out these common functions. So long as some new arrangement is not made for this purpose, the existing structure and communication should be maintained with suitable modifications and without exercising paramountcy functions. This will be to the advantage of both the Government of India and the States.

The Standing Committee, therefore, demands that the Political Department and its Agencies be handed over to the Government of India for this purpose, or in the alternative a new Central Department should be created immediately which can take charge of the staff, property and the buildings, equipment and records of the Political Department, Residencies and Agencies in the States."

APPEAL TO PATIALA RULER

The Committee passed the following resolution on Patiala:—

"The Standing Committee of the A.-I.S.P.O. has given its careful consideration to the recent happenings in Patiala State in connection with its representation in the Constituent Assembly. It approves of the steps taken by the Patiala State Prajamandal in getting the nominated members withdrawn from the Constituent Assembly and notes with satisfaction the recognition by the Ruler of the people's right to represent the State and his withdrawal of the nominated members.

"The Committee, however, cannot but view with grave concern the attitude of the Patiala Ruler in nominating the personnel of the electoral college, thus depriving the people of the right of choice of their representation in the Constituent Assembly. This is in effect taking away by the left hand what was given by the right. This is against the term and spirit of the agreement arrived at between the Negotiating Committee of the Princes' Chamber and the corresponding Committee of the Constituent Assembly regarding the method of election.

"It, therefore, urges the Maharaja of Patiala to undo the wrong and, following the example of other States such as Udaipur and Jodhpur, to send people's representatives, through election by members of whatever elected bodies exist in the State.

"The Committee condemns the repressive measures resorted to by the State authorities and demands the immediate and unconditional release of all politicals and the withdrawal of the cases, to create harmony and goodwill in the State."

APPEAL TO BHOPAL RULER

The Committee to-day also adopted resolutions on Kashmir, Mysore, Bhopal and eastern States, and the Constituent Assembly. The resolution on Kashmir condemned the repressive policy in the State, demanded the release of Sheikh Abdullah and other political prisoners and the restoration of civil liberties in the State.

In regard to Bhopal, the Committee noted with sorrow and resentment the reactionary policy pursued by the Bhopal Government in spite of the fact that it was the ruler of Bhopal who as the then Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes had in January 1947, sent round a circular urging recognition by the Princes of the fundamental rights and the early establishment of democratic Government in their States."

The Committee regretted the operation of Section 144 in the State for the best part of the year and that the reforms announced by the Nawab made no approach whatever to the principles of popular Government.

The resolution further stated that it was clear that Bhopal had not so far sent its representative to the Constituent Assembly and the Nawab intended to declare his independence on the termination of paramountcy, without joining the Indian Union. Such an attitude of isolation was not consistent with the interests of the State and was wholly opposed to the wishes of the vast majority of its population. The Committee expressed the hope that even at this stage, the Nawab would see the wisdom of participating in the Constituent Assembly's work and join the Indian Union.

The Committee condemned certain eastern States which ignored the election procedure to the Constituent Assembly, and criticised them for deviating from the principles agreed upon by the two Negotiating Committees. The voters' lists were not published on the specified date and later on the entire procedure was hurried through, with the result that popular candidates had been shut out. In the case of Baster State, the list had not been published before June 4, while nominations should have been filed on May 24.

KASHMIR GOVT.'S POLICY

The Committee passed the following resolution on Kashmir:—

This meeting of the Standing Committee of the A. I. S. P. O. expresses its deep concern over the continued policy of ruthless repression in Kashmir by the Government. For more than a year untold sufferings have been borne by the gallant people of Kashmir who have faced the State repression with commendable fortitude and valour. It is highly regrettable that the State Government has not changed its attitude towards the people in spite of the rapidly changing conditions in the country. The Standing Committee, in this connection, views the fresh wave of repression, which has been launched by the State Government against the people soon after the Congress President, Acharya Kripalani had left the State, with indignation and surprise. The Committee has noted that during the last one year the Kashmir Government has invariably intensified its repressive policies whenever any notable popular Indian leader has visited the State. These vindictive tactics are highly condemnable and in the opinion of this Committee they are bound to react unfavourably against the State authorities.

PUNITIVE TAX IN SRINAGAR

The way in which the punitive tax amounting to about three lakhs of rupees in Srinagar City alone is being forcibly collected to-day is most reprehensible. The whole State machinery, including its military forces, are going from house to house and, using foul and shabby methods in extracting money out of poor people by attaching their properties. Along with this, a systematic policy to further impoverish the poor inhabitants of Kashmir, is being relentlessly pursued by the Kashmir Government, with the result that all trades and other means by which people used to earn their living are at a standstill. On the top of this the prices of food-grains and other necessities of life are deliberately maintained at a very high level and perpetual conditions of famine, in spite of bumper crops last year, are facing the semi-starved people in the country.

The Committee notes with great concern the vindictive treatment that the Kashmir Government is meting out to political prisoners and detenus, most of whom have been lodged in far-flung fortress prisons situated in hot, waterless and malaria-infested areas of the State. Most of the detenus and political prisoners in various State jails are suffering from ailments caused by such conditions and no proper medical aid is being made available to them. All this is being obviously done to terrorise the people into submission. But the Committee is sure that the Kashmir Government will signally fail in its attempts at frightfulness and suppression of the people's legitimate aspirations and this confidence is borne out by the gallant resistance of the Kashmir people themselves.

The Committee has repeatedly been noting for the last thirteen months that the State Government and some other reactionary elements there have from time to time attempted to confuse public opinion by declaring that the Kashmir struggle for responsible Government, and people's sovereignty, does not have the support of the A. I. S. P. O. though the conference has made its position quite clear in several of its resolutions last year. To remove such misrepresentation this Committee once declares with all emphasis at its command, that the Kashmir movement has all the support of the organisation at its back and objectives of the Kashmir National Conference are strictly in accordance with the objectives of the A. I. S. P. O.

The Committee, even at this stage, trusts that better sense will soon prevail with the Kashmir authorities and they will without resorting to further atrocities release Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, the President of the A. I. S. P. O. and all the other leaders and workers of the National Conference unconditionally and restore to the Kashmir people the civil liberties which do not simply exist in the State to-day.

SITUATION IN MYSORE

In regard to the situation in Mysore, the resolution said: This Committee views with concern the continued delay on the part of the Mysore Durbar in implementing its original declaration made as early as October 1946 in favour of participation in the work of the Indian Constituent Assembly and in needlessly coming in the way of the people's representatives contributing their just share to the framing of the constitution of the Indian Union, while the representatives of many other States have already begun to take part in the work of the Constituent Assembly. The Committee notes with equal concern the extremely tardy manner in which the Dewan has been proceeding to implement the message of His Highness the Maharaja given to his people on January 8, 1947 in the matter of making proposals for constitutional reforms, none of which have so far taken any definite shape, despite the clarification sought by the President of the Mysore Congress at interviews he had with the Dewan.

The Mysore Congress which has decided on the launching of a struggle for the realisation of both of its demands in the matter of (1) Mysore's participating in the work of the Constituent Assembly and joining the Indian Union and (2) of the immediate establishment of responsible Government, the convening of a Constituent Assembly of the chosen representatives of the people of the State for the purpose of framing a constitution on that basis and the formation of an Interim Government composed of persons enjoying the confidence of the Legislature, has shown commendable reasonableness in postponing the struggle for the while in view of the negotiations between the Mysore Congress and the Government.

Now that the excuse put forward by the Government that there was propriety in awaiting H. M. G.'s proposals of June 1947 before coming to final decision no longer holds good, there could no reason for any further delay in meeting the demands of the people. Delay and indecision on the part of the authorities have the same effect as a denial of the demands. Mysore, being a premier State,

was justly expected to lead the other State in the right direction. It is yet not too late to retrieve its position.

The Standing Committee calls upon the Mysore Durbar to take immediate steps to meet the demands of the people of the State and to obviate their resorting to Satyagraha for the realisation of their objectives, which would become inevitable if the Government chooses to persist in its dilatory tactics.

Bengal Legislators Decide Partition

The decision to divide Bengal in order to remain attached to the Indian Union was taken by the Bengal Assembly members representing Hindu majority areas voting for it at their meeting at the Assembly House, Calcutta, on the 20th. June 1947.

This fateful decision was taken by 58 members voting for it and 21 against. The Congress members on whom the responsibility for the decision lay acted as they were expected to and all uneasiness that any of them could do otherwise was set at rest by all of them voting solidly for the motion. All Congress members were present with the exception of Mr. J. C. Gupta who was out of the country being on his way home from England. Mr. Annada Prosad Mandal with his temperature running 104 degrees was present and cast his vote in favour of partition.

With four Anglo-Indians, 2 Communists and 1 Indian Christian joining the solid phalanx of Congressmen and Dr. Syama Prosad Mookerjee, the number of supporters for the partition rose to 58, the Moslem League section voting en bloc against partition.

The members of the Bengal Assembly excluding the Europeans met in two sections at 11 in the morning and there being demand for joint meeting from the Congress section at both these meetings they were immediately adjourned. The joint session commenced at 3 p. m. where the League members voted solidly not to join the existing Constituent Assembly, while the Congress members and Anglo-Indians voted for it, voting being 126—90. Three Communist members remained neutral.

The two sections then met separately again and the Hindu majority section voted as stated above. While the other section, the meeting of the representatives of the Muslim majority areas, voted against partition and for joining the Pakistan Constituent Assembly.

The Congress members opposed both these motions voting 106—85 and 107—34. The motion whether in the event of Sylhet referendum resulting in favour of amalgamation Sylhet would be amalgamated, was adopted by 105—34 votes, Congress members opposing this.

MORNING SESSION

The morning session of the meeting of the members representing the non-Muslim majority districts commenced punctually at the scheduled time—11 a. m. at the southern lounge on the first floor of the Assembly House. Congress members were first to take their seats and Muslim League members started coming in when there were only five minutes to go. When Mr. H. S. Suhrawardy arrived the front benches had been filled up and the Chief Minister was looking for a seat somewhere at the back of the House. Sj. Dhirendra Narayan Mukherjee, Chief Whip of the Congress Party, who acted as the Congress spokesman for the section spotted him and leading him to the front row gave him a seat there.

Maharajahdhiraj of Burdwan who presided first ascertained if the rules of procedure for the meeting which had been settled in consultation with party leaders on the previous day and circulated had the approval of the members. Members signifying their approval, he wanted to know if any member desired a joint sitting of the two parts of the Assembly to decide which Constituent Assembly the Province as a whole would join in the event of Bengal remaining undivided.

Mr. Dhirendra Narayan Mukherjee rose up and made the demand for the joint sitting.

The Chairman then announced that the joint meeting would be held at 3 P. M. at the Assembly Chamber and the section would meet again fifteen minutes after the session of the joint meeting was over and adjourned the meeting.

The whole proceedings of the morning session took about eight minutes.

PARTITION MOTION CARRIED

The non-Muslim majority area section meeting reassembled at 3-35 p. m. after the joint session was over.

The Chairman of the meeting *Maharajahiraj Bahadur* observed that this part of the Assembly members was to decide whether the province of Bengal would be divided. He put the question before the House whether the province of Bengal would be partitioned and asked the members who were in favour of the motion to go to the 'Ayes' lobby and those who were against it to 'Notes' lobby.

The Congress members, four Anglo-Indians and two Communists went to the 'Ayes' lobby and the Muslim League members to the 'Noes' lobby.

At 3-47, according to the Clock in the House, the Chairman announced that the motion had been carried by 58 to 21 votes.

The next question put before the House was whether the constitution of the separated province consisting of non-Muslim majority areas should be framed in the existing Constituent Assembly. The house again divided and voted in favour of joining the existing Constituent Assembly, the figures of voting being again the same 58 : 21.

The Chairman then said that he had an announcement to make. The decision taken to-day that there should partition of Bengal involved fresh election to the Constituent Assembly of their choice, but until the Governor-General had received official intimation of this decision no official announcement was possible. But he had been asked to state that the programme for the election from this part was as follows. Date by which nomination papers must be received by the Secretary of the Legislative Council—June 30, 11 a.m.. scrutiny July 1, 11 a.m.; withdrawal of nomination papers July 4 between 10 a.m.'and 2 p.m.

The meeting was then dissolved.

MUSLIM MAJORITY SECTION

When the two parts of Bengal Legislative Assembly met at 11 a.m., one in the Chamber itself and another in the southern lounge on the first floor of the Assembly House, Mr. Nurul Amin, president of the Eastern Bengal section, said as follows:—"We are taking a very momentous decision to-day, at this meeting, which will go down as an important event in the history of freedom of this sub-continent. I appeal to each member of the House to support me on this solemn occasion in conducting the proceedings.

"It is necessary for us to adopt certain rules of procedure for this meeting. The rules were drafted yesterday at a meeting of the leading members of both the parts of the House including the presidents of the two parts of the Assembly. The rules have been supplied to you and I believe that they may be adopted."

There being no objection, Mr. Nurul Amin declared that the rules of procedure as circulated among members had their approval.

He then announced that the first business before them was to ascertain whether there was any member to demand a joint sitting of the two parts of the Assembly at which the decision would be taken on the issue as to which Constituent Assembly the province as a whole would join in the event of the province remaining undivided.

Mr. *Kiran Sankar Roy* then rose in his seat and demanded that there be a joint meeting.

The President thereupon adjourned the sitting in response to Mr. Roy's demand and said that the joint meeting would be held at the same place and at 3 p.m. He also announced that this part of the meeting would re-assemble in the Chamber fifteen minutes after the termination of the joint meeting.

A message to the effect that a request had been accepted for holding a joint meeting was communicated to the President of the other part of the Assembly members.

CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY ISSUE

At 3 p.m. the joint session of the two parts of the Assembly met in the Chamber under the presidency of Mr. Nurul Amin. The President then wanted to ascertain the opinion of the meeting whether the province as a whole would join the existing Constituent Assembly or a new and separate one consisting of representatives of those areas which decided not to participate in the existing Constituent Assembly. He asked the House to divide and directed that those who were in favour of joining the existing Constituent Assembly should go to the 'Ayes' lobby and those who wanted to join the new and 'separate one to the 'Noes.'

The House then divided, 90 members voting in favour of joining the existing Constituent Assembly and 126 for the new and separate one. Three Communist members remained neutral.

The members again spirit up in two sections. When the section representing Muslim majority districts assembled at 3-30 p.m. under the presidency of Mr. Nurul Amin, he said he would now ascertain the wishes of the members as to whether the province of Bengal should be partitioned or not. He asked those members who were in favour of partition to go to the 'Aycs' lobby and those against to the 'Noes'.

The House divided and 35 members were found in favour of partition and 100 against. The only Communist member of this section of the Assembly voted in favour of the partition while five Scheduled caste members including two Ministers and two parliamentary secretaries and one Indian Christian, the only Indian Christian in this section voted against.

MUSLIMS TO JOIN PAKISTAN CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY

On re-assembling the House again divided on the issue as to which of the two Constituent Assemblies, the Eastern Bengal province would join. Thirtyfour members voted in favour of joining the existing Constituent Assembly while 107 voted for the new and the separate one. The Communist member voted in favour of the new and separate Constituent Assembly along with the five scheduled caste members and one Indian Christian.

The House again met and soon divided on the question whether the district of Sylhet in Assam, if it decided to join the new Eastern Bengal province, would be allowed to remain amalgamated with it. There were 105 members in favour of such amalgamation while 34 voted against the move. The Communist member remained neutral, the Indian Christian member was absent while five Scheduled Caste members voted in favour of amalgamation.

Before dissolving the sectional meeting, Mr. Nurul Amin said that fresh election to the Constituent Assembly so far as the Eastern Bengal province was concerned would be held as follows:—Nomination papers would be received up to 11 A. M. of the 30th June, 1947, scrutiny would be held on the 1st July and withdrawal of nomination papers could be made by 2nd July and actual voting would take place on 5th July between 10 A. M. and 2 P. M. Official announcement in this connection, he said, would soon be made by the Governor-General.

Punjab Legislators Decide Partition

At a joint session of the two sections of the Punjab Assembly—Western and Eastern Punjab—held at Lahore on the 23rd June 1947 with *Dewan Bahadur S. P. Singha* in the Chair, 91 members voted for the new Constituent Assembly and 77 for the present Constituent Assembly.

Ninetyone members who voted in favour of the Punjab joining a new Constituent Assembly at a joint session of the Assembly included 88 Muslims, two Indian Christians and one Anglo-Indian. The Hindu, Sikh and Scheduled Caste representatives numbering 77 voted for the present Constituent Assembly.

The 88 Muslims included eight Muslim Unionists led by Sir Khizr Hyat Khan Tiwana.

Before the joint sitting the two sections met separately.

In the Western Punjab section, Lala Bhim Sen Sachar, Leader of the Congress Party, and Malik Feroz Khan Noon on behalf of the Muslim League Party demanded a joint sitting of the two sections. A joint sitting was accordingly arranged within 15 minutes and the House gave its verdict in favour of a new Constituent Assembly. Thereafter the two sections met again separately.

The Eastern Punjab section of the Punjab Assembly meeting separately decided in favour of partition of the Punjab by 50 against 22 votes.

Sardar Kapur Singh, Deputy Speaker of the Assembly, was in the chair.

The Western Punjab section of the Punjab Assembly voted against partition of the province by 69 against 27 votes. *Dewan Bahadur S. P. Singha*, Speaker of the Assembly, presided.

WESTERN SECTION MEETING

All approaches to the Punjab Assembly Chamber were barricaded with barbed wire and heavy police guards were posted to ensure a quiet session of the Assembly which met at 9 a.m. on the 23rd June to record its verdict on the partition issue. In accordance with the decision of the party leaders there were no demonstrations of any kind in the vicinity of the Chamber. Admittance was regulated by passes and no visitors except a few selected Press correspondents were allowed.

In pursuance of the procedure laid down in H. M. G.'s statement of June 8, the two sections of the Assembly—Western and Eastern Punjab—first met sep-

rately in two separate rooms at the Assembly Chamber. The Western Punjab section which was attended by 96 out of the 103 members was presided over by Dewan Bahadur S. P. Singha, Speaker of the Assembly while Sardar Kapur Singh, Deputy Speaker, took the Chair in the Eastern Punjab section where all the 72 members were present.

When the Eastern section met Lala Bhim Sen Sachar, Leader of the Congress Party and Malik Firoz Khan (Muslim League) demanded a joint session of the two sections to take a decision on the issue as to which Constituent Assembly the Province as a whole should join in case it was decided in the sections to remain united. Similarly in the Eastern section the Khan of Mamdot, Leader of the Muslim League Party and Seth Sudarshan, Deputy Leader of the Congress Party, demanded a joint meeting.

JOINT SESSION

A joint session was arranged within 15 minutes in the Chamber over which Dewan Bahadur S. P. Singha presided.

Instead of the various parties sitting in separate blocks as in the past seats were allotted in alphabetical order of the names of the members with the result that a back-bencher occupied the Premier's seat.

The Speaker sought the approval of the House to the decision made by the party leaders that there should be no speeches and that votes only should be recorded. The House having approved the decision, the Speaker put to the vote of the House the proposition whether they would join the existing Constituent Assembly or a new and separate Assembly. The House thereupon divided and 91 members recorded their votes in favour of a new Constituent Assembly while 77 voted for the present Constituent Assembly.

For the first time in the history of the Punjab Assembly the Speaker, Dewan Bahadur S. P. Singha (Indian Christian), went to the lobby and recorded his vote for a new Constituent Assembly.

An analysis of the division list showed that 88 Muslim members, including eight Muslim Unionists led by Sir Khizr Hyat Khan, voted for a new Constituent Assembly. The three non-Muslims who voted with the Muslim members were Dewan Bahadur S. P. Singha and Fazle Elahi (Indian Christian) and Mr. C. E. Gibbons (Anglo-Indian). The opposition consisted of Hindus, Sikhs and Scheduled Caste members.

The House then split itself again into the Western and the Eastern Punjab sections to decide the question of the partition of the Province.

The press was excluded from the sectional meetings

VERDICT OF EASTERN SECTION.

The Eastern Punjab section gave its verdict in favour of the partition of the Province by 50 against 22 votes, Hindus, Sikhs and Scheduled Castes voting in favour of the partition and Muslims against it. The Western section, on the other hand, recorded its vote against the partition by 69 to 27 votes. Those who voted for partition in this section were 14 Sikhs (Panthic Akalis) and 13 members of the Congress Party including 11 Hindus and two Scheduled Castes.

On a similar vote the Eastern section decided to join the existing Constituent Assembly while the western section favoured a new Constituent Assembly.

The decisions taken at the sectional meetings of the Assembly were communicated to the Governor by the Chairmen of the respective sections.

The partition issue having been settled the present Punjab members of the existing Constituent Assembly ceased to be members of that body from to-day and fresh elections were expected to be held in the first week of July to return representatives of western Punjab to the new Constituent Assembly, and of Eastern Punjab to the existing Constituent Assembly.

Sind First Pakistan Province

Sind was the first province in the Pakistan territory to return representatives to the Pakistan Assembly.

Mr. M. A. Khuhro, Mr. M. H. Gazdar, Pirzada Abdus Sattar representing the Sind Muslims, and S. Jayramdas Doulatram representing the Sind Minorities, were Sind's representatives. Their election to the present Constituent Assembly took place last year in pursuance of the Cabinet Mission's Plan.

When the Sind Assembly met at Karachi on the 26th June 1947, in a special session, to take a decision in pursuance of Paragraph 4 of H. M. G.'s June 3 Plan, the Premier moved the official resolution. There were no speeches. The thirty-three

Muslim League members present voted for Sind joining the Pakistan Constituent Assembly—two League members being absent on grounds of health. The 20 Congress Party members voted against the resolution. Khan Bahadur Haji Moulabux and Sardar Khan Khoso, Nationalist Muslims, remained neutral, while the three European members did not participate in the voting. The Speaker, declaring the result of the voting, remarked "Sind has arrived at the portals of Pakistan first—congratulations."

Some Muslim Leaguers hoisted the League flag on the Sind Secretariat.

The Pakistan Constituent Assembly came into existence to-day with four Sind representatives as its first members as the result of the passing by the Sind Legislative Assembly of a resolution to join it, said *Pirsada Abdus Sattar*, Revenue Minister, in a statement to the Press.

He said that the Pakistan Constituent Assembly would be a sovereign body and when power was transferred to it by the British Government on August 16, it would have its own Executive Government. It would also function as the legislative body for the State of Pakistan during the interim period.

The State of Pakistan had, therefore, taken its birth to-day. *Pirsada Abdus Sattar* felt that the next few months would mean the hardest possible labour on their part for the establishment of the new regime, but he was confident that with untiring efforts they would be able to raise a structure of which everybody should be proud.

The Inter-Asian Relations Conference

Plenary Session—New Delhi—23rd March to 2nd April 1947

Two hundred and fifty delegates representing countries with more than half the world's total population and 10,000 visitors attended the Asian Relations Conference which was inaugurated at 5 p.m. on the 23rd March 1947 at Delhi's historic Puran Qila (Old Fort) by Pandit *Jawaharlal Nehru*.

Long before the Conference—the first of its kind to be held in Asia—began, the special pandal was packed to capacity. The audience cheered the delegates as they entered the pandal in procession led by Smta. *Sarajini Naidu*, President and Sir *Shri Ram*, Chairman of the Reception Committee. The delegates were followed by observers from Australia, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and other countries, all members of the Interim Government except Muslim League members, Field Marshal Sir *Claud Auchinleck*, C.-in-C., in a lounge suit, the Maharajas of Patiala and Bikaner and others. There was another burst of cheering as Smta. *Naidu* and later Pandit *Nehru* mounted the dais which had as background a larger map of Asia and charts showing natural resources, air routes, population and capitals of Asiatic countries and the flags and coats-of-arms of the various countries. The distinguished audience included some Ministers of Provincial Governments and members of the Central Legislature.

Smta. *Sarajini Naidu* introduced to the audience the leaders of the Delegations, some of whom were in picturesque and variegated eastern costumes.

Pandit *Jawaharlal Nehru* inaugurated the Conference, spoke for about ten minutes in Hindustani and then read out in firm and measured tones his address in English. He was cheered frequently.

After Smta. *Naidu* had delivered her Presidential address, messages from the distinguished organisations and personalities from India and abroad were read, including those from Dr. *Sultan Shariar*, Indonesian Premier, the Secretary of the Arab League, *Azzam Pasha*, the Feminist Movement of Egypt, the Japanese Foreign Minister and Sir *Tej Bahadur Sapru*.

Azzam Pasha said in the course of his message: "In the name of the Missions of Arabs, some independent and some still struggling for political independence and cultural freedom, I salute this first Congress which demonstrates to the world the awakening of the peoples of Asia, so long held powerless, to exert their full normal and political influence in the world affairs."

Welcome Address

Welcoming the delegates, Sir *Shri Ram*, Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Conference, said that there was a wide field in which the countries of Asia could work together, wherein their interests, taken by and large, were coincident or at least complementary. "Our needs are similar, even if not identical and the steps to be taken by each of us would be largely similar. In respect of all these matters, we can, to our mutual benefit, pool our experiences, knowledge and, may be, some of our resources."

The Asian Conference was not being held, Sir *Shri Ram* said, under official auspices of the Governments of the countries concerned but on a wholly voluntary basis but he hoped that such agreements or understandings as might be reached at the Conference, even if only informal and not legally binding on Governments, would not command any less weight with the Governments and the peoples of the participating countries.

Sir *Shri Ram* hoped that the visiting delegates would stay on after the Conference and see the country, meet her savants and writers and artists and social and religious leaders and help her with advice and criticism.

Pandit Nehru's Speech

Inaugurating the Conference, Pandit *Nehru* spoke as follows:—

Friends and fellow Asians: What has brought you here, men and women of Asia? Why have you come from the various countries of this mother continent of ours and gathered together in the ancient city of Delhi? Some of us, greatly daring, sent you invitation for this Conference and you gave a warm welcome to that invitation. And yet it was not merely that call from us but some deeper urge that brought you here.

We stand at the end of an era on the threshold of a new period of history.

Standing on this watershed which divides two epochs of human history and endeavour, we can look back on our long past and look forward to the future that is taking shape before our eyes. Asia, after a long period of quiescence, has suddenly become important again in world affairs. If we view the millennia of history, this continent of Asia, with which Egypt has been so intimately connected in cultural fellowship, has played a mighty role in the revolution of humanity. It was here that civilization began and man started on his unending adventure of life. Here the mind of man searched unceasingly for truth and the spirit of man shone out like a beacon which lightened up the whole world.

This dynamic Asia from which great streams of culture flowed in all directions gradually became static and unchanging. Other peoples and other continents came to the fore and with their new dynamism spread out and took possession of great parts of the world. This mighty continent became just a field for the rival imperialisms of Europe, and Europe became the centre of history and progress in human affairs.

ASIA AGAIN FINDING HERSELF

A change is coming over the scene now and Asia is again finding herself. We live in a tremendous age of transition and already the next stage takes shape when Asia takes her rightful place with the other continent. It is at this great moment that we meet here and, it is the pride and privilege of the people of India to welcome their fellow Asians from other countries, to confer with them about the present and the future, and lay the foundations of our progress, well being and friendship.

The idea of having an Asian Conference is not new and many have thought of it. It is indeed surprising that it should not have been held many years earlier, yet perhaps the time was ripe for it and any attempt to do so would have been superficial and not in tune with world events. It so happened that we in India convened this Conference, but the idea of such a Conference arose simultaneously in many minds and in many countries of Asia. There was a widespread urge and an awareness that the time had come for us, peoples of Asia, to meet together, to hold together and advance together. It was not only a vague desire but a compulsion of events that forced all of us to think along these lines. Because of this the invitation we, in India, sent out brought an answering echo and a magnificent response from every country of Asia.

We welcome you delegates and representatives from China, that great country to which Asia owes so much and from which so much is expected; from Egypt and the Arab countries of Western Asia, inheritors of a proud culture which spread far and wide and influenced India greatly; from Iran whose contacts with India go back to the dawn of history; from Indonesia and Indo-China whose history is intertwined with India's culture, and where recently the battle of freedom has continued, a reminder to us that freedom must be won and cannot come as gift; from Turkey that has been rejuvenated by the genius of a great leader; from Korea and Mongolia, Siam, Malaya and the Philippines; from the Soviet Republics of Asia which have advanced so rapidly in our generation and which have so many lessons to teach us; and from our neighbours Afghanistan, Tibet, Nepal, Bhutan, Burma and Ceylon to whom we look especially for co-operation and close and friendly intercourse. Asia is very well represented at this Conference, and if one or two countries have been unable to send representatives, this was due to no lack of desire on their part or ours but circumstances, beyond our control, came in the way. We welcome also observers from Australia and New Zealand because we have many problems in common, especially in the Pacific and in the South-East region of Asia, and we have to co-operate together to find solutions.

PREFACE INTO HISTORY

As we meet here to-day, the long past of Asia rises up before us, the troubles of recent years fade away, and a thousand memories revive. But I shall not speak to you of these past ages with their glories and triumphs and failures, nor of more recent times which have oppressed us so much and which still pursue us in some measure. During the past two hundred years we have seen the growth of eastern imperialisms and of the reduction of large parts of Asia to colonial or semi-colonial status. Much has happened during these years, but perhaps one of the notable consequences of the European domination of Asia has been the isolation of the countries of Asia from one another. India always had contact and intercourse with her neighbour countries in the north-west,

the north-east, the east and the south-east. With the coming of British rule in India these contacts were broken off and India was almost completely isolated from the rest of Asia. The old land routes almost ceased to function and our chief window to the outer world looked out on the sea route which led to England. A similar process affected other countries of Asia also. Their economy was bound up with some European imperialism or other ; even culturally they looked towards Europe and not to their own friends and neighbours from whom they had derived so much in the past.

To-day this isolation is breaking down because of many reasons, political and otherwise. The old imperialisms are fading away. The land routes have revived and air travel suddenly bring us very near to each other. This Conference itself is significant as an expression of that deeper urge of the mind and spirit of Asia which has persisted in spite of the isolationism which grew up during the years of European domination. As that domination goes, the walls that surrounded us fall down and we look at each other again and meet as old friends long parted.

MEETING ON EQUAL BASIS

In this Conference and in this work there are no leaders and no followers. All countries of Asia have to meet together on an equal basis in a common task and endeavour. It is fitting that India should play her part in this new phase of Asian development. Apart from the fact that India herself is emerging into freedom and independence, she is the natural centre and focal point of the many forces at work in Asia. Geography is a compelling factor, and geographically she is so situated as to be the meeting point of western and Northern and Eastern and South-East Asia. Because of this, the history of India is a long history of her relations with the other countries of Asia. Streams of culture have come to India from the West and the East and been absorbed in India, producing the rich and variegated culture which is India to-day. At the same time, streams of culture have flowed from India to distant parts of Asia. If you would know India you have to go to Afghanistan and western Asia, to Central Asia, to China and Japan and to the Countries of South-East Asia. There you will find magnificent evidence of the vitality of India's culture which spread out and influenced vast numbers of people.

There came a great cultural stream from Iran to India in remote antiquity. And then that constant intercourse between India and the Far East notably China, in later years South-East Asia witnessed an amazing efflorescence of Indian art and culture. The mighty stream which started from Arabia and developed as a mixed Irano-Arabic culture poured into India. All these came to us and influenced us, and yet so great was the powerful impress of India's own mind and culture that it could accept them without being itself swept away or overwhelmed. Nevertheless we all changed in the process and in India to-day all of us are mixed products of these various influences. An Indian, wherever he may go in Asia, feels a sense of kinship with the land he visits and the people he meets.

I do not wish to speak to you of the past but rather of the present. We meet here not to discuss our past history and contacts but to forge links for the future. And may I say here that this Conference and the idea underlying it, is in no way aggressive or against any other continent or country? Ever since news of this Conference went abroad some people in Europe and America have viewed it with doubt imagining that this was some kind of a Pan-Asian movement directed against Europe or America. We have no design of promoting peace and progress all over the World. For too long, we, of Asia, have been petitioners in Western courts and chancelleries. That story must now belong to the past. We propose to stand on our own feet and co-operate with all others who are prepared to co-operate with us. We do not intend to be the playthings of others.

VITAL ROLE

In this crisis in the world history, Asia will necessarily play a vital role. The countries of Asia can no longer be used as pawns by others ; they are bound to have their own policies in world affairs. Europe and America have contributed very greatly to human progress and for that we must yield them the many lessons they have to teach. But the West has also driven us into wars and conflicts without number and even now, the day after a terrible war, there is talk of further wars in the atomic age that is upon us. In this atomic age Asia will have to function effectively in the maintenance of peace. Indeed, there can be no peace unless Asia plays her part. There is to-day conflict in many countries, and all

of us in Asia are peaceful, and the outlook of Asia in world affairs will be a powerful influence for world peace.

Peace can only come when nations are free and also when human beings everywhere have freedom and security and opportunity. Peace and freedom, therefore, have to be considered both in their political and economic aspects. The countries of Asia, we must remember, are very backward and the standards of life are appallingly low. These economic problems demand urgent solution or else crisis and disaster might overwhelm us. We have, therefore, to think in terms of the common man and fashion our political, social and economic structure so that the burdens that have crushed him may be removed, and he may have full opportunity for growth.

IDEAL OF "ONE WORLD"

We have arrived at a stage in human affairs when the idea of 'one world' and some kind of a world federation seems to be essential, though there are many dangers and obstacles in the way. We should work for that ideal and not for any grouping which comes in the way of this larger world group. We, therefore, support the United Nations structure which is painfully emerging from its infancy. But in order to have 'one world' we must also, in Asia, think of the countries of Asia co-operating together for that larger ideal.

This Conference, in a small measure, represents this bringing together of the countries of Asia. Whatever it may achieve the mere fact of its taking place is itself of historic significance. Indeed this occasion is unique in history, for never before has such a gathering met together at any place. So even in meeting, we have achieved much and I have no doubt that out of this meeting greater things will come. When the history of our present times is written, this event may well stand out as a landmark which divides the past of Asia from the future and because we are participating in this making of history, something of the greatness of historic events comes to us all.

This Conference will split up into committees and groups to discuss various problems which are of common concern to all of us. We shall not discuss the internal politics of any country, because that is rather beyond the scope of our present meeting. Naturally we are interested in these internal politics because they act and react on each other, but we may not discuss them at this stage for if we do so, we may lose ourselves in interminable arguments and complications. We may fail to achieve the purpose for which we have met. I hope that out of this Conference some permanent Asian institute for the study of common problems and to bring about closer relations will emerge; also perhaps a school of Asian studies; further that we might be able to organise interchange of visit and exchanges of students and professors so that we might know each other better. There is much else we can do, but I shall not venture to enumerate all these subjects for it is for you to discuss them and arrive at some decisions.

We seek no narrow nationalism. Nationalism has a place in each country and should be fostered, but it must not be allowed to become aggressive and come in the way of international development. Asia stretches her hand out in friendship to Europe and America as well as to our suffering brethren in Africa. We, of Asia, have a special responsibility to the people of Africa. We must help them to their rightful place in the human family. The freedom that we envisage is not to be confined to this nation or that or to a particular people, but must spread out over the whole human race. That universal human freedom also cannot be based on the supremacy of any particular class. It must be the freedom of the common man everywhere and full opportunities for him to develop.

TRIBUTE TO GANDHIJI

We think to-day of the great architects of Asian freedom—*Sun Yat-Sen, Zaqhiul Pasha, Ataturk Kemal Pasha* and others, whose labours have borne fruit. We think also of that great figure whose labours and whose inspiration have brought India to the threshold of her independence—*Mahatma Gandhi*. We miss him at this Conference and I yet hope that he may visit us before our labours end. He is engrossed in the service of the common man in India, and even this Conference could not drag him away from it.

All over Asia we are passing through trials and tribulations. In India also you will see conflict and trouble. Let us not be disheartened by this; this is inevitable in an age of mighty transition. There is a new vitality and powerful creative impulses in all the peoples of Asia. The masses are awake and they demand their heritage. Strong winds are blowing all over Asia. Let us not be

afraid of them but rather welcome them for only with their help can we build the new Asia of our dreams. Let us have faith in these great new forces and the dream which is taking shape. Above all, let us have faith in the human spirit which Asia has symbolised for these long ages past.

Mrs. Naidu on Asia's Resurgence

Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, in a stirring and impassioned presidential address, referred to the resurgence of Asia and said, "I bid you welcome to my Mother's home. I bid you welcome so that once more you may remember your ancient greatness and that you and we together may dream a common dream. Asia shall redeem the world. Asia shall not be a country of fellowship to the world and you and I, speaking different tongues, shall make a common charter for Asian peoples, for their freedom and the freedom of the world. I bid you rise from your graves. I bid you to become part of an eternal springtime. I bid you to rise and say, 'There is no death; there shall be no death'. We shall move together, the people of Asia, undefeated by disaster, not discouraged by anything that may befall, for it is part of my creed and my tradition and my heritage to believe that nothing can die that is good.

"When my father, who was one of the great men of the world was about to die, his last words were: 'There is no birth and there is no death.' There is only the spirit seeking evolution in higher and higher stages of life.' That is the history of India. That is the history of Asia. And I bid you all whatever your faith, whatever your creed, whatever your tongue, remember there is no birth, there is no death. We move onwards and onwards and onwards, higher and higher and higher till we ascend to the stars. Let us move towards the stars. Who shall hamper our ascent to the stars? Who will bid us 'Halt! Thus far and no farther?' We do not cry for the moon. We pluck it from the skies and wear it upon the diadem of Asia's freedom."

COMMON IDEAL OF PEACE

Calling upon the Conference to take a pledge of unity of Asia's people "so that the world in ruin to-day might be redeemed from sorrow, unhappiness, exploitation, misery, poverty, ignorance, disaster and death," Mrs. Naidu said:—"What has Asia stood for? We read of so many things, cruel and barbarous—it depends on who writes our history (laughter)—but there is one thing that has always been true, one authentic feature that brings every nation of Asia together, and that is a common ideal of peace, not the peace of negation, not the peace of surrender, but the peace of a militant, creative human spirit that rises to exaltation." (cheers.)

After referring in warm tones to India's great cultural heritage and her ancient cultural ties with the countries of Asia, Mrs. Naidu said: "Mahatma Gandhi (cheers) had taught us that not through bitterness and anger, not through hatred and strife, but through compassion and love and forgiveness shall the world be redeemed. And this is not a new message. This is an old message of Asia. To-day, India has beckoned to her kindred of Asia to come and understand the new message of hope to the diversity of customs, food, ways of enjoyment and all those things that make the daily social life of a people and which seem so curious to us in many ways, cannot divide the heart of Asia. Rather, out of the diversity of Asia's culture is born that unity of the Asian people. Who wants a uniform culture? Who wants a colourless culture? It is rather the richness, the variety, the diversity, and sometimes the conflict of one culture with another that is a guarantee and a prophecy of a real abiding dynamic unity and that is what I want, what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru wants, what Mahatma Gandhi wants and what my people want".

Delegates' Speeches

Leaders of delegations, ten speaking in languages ranging from Armenian to Chinese, expressed their approval of the idea of the Asian Relations Conference and conveyed the desire of the peoples they represented to co-operate in the work of the Conference and the achievement of its objects. The leaders of the various delegations were called upon by Smt. Naidu to speak in the alphabetical order of the countries they represent.

Dr. Abdul Majid Khan, leader of the Afghan Delegation and Vice-Chancellor of the Kabul University, addressing the Conference said:—"An examination of the dominant facts of the last few years showed that "we have to live together if we are going to live at all. Conferences such as the present one held annually

in different places would develop the betterment of international relations. Cultural relations between the Indian and Afghan people went back to time immemorial and the bonds of friendship that hold them together were genuine and strong. He said that he felt sure that the work of the Conference would be crowned with success and enable "us to live a better life."

The Leader of the Delegation from the Soviet Republic of Armenia speaking in Armenian said his was one of the countries of Asia that had experienced a tremendous upsurge. His people were an ancient one and had been very backward until they became part of the U. S. S. R. After that their period of hardship was ended for ever. He expressed the desire of the people of his country to co-operate in promoting better understanding and closer collaboration among the peoples of Asia and of the world.

The Leader of the Azerbaijan Delegation also spoke in his national language. He said that the peoples of Asia were longing for freedom to fulfil the demands of their life for economic, social, cultural and economic development to enable them to rise to the level of contemporary culture and civilisation in the world. He said that no people could be free without economic freedom. This was proved in the case of his country which until the Russian revolution was one of the most backward countries in the world. To-day his country was a flourishing industrial republic with a large number of universities and research institutions. These facts taken together with the cultural advance of Azerbaijan made the exchange of culture between his country and other Asian countries more fruitful. He hoped that the Conference would successfully cope with the task facing it.

The leader of the Bhutan Delegation Mr. Dorji, who followed him, wished the Conference success in its task. He said that he came from a small country from which he brought to the people of Asia fraternal greetings as pure and clear as the air of the mountains of his country.

Mr. Kgaw Myint, Leader of the Burmese Delegation, who is a Judge of the Rangoon High Court and was formerly a member of the Indian Legislative Assembly, recalled the days when he was in India during the Non-Co-operation Movement of 1931 and the Gandhi-Irwin pact. India and Burma were near geographically and culturally and inextricably bound with each other.

AUNG SAN'S MESSAGE

He then read a message from Genl. Aung San, sending to the Conference the warmest greetings of the Government and people of Burma. Many of the countries participating in the Conference had to reckon with the hardships resulting from the subjection of these countries to expansionist exploitation, the message said. "The distinctive feature that the nations of Asia are now ready boldly to face these and other difficulties and to take the bull by the horns so to say, is a sign that augurs well for the future of Asia and for the cause of the independence of the Asian peoples." The message concluded by expressing Gen. Aung San's regret that he was unable to come and wishing the Conference all success.

CEYLON DELEGATE'S HOPE

Mr. Bandaranaike, Leader of the Ceylon Delegation said: "It is indeed opportune that we are meeting here at a time when the long trail appears to be ending. When the promised land seems to be in sight, in order that in a friendly and informal atmosphere, we can take stock of the situation, assess the potentialities and opportunities that freedom will confer, and also realise the grave responsibilities that it will undoubtedly involve. Among the advantages that we hope to reap are spiritually the removal of that degradation of the soul, which servitude brings in its train; materially, the achievement of freedom from poverty and want from disease and ignorance and the assurance to all, as far as lies in our power, of equal opportunities and just standard of living; psychologically the elimination of fear—fear of ourselves and of each other; culturally the fostering of our languages, literatures and art and our ways of life. While we view these opportunities with a justifiable measure of elation, let us also consider the corresponding responsibilities with a due measure of sobriety.

Asia, the Ceylon leader said, might well hold the key to the new world situation, that was developing and might not only provide the battle-ground but also proved to be the deciding factor in a future conflict. Her position might be even more crucial—on her might depend the momentous issue of whether there was to be a war at all. If Asia was free, reasonably strong, and united, that future conflict might well be averted. If she was weak, disunited and unfree, then there was not much hope for her or for the world. The only remedy was for us to make a supreme effort

to achieve unity and harmony in Asia: unity in our own countries as well as amongst our different lands.

CHINESE DELEGATE'S MESSAGE

The leader of the Chinese Delegation, Mr *Cheng yin-fun* said: "Gathered together from all over Asia we are meeting together for a few days at this Conference to discuss matters of common interest to all Asian peoples. It is unimportant that we should arrive at any definite conclusion on any subject on the agenda. But it is most important for the success of this Conference that frankness and sincerity in the atmosphere of friendliness should be the key-note of all our deliberations. The Chinese Delegation regards this Conference as a sort of bridge between Asia and the rest of the world. We must know ourselves first before we can know others. But our aim should not be confined to our own Asian frontiers. The world is our Province. Within the four seas all men are brothers, runs an old Chinese proverb. Let each Asian people contribute the best of what they have to offer so that the world may be made richer thereby. Nothing short of the happiness and prosperity of all mankind should be our ultimate objective. Only thus can Asia have peace and stability and only thus can we make the world our home, instead of a battle-field.

EGYPTIAN DELEGATE'S MESSAGE

Mr. *Mustafa Momen*, the Egyptian delegate, said: "The eyes of the hundreds of millions of our peoples are focussed on Delhi, the capital of this great sub-continent. After years of foreign domination under some form or other liberty has dawned and the world is destined to see another renaissance in Asia. Let us co-operate and defend our heritage. Our survival is in our unity".

Second Day—New Delhi—24th. March 1947

EGYPTIAN DELEGATE'S MESSAGE

In a message to the Conference to-day Miss *Kayima Syed*, on behalf of the Feminist movement of Egypt, said that they had great admiration for the efforts of the organisers of the Conference in trying to build up oriental co-operation. India and Egypt were united by strong ties of national suffering and aspiration. They stood side by side in the struggle for liberty, independence and prosperity and were entitled to claim the respect of the West. During the war they put all their territory at the disposal of the allies. Egypt, by virtue of its strategic position, was the most important seat of operation in the Middle East. They had co-operated with the allies because they felt that in doing so they were fighting for the rights of nations, small and big, to exist freely. But for India and Egypt, Great Britain would not enjoy the victorious position she now did.

At that time, British statesmen spoke with admiration and gratitude of eastern co-operation. To-day they spoke very differently and tried to sow the seeds of disunity and civil war in Egypt and other places. It was time for the people of Asia to learn the value of unity. The people of Egypt were willing to stand hand in hand with the people of Asia in their fight against imperialism.

CHINESE YUAN'S MESSAGE

Dr. *Tai Chi Tao*, President of the Executive Yuan of China, in a message to *Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru* urged the Asian Countries to be "vigilant, exercise self-respect and regenerate themselves by self-reliance."

The message, which was read out to the conference by Mrs. *Vijayalakshmi Pandit*, urged the Asian countries to "uphold the good virtue of harmony and the golden mean to promote human welfare. They should further recognise the difficult circumstances in which they find themselves and the immense responsibilities they are called upon to bear. Lastly, the peoples of Asia should take cognisance of the serious fact that humanity is approaching the cross-roads of regeneration and self-annihilation. This crisis is caused by a total lack of understanding of the teachings of the ancient sages of Asia. To arrest this impending danger the Asian nations should not only co-operate and be brotherly with each other, but should strive to promote goodwill among the nations of the world".

Dr. *Tai Chi Tao* hoped that the Inter-Asian Conference would bear fruits of "mutual affection, respect, confidence and co-operation, thus fulfilling the aim of the ancient sages in saving humanity and the world."

GEORGIA'S GREETINGS

The Georgian Soviet Republic delegate conveyed the greetings of the people of Georgia to the Conference and their best wishes for its success. "The discussions at this Conference of problems of national life and culture of the Asian peoples, the establishment of personal contact among the representatives of culture and sciences

of various Asian countries and the maintaining of this contact and mutual understanding in future will play a significant part in the solving of democratic problems which face the people of Asia in their efforts to build their national life," he added. He hoped that the foundation of closer relations and better mutual understanding among the peoples of Asia laid at the Conference would be further strengthened.

INDONESIAN DELEGATE'S MESSAGE

The presence of the Indonesian Delegation at the Conference, said the leader of the Delegation, Dr. *Abu Hanifa*, was significant because it was the first Inter-Asian Conference in which Indonesians could participate without being accompanied by alien advisers. "Our presence here is for us like a significant symbol for the present stage of our national struggle. Being a young State and a young independent nation we greatly appreciate this day as the symbol of the reality that the Indonesian people cannot easily be kept in an isolated position as before". He added that while the people of Indonesia were fully prepared to work for world peace only independent Indonesia could fulfil the tasks required for this.

His country, he said, for centuries been visited by foreign peoples. Some, he said, like the Indians had come with good intentions. Others had come deceitfully like the Dutch and the Japanese who were the most unwelcome guests of all. The latter had drained all the riches of the country to themselves. His people and his culture were peaceful and they even wanted peace with the Dutch if Indonesia was recognised as an independent State. Concluding, he expressed the hope that the decision taken jointly at the Conference would give the fullest impetus to the struggle "of our peoples for political and economic independence."

At the request of *Sjta. Naidu*, the Indonesian Delegate read part of a message from Dr. *Sutan Sharif*, which said, "The Indonesian Republic and the people of Indonesia accord warm support to the aims and objects underlying the organisation of the Conference. We trust that it will have a far-reaching influence in bringing together the Governments and the peoples of Asian countries. You have chosen the right time for holding this Conference, for all of these countries have suffered grievously during the war and are now faced with problems of great magnitude. The task of reconstruction is an urgent one and we have no doubt that the opportunity provided to all Asian countries to exchange their views on these problems will be extremely useful."

"Delhi, the heart of Asia, had played its part well", said Dr. *Ghulam Hussain Sadighi*, leader of the Iranian Delegation addressing the Conference, "and now it falls upon us, who are the limbs and parts of this great ancient structure to do our duty, firstly in respect of our own individual northern countries and secondly, for the whole of Asia which is their common home." It was imperative in the modern age, he continued, when scientific and other facilities were at their disposal, that all the Asiatic nations should come together and be good friends for all time to come since they were partners in one another's happiness. The peoples of Asia had gathered here to discuss five specific subjects but they could not be successful unless they were free and their social, cultural, economic and women's movements made steady progress. The time had come when the peoples of Asia should awake from their slumber and without distinction of nationality, caste, creed, race or religion should harmonise themselves in such a way that every man, woman and child should become the standard-bearer of knowledge and wisdom and should so act as to secure prosperity for themselves and for posterity.

KAZAKHISTAN DELEGATE'S MESSAGE

Mr. *Sahrifa*, representing Soviet Kazakhstan, said that the October Revolution had brought all the people of Russia together. Their country had been rejuvenated and they had found the way to prosperity. Under the old regime, they had had no industry and the majority of the people were illiterate. To-day they are highly industrialised and they had a large number of educational and research institutions. He brought the Conference fraternal greetings from his people and wished all success in its work which, he hoped, would add to international peace and understanding.

Malayan Delegate's Message

"Asia is one", said Dr. *Burhanuddin*, leader of the Malayan Delegation, "and Malaya is a link in the chain of Asia. So far there had been no opportu-

nity for the people of Asia to get together, and he felt that the Conference was a step in the right direction. The various Asian countries represented by the delegates who had met here to-day were like so many rivers converging themselves into one mighty ocean, India. The Conference was an expression of the will of the Asian peoples to unite and find themselves possible ways and means to solve their common problems. Owing to the domestic conditions prevailing in most Asian countries, Asian solidarity had not so far been possible and it is for a great Asian country like India to give the lead towards its achievement". Finally, he concluded, the Conference was a concrete step towards better international understanding and amity.

NEPAL DELEGATE'S ADDRESS

The Nepal Delegation's leader, Sir *Shumsher Jung Bahadur Rana*, in his address said: "Two world wars in the space of a quarter of a century have almost shattered the fabrics of civilisation, and the world cannot bear a repetition of such stupendous catastrophes. Peace has returned, but the effects of the war are still very much with us. Asia, as we find it to-day, is unhappily not free from many peculiar problems, some of which are due to his'oric causes, while others are the direct consequence of the war just ended. If, as a result of this Conference, these problems and difficulties, or at least the major part of them, could be resolved, then the example and influence of the Conference might extend beyond the boundaries of Asia, and might become a powerful force for the establishment and spread of goodwill throughout the world.

"Mine is a tiny mountainous country nestling in the Himalayas, and inhabited by a people short in stature but stout of heart, and ever zealous to maintain her independence. We live simple life on the lap of Nature in our homes in the hills. Even so we have our own problems which we are trying to face with such limited resources in men and material as we possess; and I am confident that our experiences in the Conference, and the knowledge that we shall acquire here of the problems facing our neighbours, and of the ways in which they are sought to be met, will be of the most material assistance to us as well as to our colleagues and brothers involving our mutual and common problems.

"The ties between Nepal and India have been in existence, in cordiality and friendship, throughout history. Those ties are indissoluble and I hope time will but make them stronger and closer. With our neighbours in the north, too, our relations have ever been most cordial. Our presence here will, I hope, lead to strengthening of our good relations with old friends, and to the establishment of goodwill and contacts with other countries to whom we extend the hand of friendship."

Concluding, Sir *Shumsher Jung* paid tributes to *Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru* and *Sree Sarojini Naidu*. "Asia, this mother of continents, this place of origin of all the great faiths which rule the heart of man, is in the melting pot," he said, "and her future is being unfolded before the eyes of the world and *Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru* possesses those qualities of sagacity and sincerity which will be invaluable in the councils of Asia and of the world."

PALESTINE JEWISH DELEGATE'S MESSAGE

Professor *Samuel Bergmann*, speaking on behalf of the Palestine Jewish Delegation, said that he brought the Conference the greetings of the representatives of an old religion and an old Asiatic people who had been driven from their Asiatic homeland 1,800 years ago. The Hebrew University had sent its delegates to the Conference to learn "your problems and their solutions and to transplant this knowledge to Palestine."

Europe, he said, had failed to teach them how to co-operate in mutual benevolence and reciprocal help. They could not learn co-operation between groups belonging to different races. They had been everywhere a persecuted minority and during the war millions of their brethren had been ruthlessly murdered in gas chambers. He hoped that Palestine would not go the European way "solving, so to speak, problems by disposing populations." He said that they had come to learn and not to teach. Nevertheless, they could offer the help of their experts in science, agriculture, collective colonisation and the adaptation of ancient languages to modern usages. They were a small people with little space, who also wished to preserve their own language, and they had some experience in these matters, many of which were to be found in Asia. He wished and prayed that the Conference would be a success."

OTHER DELEGATIONS' MESSAGE

The Leader of the Siamese Delegation, wishing the Conference success, expressed gratification that his country had been invited to share in this noble task.

The Leader of the Tadjik Soviet Republic Delegation, referred to the great strides which the Tadjik people in general and the Tadjik women in particular had achieved with the fraternal aid of the other peoples of the Soviet Union in all spheres of life, and said that now the Tadjik women, in common with other women in the Soviet Union, had ample opportunities for free creative labour in all walks of life. Expressing profound sympathy with the progressive movements of the peoples of Asia, the Tadjik leader wished them freedom and prosperity.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who arrived at the pandal at this stage, was given a great ovation and cheered as he took the chair from Sir S. Radhakrishnan.

The Leader of the Tibetan Delegation, addressing the Conference, said: "We are a country which administers its subjects based on religious aspirations and as India is the land of Buddhism; we Buddhists and especially Tibet, had friendly relations with India from ancient times." He expressed joy at meeting representatives from all the other Asian countries and expressed gratitude to leaders like *Mahatma Gandhi*, *Pandit Nehru*, *Mrs. Naidu* and others for their services to the world and hoped that peoples of all Asian countries would in future consider themselves brothers.

"In this way, we hope there will be everlasting peace and unity in Asia".

After the leaders of the Turkish and Turkistan Republican delegations had conveyed their greetings to the Conference, the Usbegistan Soviet Republican delegates marched up the dais and presented *Pandit Nehru* with a gorgeous red and gold silk gown, a blue sash and a red cap—the national dress of the Usbegis. Smilingly, *Pandit Nehru* allowed the Usbegis to wrap him up in the gown.

The Usbegi leader, addressing the Conference, said the peoples of India and Usbegistan belonged to the most ancient peoples of the world and history was full of brilliant examples which proved the close connections between the two countries. The people of Usbegistan had always been sympathetic towards the Indian people and respected Indian culture.

The Viet Nam leader, *Mai Ta Chao* expressed the hope that as a result of the Conference peace and constructive freedom would be established among the peoples of Asia. On behalf of Viet Nam he thanked the Indian people and the leaders of the other Asian Countries for their sympathy and warm support of Viet Nam's struggle for freedom. His people were still in the midst of their struggle and so it was so time for talking. It was the time for action. Raising his voice, he added, "We have brought unity to this Conference. Now friends, let us act and be united."

The Arab League observer, Mr. *Thankiruddin* who arrived to-day, told the Conference that the League had now begun to share in the urge for freedom by India. "For, your freedom is necessary for our freedom," he added.

Pandit Nehru then announced that the representatives of four other countries of Asia—Korea, Mongolia, the Philippines, and one other—were also on their way and would join the Conference as soon as they arrived.

A BREEZE

The proceedings of the Conference was interrupted at this stage by Madame *Karima El Suid* (Egypt), asking *Pandit Nehru* to give her a chance to reply to the remarks made earlier by the Jewish leader, Prof. Bergmann, regarding Palestine.

Pandit Nehru, assenting, Madame *Karima* charged the Jewish leader with controversial matters before the Conference. Since *Bergmann* had done so, she would like to put forth the view point that there had been no controversy in Palestine between the Arabs and Jews. They had lived on friendly relations for many years. What the Arabs did not want was European Zionists, coming under British protection to claim a separate State.

Immediately Madame *Karima* sat down, Dr. *Bergmann*, the Jewish Delegation leader, got up and requested *Pandit Nehru* to give him another chance to say a few words.

On *Pandit Nehru's* pointing out that Madame *Karima* had spoken only in order to reply to his earlier points and that any further speeches would lead the Conference into the realms of controversy, Dr. *Bergmann* walked down the dais and was seen leaving the Conference pandal.

Two minutes later, however, he was seen being escorted back to the dais by Dr. *Bhatnagar*, wreathed in smiles.

Sir S. Radhakrishnan, speaking on behalf of India, said that given the chance, the countries of Asia would make their contribution to the progress of the world in a marked manner. He had no doubt their contributions would be different from those of the west. Asia would use science, for instance, not for destructive purposes but for the healing of nations and for the creation of the world.

Sir S. Radhakrishnan referred to the example set by Britain in deciding to quit India and urged the other imperialist countries like France and Holland to follow in the wake of Britain (applause). "I do hope that a liberated India will exert her greatest influence on behalf of the still-oppressed peoples of Asia and her influence in the councils of the world will be used for the purpose of enabling them to achieve their freedom." (applause).

Nehru's Concluding Remarks

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in his concluding remarks, said: "I think all of us have felt during these two days that however far we might be separated from each other in point of distance or other way, there is an essential unity about this continent and about our endeavour."

Placing before the Conference the idea of Asian unity, out of which he hoped would grow something even greater—world peace based on world freedom—Pandit Nehru said: "If any person thinks that Asia is going to prosper in the future at the cost of Europe, he is mistaken. Because if Europe falls, it will drag Asia too with it, just as if Asia remains fallen or had remained fallen, undoubtedly it would have dragged Europe and other parts of the world with it. You are going to have either war or peace in the world; you are going to have either freedom or lack of freedom in the world. Therefore, when we think of freedom and progress in Asia, we think for it in terms of other peoples' freedom also."

If they looked at it from any other point of view, the economic point of view, in future any nation or any continent which thought in terms of building up its own prosperity at the cost of exploiting others was not going to succeed. Undoubtedly, because of various special qualities and opportunities that they possessed, the people of Europe prospered. He did not criticise them or condemn them for that. They had the qualities for that and they succeeded. Nevertheless, their prosperity was based largely on the exploitation of various colonial and semi-colonial countries.

Proceeding Pandit Nehru said: "To-day we have arrived at a stage when no country in Europe or elsewhere could base its prosperity on exploiting any other country. Indeed, there was no need for it because science offered us for the first time the opportunity to make world prosperous all over, only if we worked along the lines of science.

"Otherwise, of course, we might use science only for purposes of destruction for which it was so often used. So to-day there is this problem before some of the countries of Europe who have got used to certain national economies which are based on the exploitation of other countries. There is this great problem before them, 'what to do?'

"But looking at it from the narrowest viewpoint of opportunism, that has become an impossible undertaking for them, that will drag them down. It will cost them much more than they might gain even they succeed, and they will not succeed in that. So the path of wisdom obviously is to give up that method of approach to these problems and think in terms of raising the general level, which will raise each person's level, and not trying to keep up the level of one nation at the cost of keeping down the level of another nation. On the whole it is recognised to-day that it will not be possible for political domination of one nation by another to continue. But it is not perhaps sufficiently realised that it should be equally undesirable for the economic domination of one nation by another to continue.

"We have been wrapped up in political problems and the political aspects of the national problem. In all countries, more or less, we have talked bravely of independence and all that and yet we know well enough that many a country that calls itself independent is in the economic clutches of various interests of other countries. Economic inter-dependence there is bound to be, no one can think in terms of isolationism to-day. But the point is that this practice of economic exploitation of one country by another, either directly or, what might be still more dangerous, indirectly, cannot continue and if it does continue, then inevitably it brings, I am afraid, all manner of evils and conflicts in its train.

"You will not be able to end the conflicts of to-day unless you approach the problem from an entirely different viewpoint. These two days and the next seven or eight days will no doubt bring all these problems much more before you and you will examine them. You will not suddenly find a golden way out because there is no golden way out of difficult problems of life, but it seems clear enough that we see roughly a path before us which we, of Asia, should tread upon. We shall go on that path, I hope, hand in hand and co-operating together and also always keeping the other hand for others, who wish to take."

Pandit Nehru said he was sorry that Prof. *Bergmann*, Leader of the Palestine Jewish delegation, thought that he had treated him unfairly. "It hurts me that anyone should think that I had done so to him. As you know, it was my desire to avoid a controversy on this subject, or any subject affecting the internal politics of the various countries of Asia in this Conference. Obviously, apart from Palestine, there are many other problems about which the representatives of two countries might differ or might come into conflict, ideologically or otherwise. Even within a country there are problems enough. If we enter that question, we would simply lose track of real work we have here and lose ourselves in interminable arguments."

The question of Palestine, *Pandit Nehru* said, was a highly important issue. Palestine might be a small country on the map, but undoubtedly it had become a very vital issue. The people of India, as was well known, had during the last many years sympathised very greatly with the sufferings of Jews in Europe and elsewhere (cheers). They had, whenever an opportunity came before them, raised their voice in their favour or, at any rate, expressed their hope that their sufferings might end.

"At the same time," he continued, "it is also clear, and I do not say this in any controversial spirit, that the people of India, necessarily for various reasons into which I shall not go, have always said that Palestine is essentially an Arab country and no decision can be made without the consent of the Arabs."

"We did hope, and we still hope, that if the third party is removed or went from Palestine, it may be easier for the other parties more intimately concerned to settle their own problems among themselves, however difficult they might be, because, after all, that problem, like all other problems, must be settled and if other problems must be settled and if people do not settle them reasonably then they are settled unreasonably. Nature does not long accept any unsettled problem. Therefore, I hope that this question of Palestine itself—and I say so with all respect to all concerned, our Arab friends and our Hebrew friends—will be settled in co-operation among them and not by any appeal to, or reliance on, any outsider."

The session then adjourned.

The Conference from the next day sat in round table groups—National Movements group, Migration and Racial problems group, Economic and Social Services group, Cultural Problems group and Women's Problems group.

Third Day—New Delhi—25th. March 1947

Meetings of Groups

Three Groups held meetings this morning, each group having two to four members from each delegation. Group B began examination of migration and racial problems as they affect the countries of Asia and also the inhabitants of those countries who might be in other continents. Economic development and social services of the participating countries came up before group C, and group D considered cultural problems with a view to promoting the exchange and dissemination of the cultural achievements of the various countries against each other.

Fourth Day—New Delhi—26th. March 1947

Migration and Racial Problems

The Conference to-day adopted a four-point report on racial problems and inter-racial migration. The report suggested that there should be complete legal equality of all citizens, complete religious freedom of all citizens, no public social disqualification of any racial group and equality before law of persons of foreign origin who have settled in the country.

An attempt was made by the delegate from the Soviet Republic of Georgia, supported by many others to include in the report a specific recommendation to the Governments of the countries concerned to implement these principles through legislation. The Secretary of the Conference, however, pointed out that there was no provision made when it was decided to summon the Conference, to pass any specific resolutions and recommendations.

After a breezy exchange of words by a number of delegates for and against the

proposal, the Chairman, *Mr. Han La Wu* (China), ruled that the question whether any specific resolutions can be passed by the Conference would be referred back to the Steering Committee.

The report on racial problems and inter-Asian migration was framed by a Group Committee with *Mr. Wen Yuan Ning* (China) as Chairman and *Sardar K. M. Panikkar* as Vice-Chairman. The report recorded 'consensus of opinion' among the countries that "equality between all citizens of a country, irrespective of race and creed", should be the rule for all countries.

Discussing the legal status of immigrant populations—such as Indians in Burma and Ceylon and Chinese in Malay, Burma and Indonesia—all the delegates agreed that a distinction must be made between those immigrants who identify themselves with their country of adoption and apply for naturalisation and those who choose to remain nationals of their mother country.

On the question of naturalisation, it was generally felt that all foreign settlers in Asian countries who are prepared to comply with the naturalisation laws and who look upon the country of their adoption as their homeland should be granted full citizenship and that alien settlers wanting to retain the nationality of their country of origin should have equality before the law—without having civic rights—should enjoy safety of person and property and should be treated generously.

It was generally agreed that at any one time, a person can have only one nationality and that no person can claim citizenship of a country and at the same time enjoy the protection of his home country.

There was considerable divergence of opinion in regard to future immigration. Many delegates, though recognising the right of every country to control immigration, felt complete prohibition of immigration would lead to ill-feeling between countries and, therefore advocated a quota system.

CAUSES FOR SUSPICION

Discussing the causes for the hostility and suspicion prevailing in several Asian countries between indigenous and immigrant populations, the report said in most cases economic factors were responsible for tension and the distrust. People such as the Burmese or Malays, felt Indians and Chinese exploited them and, because Indians and the Chinese in these countries were doubtful of the security of their property in Burma or Malaya, they tried to transfer profits to their respective countries. This vicious circle could only be broken by a change of attitude among both parties.

All delegates agreed while legally there was little discrimination against individual, racial or national groups, there was considerable *de facto* discrimination in the spheres of administration and public life. To remedy this, it was suggested long-term measures of remedying education, social contacts and cultural exchange be adopted but various delegates also suggested immediate steps, such as the opening up of communal social institutions and the financing of social services and the establishment of hospitals and schools by wealthy immigrants.

On the question of tribal peoples, it was suggested that a study of their cultural social and economic conditions was necessary before embarking on any policy aiming at their ultimate assimilation.

RACIALISM CONDEMNED

When the report was presented to the plenary session this evening, the Georgian delegate urged that a recommendation be added to the report calling on the Governments of the various countries to implement the findings of the report. He pointed out that in Georgia racial discrimination was punishable by law.

A number of delegates including *Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit*, *Miss Leelamant Naidu*, and *Mr. V. K. Krishna Menon*, amidst applause, pleaded that unless such a recommendation or resolution was passed, the report would draw little attention from either individual Governments or international organisations like the UNO. The delegate from Azerbaijan, supporting the view, said that the theory of racial superiority was a vestige of Fascism.

On behalf of the sponsors of the Conference, the Council of World Affairs, *Dr. Appadorai*, *Pandit Eridayanath Kuneru* and some foreign delegates stated that any formal resolution or recommendation to anyone was excluded from the purview of the Conference and would, in fact, reduce the Council of World Affairs to a partisan body.

When *Dr. Appadorai* said that the Steering Committee of the Asian Conference had decided that there should be no formal resolutions passed—except perhaps one

for the setting up of an Asian Institute—a number of delegates stood up and asked that the Steering Committee's resolution be placed before the Conference.

Mr. *Han Li Wu* (China), who was presiding, ended the discussion by saying that he would have the question referred to the Steering Committee again for consideration.

The Viet Nam Delegation, it was understood, sought to move a resolution congratulating the Government and the people of the Indonesian Republic on the occasion of the signing of the Dutch-Indonesian Agreement which recognised the Republic of Indonesia. The resolution expressed the hope that the Dutch Government would abide by the spirit and letter of the agreement.

This resolution too was however not allowed to be moved, the Secretary pointing out that under the rules no resolutions could be moved in the Conference.

Fifth Day—New Delhi—27th. March 1947

Absence Of Japanese Delegates

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, in an interview this morning, said that he would have liked to see Japan represented at the Asian Relations Conference, but he would not make any representations to General MacArthur or any other authorities over non-attendance of Japanese delegates invited to be present at the Conference. It was a "general rule", he said, that the Japanese were not to be allowed to leave their country at present for such purposes and added, "It is not, as if any exception was made in the case of this particular Conference."

The consensus of opinion of majority of delegates to the Inter-Asian Conference was that Japan could participate in this Conference, as it was of a non-political nature. Out of leaders of a number of delegations interviewed, only one was definitely of the opinion that the Japanese should not participate in the Conference. The leader of the Philippine delegation, Mr. *Anestacio de Castro* said: "For the time being, it is better that the Japanese should not be here. We cannot so quickly forget the atrocities they committed on our people".

All the other leaders were of the opinion that as Japan was an Asian country, there was no sound reason why Japanese delegates should be excluded. Dr. *Burhanuddin*, leader of the Malayan delegation, summed up the general attitude. "We should start this Conference with a clean state. It is an Asian Conference and Japan is an Asian country". Mr. *Mustafa Momen*, leader of the Egyptian delegation, was very emphatic and pointed out that Japanese delegations had been allowed to go to America. He felt that the absence of the Japanese might later be used as an excuse for saying that the Asian Relations Conference had not been fully representative.

Some other leaders of delegations interviewed were those from the Soviet republics, China, Afghanistan, Siam and Viet-Nam who favoured Japanese participation.

Cultural Affairs

At this evening's session of the Conference, *Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru* welcomed the newly arrived Philippine, Mongolia and Viet-Nam delegates. A member from each delegation replied and conveyed to the Conference his greetings and expressed his confidence in its success.

The Conference then adopted the report of the group on Cultural Affairs. The report referred to the need for the development of scientific research in Asia and after paying tribute to Western achievements in the scientific field warned the Conference against Asia being tied to the apron strings of Europe. Asia, it pointed out, had material and psychological resources to carry out first class scientific research. Other points brought out in the report in this connection are that countries like Burma which have been ravaged by war, have little scientific equipment left, and that it is necessary that scientific research should be related to questions of food, health and sanitation and thus contribute to the raising of the standard of the living of the masses.

It was suggested, the report said, to set up a cultural and scientific Asian organisation with a permanent secretariat to promote scientific and cultural collaboration. It was also suggested that a School of Asian Studies be set up. Opinion was divided as to whether there should be one of several institutions, and whether countries should not specialise in those fields for which they were best equipped. It was, however, agreed that the proposed Asian Institute, details of which were being worked out by a sub-committee of the Steering Committee, should go into

the matter. The first function of this Asian Institute should be to serve as a centre for information and exchange of ideas so that the good work done in one country should be available to all countries.

The report emphasised the importance of removing illiteracy from Asian countries and the necessity for increasing facilities for both child and adult education. The report also recommended that the use of new media of education, such as the radio and cinema, be fully explored. Other suggestions were: collaboration among libraries, translation of classics of one country into all Asian languages, preparation of documentary and educational films, appointment of Asian language teachers in Asian universities, comparative study of Asian cultures, inter-Asian students' conferences and the setting up of an Asian broadcasting station.

History should be re-written, the report said, on rational and human lines without laying subordinating nationalism to human brotherhood, relating politics to morality and preserving the values which Asia has cherished most, namely, regard for human personality, the primacy of the spirit, the importance of religion and the essential unity of Asia.

Finally, the report stated that after discussion on the value of an artificial common language, it was generally agreed that while such a language might be possible, it was not an immediate or urgent problem. For the present the report recommended that the use of English as the most widely used language should be continued, and that the study of Asian languages be encouraged. On this point there was some discussion in the plenary session before the report was adopted by the delegates.

The report was then adopted with the modification, suggested by *Pandit Nehru*, that the use of the word "Asiatic" which has been interchangeably used with "Asian" should be dropped in favour of the latter form.

Sixth Day—New Delhi—29th March 1947

Transition from Colonial to National Economy

Group reports on the transition from colonial to national economy, on agricultural reconstruction and industrial development were adopted at the plenary session of the Asian Relations Conference this afternoon. *Justice Kyaw Myint*, leader of the Burmese Delegation, presided.

The only point that aroused discussion was the role of foreign capital in colonial countries, and a number of speakers participated. It was considered that the most appropriate place for including the consensus of the House on this point was the report on industrial development and a small amendment was accordingly made at the instance of *Bardar K. M. Panikkar* and *Mr. Humayun Kabir*. The report says with reference to the use of foreign capital that "great care must be taken in determining the conditions under which foreign capital is imported." The amendment incorporated was "among such conditions should be considered the desirability of imposing limits on profits, and ensuring the maintenance of minimum living standards."

The report on the transition from colonial to national economy, presented by *Prof. D. E. Gadgil*, first describes the characteristics of a colonial economy. The main features are an unbalanced economy, foreign-owned or controlled plantations; mineral resources under foreign exploitation which are not used for the country's industrial development; an export trade consisting mainly of primary products sold at unduly depressed prices by foreign interests; a favourable visible balance of trade but an unfavourable invisible balance of payments as banking, shipping, capital and insurance are in foreign hands; large-scale but stagnant artisan and handicraft industry; a manufacturing industry unbalanced and foreign-controlled; stratification in the field of economic activity and the existence of plural societies but a tendency towards undue centralisation in administration and taxation and, an invariable feature of all colonial economies, a very low standard of living.

TRANSITION TO NATIONAL ECONOMY

For the transition from a colonial to a national economy, the report says it is necessary that the State should be able to free itself of the dominance of foreign political influence, and of foreign capital and personnel. This, the report adds, is largely a political problem. For the attainment of a national economy the report outlines certain general policies and objectives including the diversification and modernisation of agriculture; improvement in the technique and organisation of artisan and handicraft industry, the development of co-operatives to assist agriculture, small-scale industry and internal trade; development of indigenous

credit organisations and indigenous shipping and foreign trade organisations; the development of an efficient and progressive system of local Self-Government; the assurance of security to the people by means of the stabilisation of prices, fixation of minimum wages, social insurances, etc.; and the development of manufacturing industries, specially related to the internal resources and of opportunities in the country.

DIFFICULTIES ARISING IN TRANSITION PERIOD

Dealing with the difficulties that might arise during the transition, the report mentions the following as the most important: (1) A diminution in the surplus of commercial crops available for export or for industry and diversification of agriculture would lead to the growth of small peasant economies and a consequent increase in the importance of subsistence farming and a greater production of cereals. (2) Retardation in the improvement of the standard of living and a burden on the consumer due to protection of manufacturing industries, which may have to be undertaken by the State. Unemployment may increase if there is a rapid development of the manufacturing industry which would inevitably lead to the disintegration of the artisan industry. Furthermore, the existence of a stratified social structure might lead to the concentration of economic power in the hands of small groups. (3) A large-scale development programme in countries whose economies are poor may also retard the raising of the standard of living. (4) In the beginning, shortage of trained personnel may be encountered due to educational backwardness and lack of training facilities. (5) An increase in direct taxation whose incidence would be progressive, in order to meet the increased Government expenditure demanded by the State's social policy, without affecting the standard of living of the people.

(6) Obligations incurred by the membership of international organisations, such as the International Trade Organisation may bring about a conflict with economic policies necessitated by national economic policies. (7) As long as the new international order is not fully established, the policies of individual units will be largely influenced by security considerations necessitating a modification of development programmes.

In conclusion, the report makes suggestion which might help to overcome the difficulties encountered by all countries, but points out that each country will have to be individually solved. The report says that there should be an exchange of information relating to the terms and conditions of foreign borrowing. Efforts should be made for co-operation and understanding in particular regions for the planning of mutually advantageous development programmes and steps should be taken in concert for implementing ideas or policies sponsored by international organisations. Asian countries should collaborate in framing and developing economic policies to be placed before international organisations.

Reconstruction of Agriculture

Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao presented the reports on agricultural reconstruction and industrial development.

After mentioning the backward condition of agriculture generally in Asian countries, the problems created by the devastation caused by enemy occupation of a number of countries and current civil unrest, the report on agricultural reconstruction states that the problem is pre-eminently one of raising the standard of living of the masses of population who are engaged in agricultural and allied occupations.

First among the broad principle of agricultural reconstruction should be mentioned the need for raising agricultural productivity by the use of better seed, more modern methods of cultivation and the use of fertilisers; simultaneously the area under cultivation should be extended as much as possible by large-scale development schemes. More capital should be made available to the peasants in the form of equipment, fertilizers, etc. In view of the general poverty among the agricultural classes, it is only the State which can provide the required capital to the peasantry.

Industrialisation and development of cottage industries affording seasonal employment are highly necessary. It is also necessary to secure decentralisation of factories.

The terms of trade between agricultural and non-agricultural produce have always operated to the disadvantage of the former, thanks primarily to the better organisation of the manufacturing countries. As Asia is pre-eminently an agricultural continent and largely exports of raw material and primary products and imports

of manufactured goods from Europe and America, this problem has to be tackled in any scheme of agricultural reconstruction in Asia.

At the moment, transport facilities as regards movement of Asian agricultural produce across national continental frontiers is largely in the hands of non-Indians. If this is not remedied and Asian countries be organised to get control over transport facilities, especially shipping, it will be difficult to secure to the Asian cultivator adequate return from agricultural reconstruction.

There should be a substantial reduction in the share of landlords and traders in agricultural income. Fundamental reforms are necessary in the realm of land tenure and ownership should be secured to the actual tiller of the soil. Only a development of co-operative marketing based on mutual aid would enable the agricultural classes to get a larger share of agricultural income than at present.

NEED FOR SELF-SUFFICIENCY IN FOOD

An ideal solution of the problem of landless agricultural labourers would be to give landless labour possession of land. In any event steps must be taken to ensure for them an equitable share of agricultural income.

The report mentions with appreciation the collective farming units in the Asian Republics of the USSR and the Jewish Co-operative Settlements in Palestine. All over Asia, says the report, emphasis at the moment is on food production and it is hoped that Asia will soon be in a position to cease spending her foreign exchange resources on importing food rather than on capital equipment of which she is in such bad need. The countries have to take their choice between methods such as those followed in Russia with its emphasis on collective farming, or in Turkey with the emphasis on State initiative, or in Sudan with the emphasis on company management, or in Palestine with the emphasis on mutual aid and co-operation. There is general agreement, however, that agricultural reconstruction depends for its success in the last resort upon the extent to which the human factor is harnessed and its enthusiasm roused; this cannot be done without carrying out fundamental land reforms and linking up ownership and cultivation in the same hands.

Many delegates deplored the fact that allocation of rice was made at present from Washington in spite of the fact that the bulk of the production, consumption and trade in rice takes place in Asia. It was suggested that a beginning in Inter-Asian agricultural co-operation should be made by the countries located in South-East Asia which account for 85 per cent of the world production of rice, forming a Rice Board for South-East Asia for increasing the production, bettering the distribution and stabilising the price of rice in South East Asia. The experience resulting from the working of such a Board could be applied with advantage to similar schemes for other agricultural products.

The sentiment was unanimous that agricultural reconstruction is long overdue in Asia and that immediate steps should be taken by each individual nation to undertake the necessary measures of reconstruction. The sentiment was also unanimous that in this task there is a great deal of scope for inter-Asian action in the matter of exchange of information, pooling of experience and taking of common counsel on matters of mutual concern. It was emphasised however, that all such measures should be consistent with the spirit of international co-operation and of the U. N. O. It was also felt that full advantage should be taken of the facilities afforded by existing international organisations, such as the F. A. O. in order to improve agricultural conditions in Asia.

Industrial Development

The report on industrial development states that survey of the industrial position in the Asian countries reveals with glaring sharpness the low measure of industrialisation which this continent has reached, with, however, certain prominent exceptions, such as the Asiatic Republics of the USSR, Turkey, parts of Palestine and parts of the Middle East. The statements which follow are, therefore, intended mainly to depict the conditions and discuss the problems of the rest of Asia.

Among these Asian nations India is the only country, barring Japan, which is industrialised to any insignificant extent in the Western sense, and even India has such large gaps in her industrial structure as heavy chemicals, heavy engineering and other basic and defence industries. The rest of Asia, with the possible exception of China, do not possess even the light industries and have to rely on imports for the supply of manufactured consumer goods. Taking Asia

as a whole, it would not be incorrect to say that she is exporter of raw materials and importer of finished goods. The industrial status of the bulk of Asia is a clear corollary of her colonial economy; and the real test of Asian independence would be the extent to which she is able to achieve a substantial measure of industrialisation.

Industrial development raises certain problems which are common to all Asian countries. The most important of these is the problem of capital equipment. Capital equipment has to be obtained from Europe or America and it cannot be obtained except in return for exports from Asia of raw materials and primary products. The extent to which such exports can be made is limited, particularly to-day as a result of the effects of the war on the production of such goods in Asia, while the imports of capital equipment needed are likely to exceed the value of such exports.

It seems inevitable that a number of Asian countries will have to obtain substantial imports of foreign capital for carrying out their programmes of industrial development. Opinion was, however, unanimous that such imports of foreign capital should not be obtained under conditions that will result in foreign control of domestic economy, which would only lead to the emergence of the colonial economy under a new guise.

It was felt, therefore, that imports of capital should be obtained by the Governments of the countries concerned rather than by private interests. Only then sufficient strength could be afforded to the borrower to resist the direct and indirect domination that a lender usually exercises on the borrowing country. One delegate differed from this view and expressed the opinion that the same objective could be served by insisting that control should vest in the hands of the private industrialists in the borrowing country, which will leave the control of foreign capital in national, though not Governmental hands. In any case, there was unanimity for the view that great care must be taken in determining the conditions under which foreign capital is imported; and it was felt that the terms and conditions of foreign borrowing was a suitable subject for mutual consultation among the Asian countries. Among such conditions should be considered the desirability of imposing limitations on profits and ensuring the maintenance of minimum living standards.

It appeared as a result of discussions that with inter-Asian co-operation it should be possible to establish in Asia, taking all countries together, quite a large number of post-graduate and research institutions.

The report deplored the "complete domination" now exercised in the fields of transport and communications by non-Asian nations and it was felt that without Asian countries controlling and owning various types of transport and different forms of communication, such as shipping, radio, cables, etc., it would be difficult either to attain economic independence or develop closer contacts among them or enjoy a substantial share of the fruits of economic development.

It was generally felt that the question of the State's role in industrial development would have to be dealt with by each country in the light of its own circumstances, administrative resources, traditions, etc., but it was agreed that key industries, defence industries and public utilities may appropriately fall within the purview of State-ownership or control.

Opinion was also widely expressed that there should be a sector of industrial economy which should be left to private enterprise. There was general agreement on the need of planning industrial development in each country and one delegate advanced the view that people should begin to think in terms of a co-ordinated and mutually consistent plan of industrial development of all countries in Asia.

It was emphasised that agricultural reconstruction and industrial development constitute the key-note of Asia's transition from a colonial to a national economy. Without them, it is impossible to raise the standard of living of the masses of the people. They are also essential for the maintenance of the political independence which many of the Asian countries are now acquiring and for enabling Asia to make full contribution to world security and the maintenance of world peace.

Agricultural reconstruction and industrial development are not going to be easy for an Asian country or even for the whole of Asia taken together. At the same time it is not too difficult, particularly if Asian governments will take the initiative in reconstructing and developing their economies and enlisting the fullest co-operation of their people. In the achievement of this objective, there is considerable room for inter-Asian cooperation, consistently with world objectives and the fullest utilisation of the existing specialised agencies of the U. N.

Mr. S. W. R. Banuarnaike was Chairman, Mr. D. Sjahroezah was Vice-Chairman and Prof. D. R. Gadgil, Rapporteur of the group dealing with transition from colonial to national economy while for the group which considered agricultural reconstruction and industrial development, Mr. David Eacohen was Chairman, Major-General Vijaya Shumshere Jung was Vice-Chairman and Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao was Rapporteur.

Seventh Day—New Delhi—1st April 1947

Gandhiji's Appeal To Asian Delegates

Mahatma Gandhi, taking advantage of his presence in the capital for political purposes, attended the penultimate plenary session of the Conference this evening for a few minutes. The delegates assembled from 23 countries of Asia stood up as a mark of respect both when he entered the hall and when he left it.

Yielding to their persistent demand, *Mahatma Gandhi* amidst loud and continued applause urged the Conference to work for the 'one world' ideal with determination. His remark that a free India would not use her influence to suppress other parts of the world was also greeted with cheers. Before leaving the Conference, the leaders of the various delegations walked up to the dais and warmly shook hands with *Gandhiji*.

Gandhiji said: "I would not like to live if it was not one world. I would certainly like to see that dream realised in my lifetime. If all of you representatives who have come here from different parts of Asia go away with one mind and with that fixed determination to carry your will through, there is no doubt that in your own generation you will succeed and see that dream realised."

Describing the Conference as a 'great event for us all who belong to Asia' *Mahatma Gandhi* said this was perhaps for the first time in history that such a Conference was being held on Indian soil.

Gandhiji urged the delegates to carry away sweet memories with them and hoped they would make every effort to build the great edifice of Truth, for Truth was God.

Why had the representatives of the Asiatic powers and peoples come together, he asked. Was it in order to wage war against Europe, America or against non-Asiatics? "I would emphatically say no. This is not India's mission. I would feel extremely sorry if India, having won her independence essentially—rather predominantly—through non-violent means, was going to use that independence for the suppression of other parts of the world—let alone Asiatic powers, but even European powers, although European powers have exploited the different races inhabiting this vast continent till now, it would be a sorry thing."

Mahatma Gandhi suggested that the Conference might meet yearly, or once in two years or three years. "If you ask me where, I would say India is the place. You will forgive me for that partiality for India."

Mahatma Gandhi, who spoke in response to persistent demands from the audience, said he was hoping to say a few words at to-morrow's session of the Conference. But if anyone would ask questions, he would try to answer them to-day.

CHINESE DELEGATE'S QUESTION

Addressing *Gandhiji* as 'the spirit of India, the light of Asia and great man of the world,' Dr. Han Diwu from China asked him to say a few words on the proposal to form an Asian Institute.

Gandhiji said although *Pandit Nehru* had asked him to attend the Conference right from the beginning he had been unable to do so. When Lord Mountbatten, the new Viceroy, invited him to meet him, however he could not say "no". It would have been foreign to his nature to do so. The Viceroy had already told him that the credit for bringing him to Delhi during the Asian Conference must really be his. And he had told the Viceroy: "I am your prisoner. But, I am also *Pandit Nehru's* prisoner, for, after all, he is your Vice-President."

Gandhiji prefaced his remarks about the Asian Conference by saying that he was doubtful whether he would be able to say anything useful. But the question was one after his heart. He was naturally interested in all the people that were coming, having known by correspondence almost all parts of the world—and therefore of Asia. It was indeed a great event for the people of Asia.

REFERENCE TO CONDITIONS IN INDIA

Gandhiji indirectly referred to the disturbances in the country and said he was sorry "we do not know how to keep the peace between ourselves. We have so many opinions which we do not know how to settle between ourselves in a humane manner. We think we must resort to the law of the jungle. It is an experience which

I would not like you to carry to your respective countries. I would, instead, like you to bury it here.

"Now when India is on the eve of Independence, she wants to be independent of everyone who wants to own this country, who wants to be its lord and master. We do not want any change of masters, We want to be our own masters.

"How shall we be our own masters? I do not know; I am sure that *Pandit Nehru* does not know; I am sure *Khan Sahib (Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, sitting beside him)* does not know. All that we know is that we should do our duty and leave the results in the hands of God, not in the hands of man. Man is supposed to be the master of his own destiny but it is only partly true. He can make his own destiny only in so far as he is allowed by the great power which overrides all our intentions and plans and carries out his own plans. I call that power not by the name of Allah, Khuda or God, but Truth. You gentlemen from different parts of Asia having come here and having met together, should carry away sweet memories of the meeting and make every effort to build that great edifice of Truth.

Dr. Sharir's Address

Dr. *Sutan Sharir* made his first public appearance at an international conference when he attended the plenary session of the Asian Relations Conference this morning. "Our being here", he said speaking to the delegates, "is due not only to our immediate interest in the business of the Conference but because we had been isolated so long."

He said that more important than all conferences, were the personal contacts that one made. He hoped, in the remaining two days of the Conference, to meet as many people as he could.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, welcoming Dr. *Sharir*, said that as usual Dr. *Sharir* had given them all many surprises. They had heard a few days ago that he might come, then, that he would come but only after the Conference, and finally he had arrived unexpectedly at midnight yesterday and many people who had wanted to greet him at the airport had been unable to do so.

Dr. *Sharir's* presence had great significance for India, *Pandit Nehru* continued, as Indonesia had played a very important part in the Asian world during the last two or three years.

Pandit Nehru then welcomed the Korean delegation which also arrived yesterday.

Report On Freedom Movements Adopted

The plenary session then heard and adopted with a few amendments the group report on national movements for freedom, read by Mr. *M. A. Raschid* of Burma. Mr. *Hoalim* from Malaya presided.

The report is the only one presented at the conference frankly discussing a political issue, without entering into the history of individual movements. The report says that freedom movements in Asia had derived their inspiration from revolutionary developments in various parts of the world and that the outbreak of the second world war focussed greater attention on freedom movements in Asia.

There is an intensive and widespread urge in Asian countries to terminate foreign domination, the report says and adds that for various reasons Western Colonial powers, particularly Britain, cannot afford much longer to hold Asian countries in subjection and therefore, the question might resolve itself into that of the speedy termination and peaceful transfer of political power.

All Asian countries, the report continues, should develop the attitude that Imperialism could not continue to dominate any part of Asia for any length of time and all Asian nations should take effective steps to see that imperialist domination over them was speedily terminated.

Some delegates expressed apprehension that western powers would attempt to continue economic domination and it was necessary to bear this in mind as political freedom would be of little value. It was also felt by some delegates that Britain would try to become stronger in Ceylon and Malaya with a view to retaining her supremacy in the Indian Ocean and that these "danger spots should be carefully watched for developments. It was urged that no Asian country should aid any colonial power directly or indirectly to keep any other Asian country in subjection. It was also stated that the smaller Asian countries would need economic help from larger Asian powers, but it was hoped that such assistance would not lead to domination by the large power. Admiration was expressed for those Asian Countries struggling to free themselves from imperial domination and particularly for the Indonesian and Viet Nam people. One delegate suggested that a neutrality bloc be formed in Asia.

Regarding the use of Indian troops in Burma and Indonesia, the report states that Indian delegates explained that till recently Indian troops in Burma and Indonesia had been under foreign control and that the interim Government had adopted the policy that Indian troops should be withdrawn from other Asian countries and that in no case would these troops be allowed to be used for the suppression of any national freedom movements in Asia.

The report also stated that Indian delegates stated that with regard to support for freedom movements, it was difficult to visualise, short of declaring war, anything but moral support. It was emphasised that any support given should not have the effect of enlarging the area of conflict.

Indian and Chinese delegates promised full support to Asian countries seeking admission to the UNO and other international organisations. It was also suggested that all other Asian countries immediately recognise the Indonesian Republic.

It was unanimously agreed that indigenous minorities resident in any Asian country should support and assist the struggle of that country for freedom. All Asian countries should treat non-indigenous minorities fairly as no country, it was pointed out, could be regarded as completely free unless it had the goodwill of all national minorities within it.

Group Reports Adopted

The afternoon plenary session of the Asian Relations Conference to-day adopted group reports on labour problems, social services and the status of women and their movements. Mr. Fousef, the Azerbaijan delegate, presided.

The report on labour problems stated that agriculture constituted the major occupation for peoples of the Asian countries and that there was silent competition between industrial and agricultural labour as the conditions of the former could not be improved without improvements in the conditions of the latter. Agricultural labour was becoming more and more conscious of its importance and there was also indication that trade unionism was gaining a hold on it. In this connection it was pointed out that plantation labour was easier to organise, as had been proved in Indonesia and Ceylon.

Leaving aside the Soviet Republic in Asia, where agriculture had been largely industrialised, two features were common to most of the other countries, it was stated. One was that industrial labour was more organised and that more figures and data were available about it than for agricultural labour. While in cases such as those of China and a few other countries industrial labour had been able to improve its condition during the war, it was generally agreed that even so the economic condition of workers in most Asian countries was far behind that of workers in Great Britain and other industrial countries. Therefore the pace of progress in this field must be more rapid than in the more advanced countries.

While the social objective was the raising of the standard of living through increased production and more equitable distribution, there was one danger that had to be guarded against. There was the threat of post-war unemployment facing most countries in the world and this called for national and international measures to meet it. Steps must be taken to see that any gains that agricultural labour had made during the war must be maintained.

In the opinion of the group, experience had shown that strikes cannot be eliminated by legislation alone. It was doubtful whether the right to strikes could be checked and if it was, there must be compensating limits on the right of lockouts and changes in the terms of employment. It was felt that the labour problem could be better solved by associating labour with administration of both industry and public affairs and joint management was more likely to eliminate the problem of strikes in industry.

It was stated that all over Asia, there had been a tremendous growth in Trade Union activities and that agricultural labour had also been drawn into it.

CHARTER OF HUMAN RIGHTS

The recommendations of the report include the formulation of a charter of human rights embodying minimum standards of requirements for food, education, housing and social security; extension of political rights to workers; co-operation with the World Trade Union Conference and the I.L.O.; and the organisation of training centres for Trade Union officers. The report also recommended general legislation for the improvement of conditions of workers.

The group reports on social services and status of women which were jointly presented, agreed that the existing conditions in health hygiene, housing and education required great improvement in most Asian countries, with the exception of the Soviet

Republic in Asia, and that these improvements could not be carried out by private enterprise alone. It was by State action alone and the nationalisation of social services that the necessary changes could be brought about as quickly as was considered desirable. It was stated in the report that expenditure for such purposes could never be too great.

MAIN SUGGESTIONS

Action on the following lines was suggested by the two groups in their report.

- (1) Collection of information in respect of all these questions in different Asian Countries. The Conference itself has shown that the different countries can learn a great deal from one another, and a pooling of experience and resources would be conducive to the interests of all.
- (2) Expansion of medical education and the training of nurses and midwives.
- (3) Introduction of social security schemes.
- (4) Definition of minimum standards of housing for the adult population in conformity with the climatic and geographical conditions of the country.
- (5) Promotion and control of schemes for providing sanitary and other amenities in urban and rural areas.
- (6) Provision of compulsory education in ever-increasing degrees for all.
- (7) Conscription of students for education services both in rural and urban areas.
- (8) Steps for minimising the disparity between conditions in rural and urban areas in respect of social amenities.

Eighth Day—New Delhi—2nd. April 1947

Filipino Delegate's Greetings

A crowd of over 20,000 persons assembled inside the shamiana in Puran Quila to attend the concluding session of the Asian Relations Conference this evening.

Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, who came to the Conference straight from her sick bed, took the chair amidst loud cheers.

The leaders of three newly arrived delegations from the Philippines, Outer Mongolia and Korea, conveyed their greetings to the fellow-delegates at the outset.

The Philippine delegate, Mr. *Alexandro D. Castro*, speaking of his country's recent liberation from foreign domination, said the United States of America had readily done magnificently by his country. Even after the Philippines became free, the United States was helping her to rehabilitate herself. Referring to the Asian Conference, the Philippine delegate said the discussions at the Conference had been most instructive and valuable and his country would try to carry out the suggestions made in the various reports as far as possible.

The leader of the Mongolian delegation expressed the hope that the contacts established at the Conference would be developed and strengthened.

To the people of India who were very soon going to be fully free, the Mongolian delegate wished all success and prosperity in the future.

The delegate from Korea said the Asian countries had come together determined to be a single unit—a unit not separate from the rest of the world, but a unit which would function within the larger unit which was the world itself.

A delegate from Egypt, Mr. *Momin*, who spoke next, pointed out that the desire of the countries of Asia to come together did not mean hostility to any other nation. It was only a step in the direction of world co-operation, aimed at the realisation of justice, freedom and happiness for all the human races.

As the next speaker, the delegate from Iran, began his speech in beautiful sonorous Persian, *Mahatma Gandhi* arrived. Mrs. Naidu asked the speaker to pause for a while as she wanted *Mahatma Gandhi* also to hear the sonorous Persian. To avoid the crowd, *Mahatma Gandhi* entered the dais through an entrance at the back. He was given a great ovation.

The Iranian delegate said that the true foundations of a great organisation had been laid as a result of the Conference. This organisation would, he hoped, help the present and future generations on the road to prosperity.

Mrs. Naidu next called upon the Indonesian premier, Dr. *Sharif*—whom she described as an 'atom bomb'—to speak.

Dr. Sharif's Speech

Rising amidst continued applause, Dr. *Sharif* thanked India for the kindness shown to him and his country. The Indonesians deeply appreciated the reasons which led to the inauguration of the Conference—namely the desire to see the Asian continent rise to its full stature, not in a spirit of hostility or as a threat to others

in other lands but purely in order to create for Asia the opportunity to develop along humanistic lines.

The world to-day was living in troubled times when changes of far-reaching consequences were taking place everywhere. Despite this, the present was the time for action. "But even while we initiate policies and execute plans, care must be taken to see that these things are done in such a manner that the consequences of our action would not be unpalatable to other peoples but would strengthen the bonds existing between the races of the world."

Above everything, the compelling factor which had made the Conference a success was a bond of common sentiment—an Asian sentiment. There was no doubt that such a sentiment existed. In his opinion, the sentiment was based not only on truth and justice but was in consonance with the whole humanity. This sentiment must be so directed and used that it would not fall from the path of justice, humanity and idealism. If this was done, it would lead to "One Asia" and ultimately "One World."

Dr. *Sharir* hoped that delegates would carry with them to their respective countries a message of hope and inspiration from the gathering and work for the implementation of the ideals for which the Conference stood.

Dr. *Sharir* thanked all the countries who had supported Indonesia in her struggle. He had a special word of thanks for India "for her moral and material support" to his country. The Indonesians would never be guilty, he added, of ingratitude.

Gandhiji's Parting Words To Delegates

Mahatma Gandhi who followed Dr. *Sharir*, said that what the delegates had seen of India was not the real India. The real India lay in the 700 thousand villages of India, where thirty-eight crores of people lived. "Perhaps if you see a few villages, you will see real India where miserable specimens of humanity with lustreless eyes live. Yet in those humble cottages, in the midst of these dung-heaps are to be found the humble bhungia."

Stating that wisdom had come to the west from the East, *Mahatma Gandhi* said that all the great teachers of the world had belonged to the East. "Zoroaster belonged to the East. He was followed by Buddha, he belonged to the East—to India; Moses belonged to Palestine. Then came Jesus. Then came *Mohammad*. I omit *Krishna*, *Mahavir* and others unknown to the outside world. All the same, I do not know a single person to match these men of Asia and then what happened? Christianity became disfigured when it went to the west. I am sorry to say it, but that is my view.

"I want you to understand, if you can, that the message of the East, the message of Asia is not to be learnt through European spectacles. If you want to give a message to the west, it must be a message of love and truth. I want you to go away with the thought that Asia has to conquer the west—through love and truth."

Gandhiji referred again to-day to what he said yesterday about "One world" and said: "Of course, I believe in 'one world.' How can I possibly do otherwise, when I became an inheritor of the message of love that these great unconquerable teachers left for us? You can re-deliver that message now in this age of democracy, in the age of awakening of democracy, in the age of awakening of the poorest of the poor. You can re-deliver this message with the greatest emphasis. Then you will complete the conquest of the west—not through vengeance because you have been exploited in the past, but through love.

"If all of you put your hearts together and not merely your heads and understand the secret of the messages of all these wise men of the East and if we really become worthy of the great message, you will easily understand that the conquest of the west will be complete and that conquest will be loved by the west itself. That west to-day is pining for wisdom. It is to-day in despair of the multiplication of atom bombs because the multiplication of atom bombs means utter destruction not merely of the west but the destruction of the world; as if the prophecy of the Bible is going to be fulfilled and there is to be—heaven forbid—a deluge.

"It is up to you to deliver the whole world, not merely Asia, from that sin. That is a precious heritage your teachers and my teachers have left to us."

The leader of the Chinese delegation on behalf of all the delegates from the various countries presented *Pandit Nehru* and *Mrs. Naidu* with silver platter each for their great services in organising the Conference.

NEXT SESSION IN CHINA

Announcing that the next session of the Conference would be held two years

from now in China the Chinese delegate extended a cordial welcome to all the Countries to be present.

The Viet Nam delegate read out a message from the President of Viet Namese Republic Dr. *Ho Chi Minh*, expressing his regret at not being able to attend the Conference in person. "My heart and my thoughts will be with you during the Conference. The success of this Conference will be ours because it will be the success of the Asian people".

President *Ho Chi Minh* also expressed gratitude for the support which Viet Nam had received from the Asian countries.

After *Pandit Nehru* had addressed the Conference, Mrs. *Naidu* wound up the proceedings.

Resolution On Asian Organisation

Following is the resolution on the Asian Relations organisation passed at this morning's plenary session of the Asian Relations Conference.

"The members of the delegations from the Asian Countries, assembled in the first Asian Relations Conference in New Delhi, firmly believing that the peace of the world, to be real and enduring, must be linked up with the freedom and well-being of the peoples of Asia, are unanimously of the opinion that the contacts forged at this Conference must be maintained and strengthened and that the good work begun here must be continued, efficiently organised and actively developed. They accordingly resolve to establish an organisation to be called the Asian Relations organisation with the following objects:

(a) To promote the study and understanding of Asian problems and relations in their Asian and world aspects.

(b) To foster friendly relations and co-operation among the peoples of Asia and between them and the rest of the world, and

(c) To further the progress and well-being of the peoples of Asia.

"To this end, a Provisional General Council is appointed. The Provisional General Council will elect a President and two General Secretaries, one from the country in which the first Conference has been held and the other from the country in which the next Conference is to be held.

"The Asian Relations Organisation will be composed of national units, one in each Asian country, affiliated to the organisation. The units will be non-governmental in character with objects similar to those of the organisation. The organisation and the units will devote themselves to the study of Asian and International affairs and have no party affiliations, nor will they engage in political propaganda.

"The first task of the members of the Provisional General Council on return to their respective countries will be to take immediate steps to secure affiliation of existing national units and to establish such units where they do not exist. The Council is authorised to grant such affiliation. The work of the organisation will be carried out in the countries concerned through their respective national units after they are established and affiliated to the organisation and, pending such establishment and affiliation, through their members on the Council.

"The next General Conference will be convened in 1949. The Council may convene special or regional conferences in the interval for special purposes in general conformity with the objects of the organisation at centres which it considers suitable. The Council will take such action as may be considered necessary from time to time for the progressive development of the organisation.

"The Council will frame a provisional constitution under which the organisation will function. This constitution will be submitted for ratification to a general or special conference.

"The Provisional General Council now appointed will hold office until the body which is to take its place is elected and assumes office. The following are the members of the Provisional General Council.

Dr. Abdul Majid Khan, Afghanistan, Mr. Taquiddeen Elsolen, Arab League, Mr. Kalantar, Armenia, Mr. Yusufov, Azerbaijan; the Hon. Mr. Justice Kyaw Myint; Burma. Mr. M. A. Raschid, Burma. The Hon. Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike, Ceylon. The Hon. Mr. R. George De Silva, Ceylon; Mr. Han Lih-wu, China; Mr. Wen Yuan-Ning, China; Mr. Kupradze, Georgia; Dr. Abu Hanifah, Indonesia; Mr. Soeripno, Indonesia; Dr. G. H. Sadighi, Iran; H. E. Ali Asghar Hekmat, Iran; Mr. Sharipov, Karyakistan; Dr. Paik, Korea; Dr. Burhanuddin, Malaya; Mr. J. A. Thivy, Malaya; Mr. Lub San Vandan, Mongolia; Major General Bijaya Shumshere Jung Bahadur Rana, Nepal; Prof. Hugo

Bergmann, Palestine; Mr. Anastacio de Castro and A. M. Mannel S. Emerge, Philippines; Prof. Sukit Nimanhemindran, Siam; Mr. Tursunzade, Tadzhikistan, Mr. Sarimsakov, Uzbekistan; Dr. Tran Van Luan, Viet Nam; Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, India; Rani Laxmi Bai Rajwade, India.

Pt. Nehru's Call to Asians

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, addressing the Conference, referred to the setting up of the Asian Relations Organisation and said: "So we have arrived at the end of this Conference and the beginning of our work. All these nine days we were preparing for this final act, that is to say, to lay the foundations of some kind of an organisation which would carry on the work of this Conference, for otherwise, if we had not done this—this Conference itself would not have failed of course, because such an endeavour can never fail,—nevertheless, it would have been a bit of a failure if all this work should end without any effort really to continue it. So to-day the plenary session of the Conference decided to start an Asian Relations Organisation. They started it in a simple way without a complicated organisation with a Provisional General Council and with certain simple rules.

"The Provisional Council did me the honour of electing me its President (cheers). Being irresponsible by nature (laughter), not thinking too much of what might lie in store in future, I accepted that office. But it is a heavy burden because there are no known paths to trial except memories of to-day and hopes of the future. That is enough, certainly; yet we have to build this organisation from the bottom up. It is not something which we merely have to carry on and in the building of this obviously we will not succeed unless all of us function together and co-operate together."

MESSAGE OF ASIA

It was remarkable how much unanimity there was among the varied people coming to the Conference from the four corners of this mighty continent, continued *Pandit Nehru*. When he thought of this Conference in session and tried to think of other conferences in Europe or America or elsewhere and compared the two, a certain hope and emotion filled him, that what we were doing here was not a thing of the moment, just a big show for a number of people who had come from abroad, but that there was something deeper behind it which would carry the message of Asia to other countries and other continents. The age-long message of Asia had something of enormous value for modern civilisation in the West. In spite of all the great advantages of the West, there had been something strangely lacking there and because of that lack they had to come to this pass when with all the good things of the world before them they yet quarrelled and thought in terms of war.

It was astonishing that when, with the advantages of science before us, the whole world could be a happy, prospering, co-operative commonwealth, people think of wars and of hating each other and of killing each other and devise tremendous engines of war and one people should suppress another. We stood for the UNO because therein lay some hope of world co-operation and world peace and yet the United Nations had not functioned in an obviously united way. They had not set an example of peace and goodwill in their attempts to function together. He hoped that these were only the beginning and that they would survive the struggle and lead to a better and co-operative world.

This mighty civilisation of the West, which had done so much in raising human standards, yet somehow occasionally did something which made us sink to the level of the beast. What was it that it was lacking? He did not know. Perhaps it might be that something of essential spirit, the old wisdom of Asia might help to provide that lack in Western civilisation. In any event, we of Asia should try first of all to hear our own message because we could not carry that message to others unless we knew it ourselves. During these past ages and past generations, we had forgotten ourselves what we were and what we are. "We have to find ourselves, others undoubtedly will find us also. We are now in the process of finding ourselves and, therefore, others are also in the process of realising that Asia is not merely something on the map, is not merely a place for the rivalry of various imperialism or a place where there are markets to be exploited but that Asia consists of human beings with dignity, human beings with a long past behind them and human beings who are going to have a great future. (Cheers).

"We are going to have a great future. So in this sense we are always living

in a period of transition. The world is not a static place, yet sometimes there are some landmarks which divide one era from another and undoubtedly I think all the delegates who come from abroad will agree with me that this Conference has been such a landmark in the history of Asia, it is a landmark in the history of the world."

For a number of centuries Europe was the centre of history because it was most dynamic, creative and adventurous continent. What was happening today? Europe would continue, of course, as a highly cultured and highly civilised continent but it was that the centre of events was shifting from Europe. On the one side it had shifted to America and on the other to Asia (cheers).

It was up to us to realise the part we had got to play and train our respective nations for it. We could not, and must not, think in terms of a small and unworthy part, a narrow, if he might say so, just purely nationalist part even. Although inevitably the nations of Asia must be nationalistic and must advance along the lines of their nationalism, to-day we were facing bigger problems and these could not be solved by a mere nationalistic approach. Therefore, we were going to maintain contacts and meet together frequently so that we might evolve common plans of action.

"I have no doubt at all that your coming here has been a vast education to the Indian people. They will feel in a friendly way towards your countries and I hope that in the same sense you who go away from here will carry away with you friendly memories not of us few whom you have met but of the people of Asia (cheers).

"Unfortunately the part of India you have seen most is New Delhi and perhaps a little of Old Delhi.

THE REAL INDIA

"Mahatma Gandhi was telling you that this not India. If you want to see India, you have to go to hundreds of villages and see their poverty. It is not a pleasant sight, yet it is not good avoiding reality because it is unpleasant. That is India and the problem of India is the problem of the poverty of India and unless we can get rid of that poverty, all else will be nothing. We are going to have political independence of course, but if that independence has any meaning, it must lead to the elimination and liquidation of this poverty in India (cheers). I talked of poverty in India but there are few Asian countries which are not cursed by these low standards and poverty.

"It is a common problem for all Asia and, therefore, one of the special things we have to undertake wherever we go is to tackle this problem of poverty of raising the standards of the people and trying to learn from each other's experience. This organisation that we have established, I trust, will help us in learning of each other's failures as well as successes."

ACADEMY FOR ASIAN STUDIES

The new Provisional General Council had made a recommendation to all national units to start academies or schools for Asian studies. It was for the delegates when they went back to give effect, in so far as they could, to that recommendation. They proposed to have in Delhi such an academy which really would be in the nature of a big university and he appealed to the people of Delhi especially and the people of India generally to take it up quickly, because the burden was going to fall upon them.

Referring to the troubles in India, Pandit Nehru said: "You read in the newspapers of the troubles we are having in India and we sometimes read in newspapers of troubles you are having in your countries. There is hardly a country which is devoid of trouble and conflict. Perhaps that is a legacy of this war, perhaps it is an inevitable consequence of having to pass through this period of transition. What is happening in India is bad enough and those of us who have to shoulder responsibility for this find it a heavy enough burden. Yet, do not imagine for a single instant, you who come from abroad or you who live in this country that this trouble and conflict that is taking place in India is anything that frightens us.

"We are having trouble, we may have more trouble, but big things are happening in the world, in Asia and in India, and when ancient empires are uprooted, the ground shakes. You cannot have the birth of complete freedom without the labour pains that accompany every birth. So while we regret what is happening and we try to put an end to it, to find a peaceful way of progressing, we also realise that sometimes it is inevitable that this kind of thing happens.

And we have to face it and try to conquer it as undoubtedly we shall, and as undoubtedly you will wherever you may come from. So, I want you to face these difficulties and troubles in Asia as elsewhere, with confidence in yourselves and in the future of your country and of Asia."

Mrs. Naidu's Appeal

Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, in her closing address, said: "During the speeches of the various delegates we heard the same echo, the same urge and desire that there shall be understanding, that there shall be co-operation, that there shall be a free and united Asia. (Cheers.) In this heart of Delhi, in this heart of the old Hindu Empire, we have founded to-day our new world of brotherhood, not an empire which monopolises power for any one section or another but a federation of Free Peoples where every individual is as great as the next, where there will be no leaders and no followers, but all will be brothers in a mighty task of regeneration. Pandit Nehru has said that Europe and America have been dynamic centres of culture, organisation, science and achievement. All honour to these young continents. But we of the immortal East, we who were when time was, we who will exist as long as eternity lasts, we have a lesson to teach to the world. But, as Pandit Nehru said, let us first understand the message ourselves.

"For centuries that message of the East has been almost forgotten and lost on narrow minds. We have followed after strange gods, we have despised our own treasures and sought the imitations that come to us from outside. But to-day consciousness has returned to us, we are reborn in the crucibles of many sufferings and we have emerged pure gold, the gold of Asia. What other message have we received or could we receive from these brothers from far-off places who have come to us over the mountain tracks, over the clouds and over the oceans and brought us their good-will and their faith in our honesty of purpose?

"They have realised that it is the place and function of India to rekindle the torches of the world. (Cheers.) And they have brought their own torches to be rekindled, even as the old Zoroastrians brought their burning log a thousand years ago to India whose flame has never died.

"After two years, we shall go to China and as the Chinese delegate gave us his invitation, I thought of what the Prophet of Islam said so beautifully, 'Go even as far as China to seek knowledge.' We shall go to China to seek knowledge and wisdom and all those who came here to-day will go to China to-morrow. And so we have seen the great wheel of destiny in motion again (Cheers). And in the years to come, when I, who speak, am dead, when you who are here are no more, the work we have done to-day will remain, will survive, will be a beacon star to all those who seek freedom, fellowship, equity and love in the world."

MESSAGE OF INDIA

Referring to Mahatma Gandhi's message, Mrs. Naidu, said, "You have heard the message from the lips of the great apostle of Love and Truth. He is feeble to-day, he is bent and tired with the tragic pilgrimage of his to solace the bleeding hearts of sufferers in Bengal and Bihar. But with that frail body, those tired limbs, that old, almost inaudible voice, Gandhi it is who says, 'Love and forgive, love and create, love and be free. This is the message of India, my children, my brothers, my sisters, my daughters'; take that message of Gandhi to your country" (Cheers).

"The long night of India's darkness," said Mrs. Naidu, is coming to a close. We were fatalistic, we believed it was destined that we "should be dependent, that we should be exploited, that we should be dominated. Alas, that period was ours. But no longer, not from to-morrow's dawn, no, not from this hour which we pass. Fellow Asians, my comrades and my kinsmen, arise; remember the end of darkness is here. Together, men and women, let us march forward to the dawn." (Loud Cheers).

Nehru Elected President of Council

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was unanimously elected President of the Provisional General Council of the Asian Relations Organisation at a meeting of the Council held this afternoon. Two General Secretaries were also unanimously elected, Mr. B. Shiva Rao from India and Mr. Han Lihwu from China.

The Council adopted a motion recommending to national units the early establishment of an Academy of Asian Studies in each unit.

A sub-committee was appointed consisting of the President, the two General Secretaries and H. E. Ali Asghar Hekmat (Iran), the Hon. Mr. Bandaranaike (Ceylon), the Hon. Mr. Justice Kyo Myint (Burma) and Dr. Abu Hansah (Indo-

nesia) to draft provisional directives for the guidance of the Secretariat of the Council pending the drafting of a constitution.

Report on Women's Movements

The plenary session earlier adopted the group report on the status of women and women's movements in Asia. The report was read by Miss *Lilamati Naidu*, who was complimented by delegates for the clearest report during the session. The report states that the main objectives of the women's movements in Asia are service to the country through organised efforts to promote the educational, social, political and economic interests of its people, and also to remove all inequalities, restrictions and disabilities imposed on women by religion, custom or law.

Referring to women's legal status, the report says that there should be absolute legal equality between men and women, and this should operate in matters pertaining to inheritance; there should further be joint guardianship of children. With regard to marriage and divorce, the following reforms were advocated: The abolition of polygamy and polyandry; fixing the age limit of marriage for boys at 18 and for girls at 16, with the consent of parents or guardians, otherwise the corresponding ages should be 21 and 18; women should have the same ground for divorce as men.

With regard to franchise, while it was admitted that in some countries, as the Philippines, Egypt and Malaya and China, women had political rights, universal adult franchise should be made operative without undue delay in all Asian countries.

Finally, the report suggested that, for the closer association between women of Asian countries there should be a revival of the All-Asian Women's Conference, of which the only session was held in India in 1931. A Liaison Committee of Asian women representatives should be formed and the affiliation of Asian women's conferences to local units of the permanent organisation should take place.

In an introductory passage, the report points out that Asian women in olden days had enjoyed a better status than they did at present and that long periods of alien domination which had shattered the economic and political structures of Asian countries had robbed the women of their former high estate.

The report also recalled the significant contribution made by women in all freedom movements in Asia and that the struggle for freedom in Asian countries had given women a consciousness of their own destiny as being bound up with the historic destiny of their countries. Women were an indispensable factor in the progressive realisation of national ideals, the report added.

Muslim Leaguer's Attitude

The Muslim League party in the Central Legislature, at a meeting held at New Delhi on the 19th March 1947, decided to boycott the Asian Relations Conference and to decline the invitations which had been sent on behalf of the sponsors of the Conference.

The party issued the following statement: "The so-called Asian Relations Conference which has been sponsored by the Indian Council of World Affairs, ostensibly for the purpose of fostering cultural relations between Asian countries, is a thinly disguised attempt on the part of the Hindu Congress to boost itself politically as the prospective leader of Asiatic peoples. In convening this Conference through the Indian Council of World Affairs, which has been used for Hindu political propaganda abroad, the Congress did not seek the co-operation of the Muslim League which alone represents the hundred million Muslims of India. It is absurd and ridiculous for a Hindu political party to pose as the sole cultural representative of this vast sub-continent, and its attempt to mislead Asiatic countries into accepting it as such is nothing short of a fraud.

"Nor is the present time, when internal conflicts of unprecedented magnitude are inflicting such tremendous wounds on the Indian body-politic and when the future shape of independent India is still to emerge from the welter of the present, opportune for getting together with other peoples of Asia either on the social, cultural or political plane.

The Muslims do not yield to any other section of the peoples of India in their goodwill towards their Asian neighbours, nor are they less anxious to forge cultural and other ties with them. But they cannot countenance the manner in which this particular Conference has been called, nor the motives of its sponsors.

We regret that a number of organisations in Muslim countries should have been beguiled by the Indian Hindu Congress into consenting to participate in this Conference by sending either delegates or observers. Indian Muslims are engaged at

present in a struggle for their very existence with the Indian Hindu Congress at whose invitation these Muslim representatives from abroad have come or are coming. Our Muslim brethren from abroad who have agreed to associate themselves with this move without ascertaining the views of Muslim India are unwittingly doing a disservice to the Muslim cause in India".

Sponsors' Reply to Leaguers' Charge

"The statement issued by the Muslim League party of the Central Legislature announcing its decision to boycott the Asian Relations Conference is grossly inaccurate and misleading in all essential aspects," said the Working Committee of the Conference. The Working Committee added :

"The Indian Council of World Affairs is a non-political body, established in 1943 for the objective study of world problems. Its sponsors and founder-members belong to all parties and invitations were sent to over two hundred representative men and women throughout the country, including members of the Muslim League. Most of the prominent leaders of the Congress were in prison at the time. Its first president was Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, a widely respected Indian with no political affiliation of party character. Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru continues to be its president and would have taken the lead in this Conference had his health enabled him to do so. Among the Vice-presidents of the Council are Sir Maurice Gwyer, ex-Chief Justice of the Federal Court of India and Vice-Chancellor of the Delhi University, and Dr. Zakir Hussain, head of the Jamia Millia, Delhi. From its inception, the Council has rigidly kept itself aloof from all political or communal affiliations and its publications have been acclaimed by all disinterested scholars as entirely objective and factual.

"The decision to invite an Asian Relations Conference was taken by the Indian Council about a year ago so as to bring together the leading men and women of Asia on a common platform to the peoples of this Continent. As the tentative agenda of the Conference issued several months ago shows, the primary object of the Conference is to focus attention on social, economic and cultural problems of the different countries of Asia and to foster mutual contacts and understanding. Political problems, particularly of a controversial character or relating to the internal affairs of any participating countries are deliberately excluded from the agenda of the Conference. Mr. Nehru, after his release from prison, joined the Indian Council and has taken a leading part in promoting the idea of an Asian Relations Conference. In August, 1946, he sought Mr. Jinnah's support for the Conference and at the request of the latter, papers relating to the Conference were sent to him in Bombay. It is regretted that Mr. Jinnah took no further notice of the scheme.

"Efforts have nevertheless continued to be made at every stage to enlist the support of all sections of the people in the country, political or otherwise, for the Conference. The Indian Council of World Affairs, anxious to make the Indian delegation as fully representative as possible, invited a number of outside organisations standing to send suggestions of persons for inclusion in the delegation. The Indian delegation of 48 members consists of prominent Indians who have distinguished themselves in various walks of life and includes distinguished Muslim scholars. They belong to all schools of political thought and a majority of them are not identified with Congress politics.

The Indian Constituent Assembly

2nd. Session—New Delhi—20th January—25th. Jan. 1947

There were two highlights on the opening day of the Indian Constituent Assembly's second session which commenced at New Delhi on the 20th January 1947.

One was the emphatic but reasoned declaration by the President, *Dr. Rajendra Prasad*, that, despite declarations to the contrary in the British Parliament, the Indian Constituent Assembly was fully representative of the country and of every party in the country except the Muslim League.

The other was a brief but telling speech by *Mrs Vijayalakshmi Pandit*, who took the debate above the level of political and legalistic argument to that of idealism, emphasizing an independent India's role as leader of the Asiatic countries and as a force for human progress.

Dr. Prasad Replies To British Critics

Dr. Rajendra Prasad made a statement refuting the views expressed in Parliament recently that the Assembly represented only one major community in India or was a body of Hindus or Caste Hindus.

Mr. Arthur Henderson, under-Secretary of State for India, watched the proceedings of the Assembly for about an hour.

Dr. Rajendra Prasad made a reference to certain textual differences between the Cabinet Mission's Statement of May 16, 1946, as published in India and as circulated by the Assembly office and said the differences were not of a material character. He stated:

"In the course of the debates on India in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords in December last, certain statements were made detracting from the representative character of this Assembly during its last session. Notable among those who spoke in this strain were *Mr. Churchill* and *Viscount Simon*. *Mr. Churchill* observed that the Assembly, as it was meeting then, represented 'only one major community in India'. *Viscount Simon* was more specific and referred to the Assembly as 'a body of Hindus'. He went on further to ask 'whether this meeting of Caste Hindus at Delhi can be regarded by the Government as the Constituent Assembly they meant at all'.

"But these gentlemen have held the highest offices of responsibility and have had a long and intimate connection with affairs of India; and whatever may be their views on current political controversies, they would not, I am sure, like to make statements which are wholly contrary to facts and lead to mischievous inferences. It is for the reason that I have considered it necessary on this occasion formally to state the facts. Out of a total of 296 members who were to take part in the preliminary session, 210 members attended. These 210 members consisted of 155 Hindus out of a total of 160, 30 Scheduled Caste representatives out of a total of 33, all the five Sikhs, six Indian Christians out of a total of seven (one of them is also counted as a member of backward tribes), all the five representatives of backward tribes, all three Parsis and four Muslims out of eighty. The significant absence is, of course, that of the representatives of the Muslim League—an absence which we all deeply regret. But it is clear from the figures I have pointed that with the exception of representatives of the Muslim League, every community in India, whatever the party affiliation of the persons representing that community, was represented in the Assembly; and, therefore, to describe the Assembly as representing 'only one major community in India' or as a body of Hindus or as a 'meeting of Caste Hindus' is a complete travesty of facts.

"Members may recollect that, in the course of the debates in the Constituent Assembly on *Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's* resolution, *Mr. Jaipal Singh* (Bihar) pointed out that there was a discrepancy between the Cabinet Mission's Statement of May 16, 1946, as published in India, and the printed pamphlet circulated by the Assembly office. The discrepancy referred to was in Paragraph 20 of the Statement. His complaint was that whereas the statement originally published in India referred to full representation of the interests affected, our reprint referred only to due representation. I have had the matter investigated since.

"The Principle Information Officer of the Government of India, who originally published the statement in India, and who has been consulted, has informed us that it was printed exactly in accordance with the copy handed over to him by the Information Officer of the Cabinet Mission. Our own pamphlet is an exact reprint

of the White Paper submitted to Parliament. It appears that the statement as published in India underwent some small alterations at the hands of the Cabinet Delegation before being presented to Parliament.

"The discrepancy pointed out by Mr. Jaipal Singh is not only the one; there are a few others also. I am, however, satisfied that in practically all cases these changes are purely verbal. Whether the change in Paragraph 20 is also purely verbal or not is a matter of opinion. I personally do not think that any material difference has been introduced."

Debate on Nehru's Resolution

Sir S. Radhakrishnan, speaking on Pandit Nehru's resolution, said that on the question of independence there could be no difference of opinion. It was inconceivable that India could be a dominion like other dominions which were bound to Great Britain by ties of race, religion or culture. "Yet even though we elect to get out of the British Commonwealth there are hundred different ways of voluntary co-operation and mutual collaboration. Whether all these forms of voluntary co-operation are going to develop in a spirit of friendship or whether they are going to terminate depends completely on the attitude which Great Britain will adopt in the matter."

Sir S. Radhakrishnan made a bitter reference to the recent statements made by Mr. Churchill on India and said, "Such statements merely prolong the agony. The British connection will end, must end."

Referring to the mention of a sovereign Republic in the resolution, Sir S. Radhakrishnan said, "The Princes will be there so long as they make themselves responsible to the people of this country. If the great Paramount Power with its sovereignty in this country by conquest is now transferring responsibility to the representatives of the people, it goes without saying that those who depend on the Paramount Power must also transfer responsibility. I count many of the Princes as my personal friends. The Princes have agreed to the Cabinet Mission's statement. They wish to take their share in the future development of this country and I do hope that they will realise that when large empires are passing away, it is their duty to take notice of the surging aspirations of the people and make themselves responsible. If they do so, they will play a notable part in the shaping of our country. We have no ill-will towards the Princes."

Referring to the absentees members, he said that it was not the desire of the House to establish any sectional rule. "We are not working for a particular community or a particular class. We are here to establish Swaraj for all the Indian people. It will be our endeavour to abolish every vestige of absolutism. We are here to bring about a real satisfaction of the fundamental needs of the common man in the country irrespective of race, religion or community."

It was essential that we must be clear in our objectives and give a sense of exhilaration to the common people. He therefore believed that a declaration of objectives was essential and it was not necessary to wait till the Assembly was more full than it happened to be at the present moment.

Much against its will, said Sir S. Radhakrishnan, the Congress had accepted H. M. G.'s interpretation on Grouping. If after this, and after adequate safeguards were provided for minorities, the British Government still invented some excuse for postponing the change over, it would be a colossal betrayal in human history.

There were two alternatives before Britain, he said. His Majesty's Government could accept the constitution as framed by the Assembly, finding out whether there were adequate safeguards for minorities or not. If, after all these conditions were fulfilled, the British Government still created difficulties, he dared not contemplate the possibility.

Mr. N. V. Gadgil, supporting the resolution, said that there was nothing in the resolution to which any person or any party who was anxious to have freedom could take objection. There was nothing in it to which the Muslim League could object. "If it can be pointed out there is anything objectionable, then certainly it is a matter which can be adjusted when those who take objection to it are here".

The resolution would evoke the necessary loyalty from every citizen for whom the Assembly would draft the new constitution.

Describing the Assembly as a "sort of a council of action", Mr. Gadgil said, "We are here because of the struggle that has been carried on by the people. We will frame the constitution and ask for an honest deed of transfer in favour of the masses who have suffered so long and so much under foreign rule."

"If the British go peacefully, well and good, but if there must be a struggle, I can only say that we do not want to fight but if we have to, we have got the men and we have got the mind. In that case they will have to go leaving nothing behind, not even good-will or good memory". The task of the representatives gathered in the House was great and historic and he had no doubt that they would rise to the occasion and lead this ancient country to its destined goal of freedom.

Mrs. *Vijayalakshmi Pandit*, supporting the resolution, said that it was her privilege in 1937 to move the first resolution after the inauguration of provincial autonomy in the United Provinces, demanding a Constituent Assembly to draw up a constitution for an independent India. "To-day, ten years later, that Constituent Assembly is meeting here. I consider this a historic milestone of our progress towards freedom. And yet freedom remains just a little beyond our grasp. Imperialism dies hard: even though it knows its days are numbered it struggles for survival. We have before us the instance of what is happening in Burma, Indo-China, and Indonesia and we see how there, in spite of the desperate effort of the peoples of those countries are putting up to free themselves, the stranglehold of imperialism is so great that they are unable to shake it off.

"We had seen the sorry spectacle of what happened in San Francisco when the U. N. was being founded. The Asiatic Nations assembled there were so dominated by the imperialist Powers that ruled them that they could speak with no independent voice and echoed only the voice of the respective imperialist Powers. The result is already seen in the fact that in spite of the brave words of the Charter that came into existence at that time, no implementation of that Charter was possible, because there was not enough strength behind it. The peoples of Asia were silent and could not insist upon its implementation. Even now we see that Asia is very far behind the peoples of Europe in representation in the U. N. and it was perhaps the first time in history that at the last United Nations Assembly a country, not itself free, was able to raise its voice not only for the cause it was espousing but for the freedom of the oppressed and dependent peoples all over the world (cheers). The fact that the United Nations Assembly has recognised this is, I think, due to the fact that India, even to-day, has within herself the great power of giving a lead to the world.

"An independent India would no doubt assume the leadership not only of Asia but of the world. So when we meet here in this Assembly to draw up the future constitution of our country, we must not forget that it is not only ourselves and our own good that we must look to but that we have it in our power to help the entire world towards a better way of life."

Our contribution to the future, she said, "is one of neutralisation of political and social discontent and that end we must work for the establishment of freedom in our own country and of freedom in the world. Unless Asia comes into her own, the world cannot function. India, to assume her leadership of Asia and Asia of the world, must first free herself socially, economically and culturally. I appeal to the members of the House to pass the resolution in order to show that this ancient land is conscious of the challenge that has been presented to her and can live up to the ideal of the past."

Mr. *N. G. Ranga* considered the resolution comprehensive and liberal. Unlike similar resolutions that were adopted by other Constituent Assemblies the present resolution specifically mentioned the freedom of action of individuals. Mr. Ranga deplored the absence of Muslim League members and said that even their absence need not bar consideration of the resolution. "Is it necessary," he asked, "that all the people in a family should be present where the only point for consideration is that the total prosperity of the family should be increased? Could there be any member of the family who is against increase of the moral and material prosperity of the family. This resolution is nothing but that. We are here to consider in what manner the rights and obligations, the powers and duties of every individual in this country and groups of people could be increased."

Apart from what was mentioned in the resolution, Mr. Ranga said, it was necessary for them to create conditions in which the masses could take advantage of the privileges conferred on them. The only people in the country who needed protection and whose interests required to be safeguarded were the masses who were economically and socially backward.

Mr. Ranga appealed to the Muslim League not to pursue the path of non-cooperation. The Congress had accepted various safeguards and interpretations which the League had secured from the British.

The League's non-co-operation in the Constituent Assembly, Mr. Ranga said, might arrest India's progress towards freedom, it might be, by a few months, but the masses in the country would soon be in a position to throw away not only British imperialism but also its allies in this country.

Dr. P. K. Sen said that the resolution which proclaimed India's goal as an independent sovereign Republic was meant for those who might be regarded as doubters and waverers. It was also necessary that the Constituent Assembly should proclaim to the world its determination to frame an independent and republican constitution, a Republic in which the ultimate power was vested in the people from whom all power and authority were derived. In so far as this principle was concerned, there was none, neither the League nor any other minority, which was against it.

The British Government, Dr. Sen believed, was now prepared to transfer power. In these circumstances it was incumbent upon the Constituent Assembly to frame its objectives. The resolution, as Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had stated, was a resolve, an undertaking and a dedication when the country had come to the threshold of freedom. "We are," Dr. Sen said, "as it were pilgrims gathered on the threshold of a temple and at this moment we make a vow of dedication or consecration to the task which has been cast upon our shoulders. It is tremendous responsibility. We should have a firm resolve in our minds to so discharge our duties and to frame a constitution for a free, independent and sovereign Republic of India."

Mr. S. Nagappa (Scheduled Caste) claimed that Harijans and Adibasis of this country were the real sons of the soil and even if all the rest decide to go away from the country, the Adibasis and Harijans would remain. Deploring the League's absence, Mr. Nagappa said that it appeared the Muslims here looked more to the Arabs, Persians and the Turks and to the Islamic countries in general for inspiration. If the Muslim League was interested in the freedom of India they would have been the first to join the Constituent Assembly and help to make India free.

To-day, Mr. Nagappa said, they were all asking the British to quit, but he would go a step further and ask the caste Hindu Aryan migrants to quit and for the same reason the Muslims also. (Laughter.) But the only consideration that deserved attention was that they had nowhere else to go to. "We in India," Mr. Nagappa said, "are all Indians and we must all feel that way. With all the fellow-feeling we must join together and help to see that our country is free as early as possible."

While the Harijans were thankful for the resolution, Mr. Nagappa said he would also emphasise that the principles enunciated in it must be translated into action. In so far as the Harijans were concerned, it was not their claim that they were a political minority whose rights must be recognised and which should be given their due share in the administration of this country. They formed one-fifth of the population of India. He said the Congress should be fair to all minorities and not placate a particular community or section. The Congress had already gone too far in accepting the December 6 Statement. He was glad the resolution gave equal opportunities to all and he looked forward to the day when a Harijan could become the Premier of India.

Mr. Jagatnarain Lal said that the sanction for the resolution was the will and determination of the people of India. Whether the transference of sovereignty to the new constitution would be peaceful or otherwise was for the British Government to choose. During the last and in the present century there were many constituent Assemblies. In many cases, they were followed by violent revolutions; some were peaceful such as in the case of Canada or Australia. Ireland proved particularly difficult and to this day it was a matter of sorrow for them. In India's case, it was for the British, as it was for them in respect of other countries, to decide whether the transference of power should be peaceful or not. But the present signs were that the British Government had not ceased making such efforts as they made in Ireland. He would, therefore, urge that the Constituent Assembly should rely on its own efforts and for its sanction depend on the country for bringing about an independent sovereign Republic for India. He hoped Dr. Jayakar would withdraw his amendment and the House adopt the resolution unanimously.

Mr. Aiyarai Shastri supported the resolution because he felt that it embodied the principles for which India stood. The resolution, he said, aimed at creating a free and independent India which, as he visualised it, would include not only

British India but also the Indian States and certain other parts of the country like Pondicherry, Nepal and Bhutan.

The resolution, he pointed out, aimed at establishing economic, social and political equality among the people of India. This, he said, was in consonance with the teachings of the Rig Veda. The principle of Government of the people and by the people on which this resolution was based, was supported by Islamic teachings also. Caliph Umar, in his directive to Mohd. Bin Qasim said that his duty was to protect and serve the people of the country he had conquered.

The free India which was to come into being would not live in isolation but would take part in international affairs on an equal footing with other countries of the world. Mr. Shastri put forth a strong plea for the business of the House to be conducted entirely in Hindustani.

Second Day—New Delhi—21st. January 1947

Steering Committee Personnel

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad announced to-day the members of the Steering Committee.

The Committee will consist of the following 11 members: Maulana Azad, Sardar Patel, Sardar Ujjal Singh, Srimathi Durga Bai, Mr. Satya Narain Sinha, Ananthasayanam Iyengar, Mr. S. H. Prater, Mr. S. N. Manu, Mr. K. M. Manshi, Mr. Kiran Shankar Roy and Diwan Chamanlal. There were originally 13 nominations for the 11 seats, but Mr. Somnath Lahiri (Communist) and Mr. Lakshminarain later withdrew from the contest.

Aims & Objectives Resolution (Contd.)

Pandit Nehru was to have moved to-day a motion for the appointment of a special committee to confer with the Negotiating Committee of the States and also to confer with such persons as it thought fit to examine special problems and report to the House. Pandit Nehru was not in his seat and the President passed it over and asked the House to resume the debate on the resolution on aims and objectives.

Mr. Madhava Menon, supporting the resolution, said that it must be passed forthwith as any further delay would put a premium on intransigence.

Mr. B. Das appealed to the Muslim League representatives to come into the House and tell them what kind of constitution they wanted—a Dominion Pakistan or a Republican Pakistan.

Mr. K. Madhava Menon, supporting the resolution said, "It is absolutely necessary that we should pass this resolution without any further delay. We have already waited too long in this matter and we will be failing in our duty if we delay any further. We must realise that the whole country is looking towards us to see what we are going to do for them. If we delay further on the ground that others are absent, I am afraid we will only be putting a premium on intransigence." He recalled that Dr. Jayakar, while moving his amendment, had asked the House to wait till January 20 and said, "We have waited as he wanted us to do. We hope that he will have no reason to complain that his request has been disregarded by us."

Mr. B. Das appealed to the League to enter the Constituent Assembly. "Those who are our friends outside," he said, "should be friends in this House. They should let us know whether they want an independent Republic of Pakistan or a Dominion Pakistan. We do not know what they want. I appeal to my Muslim League friends to come to the House so that we can all build up Indian independence without being dominated by the third party—the British Raj. I appeal to Mr. Jinnah and my League friends to come and tell us where we are making mistakes."

Mr. Devendranath Samant said that the constitution to be framed should promote the interests of the masses and benefit the country as a whole. The principles enunciated in the resolution should allay the suspicions entertained by any minority.

Barring the Muslim League, said Mr. Samant, no one in the country favoured the idea of vivisection of the country. He hoped that in future the necessity for a united India would be appreciated by every section of the people.

Rev. Jerome D' Souza, supporting the resolution, said, "If the spirit that animates the resolutions is applied to the details of the constitution that this Assembly will draw up and to the daily administration of the Provinces and the Centre, there will be no section of our people which will have reason to complain."

He asked the House to be on guard against two dangers—the temptation to do

things more by force and regimentation than by agreement and persuasion, even though this temptation might arise from love of the country and desire for rapid improvement and progress; and the temptation to override the privileges and safeguards of minorities out of a desire for uniformity.

"I am sure," he said, "that apart from specific religious beliefs, it is possible for members of all communities to accept the common heritage of this great land and secure that degree of uniformity and common agreement on the basis of which national unity can be built up."

Referring to the mention in the resolution of the sovereignty of the people, *Rev D' Souza* recalled that in the sixteenth century when certain kings advanced the doctrine of their divine right, even very conservative monarchists asserted the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people. The ultimate authority came from moral law on the basis of which the rights of individuals and the State had to be maintained. If by some way, the State had to be maintained, if by some way, the name of Almighty God had been brought in "in this momentous declaration," it would have been in conformity with the spirit of our vast land (hear, hear), he said. Although his name is not in the resolution, "I am sure it is at the back of the minds of all the members. I sincerely believe that we have met under the cover of that protection and we hope and pray that the deliberations which we have begun will be taken to their legitimate conclusion and the land for which we are labouring will rise again with new strength, prosperity and happiness." (Cheers.)

Mr. H. J. Khandekar said that the Harijan community had accepted the resolution with great pleasure as it promised safeguards and equal rights to all the minorities in India. He expressed satisfaction at *Dr. Ambedkar's* speech in which he had asked for a united India with a strong Central Government.

The condition of the Harijans of this country, *Mr. Khandekar* said, was deplorable and they had been subjected to unfair treatment for centuries. Still they were resolved not to go out of the fold of the Hindu religion, he declared. Their greatest fear was that they would be wiped out of existence when Pakistan was established in groups B and C as already the Harijans of East Bengal had experienced extreme misery and oppression.

Mr. Khandekar hoped that the about ten million people belonging to the so-called Criminal tribes of whom no mention had been made in the resolution, would also receive the same rights and safeguards as were being promised to other minorities.

Dr. H. C. Mukherjee said that he supported the resolution because the world should know that the resolution was being backed not only by a great Indian political party but also by the small minorities such as the Indian Christians whom he represented. Of special interest to him was the declaration in the resolution which guaranteed freedom of thought, expression, belief, faith, worship, vocation, association, and action and also the provision of adequate safeguards for minorities. The Congress, he said, would retain its leadership so long as it advocated and stood by the principles enunciated in the resolution. He did not see any reason why Christians should have any fear because to-day every religion in India enjoyed the privilege of converting others. He was confident that the principles enumerated in the resolution would command the allegiance of not only the majority in the land but also of the smallest minority.

Mr. H. V. Patasker said that the problem before the Constituent Assembly was very complex. They were to draft a constitution for forty crores of people divided into many sects and living under divergent economic structures. Instead of trying to solve the antagonism between the various communities, he would suggest a declaration of rights of the common man. Otherwise, he was afraid there would be a scramble by the various communities to secure rights for themselves. "We shall try to be fair and just to every section," *Mr. Patasker* said, and added, "We shall also see that we are not coerced into doing anything wrong. Having made our objectives clear, we shall march forward in our task and we shall face all difficulties that may lie in our path." The future India, he said, would be an important factor in stabilising world peace.

Mr. R. V. Dhulekar, supporting the resolution, said that *Mahatma Gandhi* had summarised the philosophy of life in two words—truth and non-violence—and the resolution under discussion was based upon and was a true expression of the essence of that philosophy. He was confident that no one could oppose the resolution because it promised safeguards to all minorities. *Mr. Dhulekar* was opposed to the postponement of the resolution as, he felt, Congress acceptance of the December 8 interpretation had left the Muslim League with no further excuse to keep out of the Assembly. He appealed to the Muslim League to grasp the hand of friendship extended

by the Congress and to co-operate in the task of constitution-making. "Now that the British are leaving India, let us not perpetuate the division created by them," he said.

Mr. S. H. Prater (Anglo-Indian representative) recalled that on an earlier occasion he had supported Dr. Jayakar's amendment for a postponement which should no longer be valid or justifiable. The House should proceed forthwith to accept and pass the resolution. (Cheers) After explaining the terms of the resolution, Mr. Prater said that it stood within the terms of the Cabinet Mission's proposal. The resolution embodied two basic principles without which no constitution could be framed namely, that any constitution made must be based on provincial autonomy and, secondly, there should be a Union of all the States and Provinces. The history of India since the days of the Mauryas to the present was that it was composed of separate States with separate national identity and culture which often engendered strong local feeling. That was why the strong centralised unitary Government of the British rule of an earlier period gave way to a process of rapid decentralisation and increasing independence to provincial administration.

While recognising this principle, at the same time, Mr. Prater said, there must be a Union, as there had always been, of all the provinces governed by a single authority. Otherwise mutual strife and struggle between the various provinces would have disastrous consequences to the country as a whole. It was only by a Union such as the one which the resolution envisaged that there could be peace and prosperity and we could withstand for-ign aggression and it was only by such a Union that the people of India as a group could become a dominant power in the world. Such a Union, he said, could be maintained by according the fullest protection to the minorities but eventually the whole question would depend on the goodwill and sympathy and understanding of the Constituent Assembly.

"We are a sovereign body," he said, "but let us approach the task not in the spirit of legislation by majority vote. Let us approach our task in a spirit of negotiation." Mr. Prater added that the Assembly should establish some such convention and there should be a common endeavour to achieve good results.

Dr. Jayakar Withdraws Amendment

Dr. M. R. Jayakar said he would like to make a brief statement in connection with the amendment he had moved. He said that the amendment was dictated by a few considerations, mainly, the desire to make it easier for the League to come in. In connection with the Muslim League, he could say that the Constituent Assembly had practically accepted his proposal. The discussion on the resolution was postponed to January 20 as he had suggested, and they had gone further, despite the resentment of some members and provinces and accepted the statement of his Majesty's Government of December 6. They having done all that, the Muslim League was still coming in; whether they would come in or not nobody knew. The League had held up their cards upto January 20 knowing fully well that the Assembly was meeting on January 20.

Dr. Jayakar said he now felt in honour bound not to press his amendment any longer. (Cheers.) He made the proposal in good faith and the House having accepted that proposal, the contract was complete and he, therefore, did not propose to press his amendment. But in doing so, he would like to make a few considerations *suo moto* and if those considerations appealed to the House—quite apart from his amendment which had now gone out completely—the House might take such course as it thought best. But he also knew that in its present mood the House might not accept those considerations.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, intervening, submitted that as Dr. Jayakar had withdrawn his amendment he could not now complicate the situation by pressing in some form or other a new and fresh amendment at this stage. Whether he put it forward in the precise form of an amendment or not, made no difference and any suggestion made now would put the Assembly in an awkward and embarrassing position.

Dr. Punjab Rao Deshmukh asked what would have happened if Dr. Jayakar had withdrawn his amendment after making a speech. He said he should not be prohibited from making further observations.

Mr. R. K. Sidhwa supported Pandit Pant's objection.

The President Dr. Rajendra Prasad asked if Dr. Jayakar had the leave of the House to withdraw his amendment. The House agreed and Dr. Jayakar resumed his seat.

Mr. Bishamber Nath Tripathy welcomed the resolution as it clearly enunciated

the basic principles on which the future constitution of India was going to be framed. Certain other countries had included these principles in their respective constitutions but they were never practised. Mr. Tripathy suggested that while drafting the constitution the House must make sure that these principles were not shelved and that no future authority interpreted the constitution to serve its own purposes. Mr. Tripathy thought that if the House were to declare in clear and unambiguous terms that the future constitution should be socialistic, then a large number of muslims would also see their way to supporting the Assembly in its work. He also advised the Assembly to proclaim itself a sovereign body.

Third Day—New Delhi—22nd January 1947

Resolution on Aims Carried

The Assembly to-day unanimously passed Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's resolution declaring India's objective as an Independent Sovereign Republic. The resolution has been discussed at great length during the two sessions of the Constituent Assembly, nearly fifty speakers participated in the discussion.

Pandit Nehru, in a stirring and impassioned reply to the debate, said: "There has been plenty of opportunity for those who wanted to come, to come. Unfortunately, they have not yet decided to come and they still hover in this state of indecision. I regret that and all I can say is this: We shall welcome them at any future time. They may come, but it should be made clear without any possibility of misunderstanding that no work will be held up in future whether anyone comes or not. (Cheers.) There has been waiting enough, not only waiting for six weeks, but many in this country have waited years and years and the country has waited for some generations now. How long are we to wait? If some of us, who are more or less prosperous, can afford to wait, what about the waiting of the hungry and the starving?"

PRINCE'S OBJECTION CRITICISED

Referring to Indian States and the question of sovereignty, he said: "A point has been raised that the idea of the sovereignty of the people which is enshrined in this resolution does not commend itself to certain Rulers of Indian States. That is a surprising objection and, if I may say so, if that objection is raised in all seriousness by anybody, be he Ruler or Minister, it is enough to condemn the Indian State system and every Ruler and Minister that exists in India. (Hear, hear.) It is a scandalous thing for any man, however highly placed he may be, to say that he has any special divine dispensation to rule over human beings to-day. That is an intolerable presumption on any man's part (Hear, hear) and it is a thing which, I hope, this House will never admit for an instant and will repudiate if it is put before it."

"We have heard a lot about this idea of the divine right of kings," said Pandit Nehru. "We have read a lot about it in past histories and we had thought that we had seen the last of it and that it had been put an end to and buried deep down into the earth long ages ago. And for any individual in India to raise it to-day shows that there are parts of India and Indians who live buried deep down in the past without any relation to the present (Hear, hear.) So I would suggest to them, in all friendliness, that if they want to be respected or to be considered with any measure of friendly feelings, no such idea should be even hinted at, much less said. On this there is going to be no compromise."

Referring to the absence of Indian States representatives, Pandit Nehru said: "If they are not here it is not our fault. It is largely the fault of the scheme under which we are functioning. We have this choice before us: Are we to postpone our functioning because some people cannot be here? It would be a dreadful thing if we stopped not only this resolution but possibly so much else because the representatives of the States are not here. So far as we are concerned, they can come in at the earliest possible moment. We would welcome them if they are proper representatives of the States."

FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH ALL NATIONS

Pandit Nehru went on: "We claim in this resolution to frame a constitution for a sovereign independent Indian Republic, necessarily democratic. What else can we have in India? Whatever the State may have or may not have, it is impossible and inconceivable and undesirable to think in any other terms but in terms of a Republic in India. What relation will that Republic bear to other countries of the world, to England, to the British Commonwealth and the rest? For a long time past we have taken a pledge on Independence Day that India must sever her con-

nection with Great Britain because that connection had become an emblem of British domination. At no time have we thought in terms of isolating ourselves in this world from other countries or of being hostile even to countries which have dominated over us. On the eve of this great occasion, when we stand on the threshold of freedom, we do not wish to carry a trail of hostility with us against any country. We want to be friendly with all. We want to be friendly with the British people and the British Commonwealth of Nations."

Pandit Nehru proceeded: "I commend this resolution to the House—not only to the House but to the world at large—making it perfectly clear that it is a gesture of friendship to all and behind it there lies no hostility. We have suffered enough in the past: we have struggled sufficiently and we may have to struggle again but under the leadership of a very great personality, we have sought always to think in terms of friendship and good will to others, even those who have opposed us. How far we have succeeded I do not know, because we are weak human beings. Nevertheless, the impress of that message has been left in the hearts of millions of people in this country and even when we err or go astray, we cannot forget it. Some of us may be little men and some of us big, but whether we are small or big, for the moment we represent great causes. And, therefore, something of the shadow of greatness falls upon us and we also become great. And today in this Assembly, we represent a mighty cause and this resolution that I have placed before you gives some form to that cause. I hope that this resolution will lead soon to a constitution on the lines suggested to it and I trust that constitution itself will lead very soon to the real freedom that we have craved for, and that real freedom will be realised in terms of food for our starving people; clothing for them, housing for them and all manner of opportunity for progress."

"I hope it will lead also to the freedom of the other countries of Asia, because in a sense, however unworthy we may be, we have become—let us recognise it—the leaders of the freedom movement in Asia (chaere) and whatever we do, we should think of ourselves in these larger terms. When some petty matter divides us and we have difficulties and conflicts amongst ourselves over small matters, let us remember not only this resolution but this great responsibility that we shoulder, the responsibility of the freedom of 400 million people of India, the responsibility of the leadership of a large part of Asia, the responsibility of being some kind of a guide to vast numbers of people all over the world."

Pandit Nehru said: "It was my proud privilege six weeks ago to move this resolution. I felt the weight and solemnity of that occasion. It was not a mere form of words that I placed before the House, carefully chosen as those words were; those words and that resolution represented something far more. They represented the depths of our being, they represented the agony and hopes of the nation coming at last to fruition. And as I stood here on that occasion, I felt the past crowding around me, then I felt the future also taking shape. We stood on the razor's edge of the present and I was addressing not only this House but the millions of India who are vastly interested in our work. And because I felt that we were coming to the end of an age, I had a sense of all our forbears watching this great undertaking of ours and possibly blessing it if we moved aright; and the future, of which we became trustees, became almost a living thing taking shape and being moulded before our eyes."

"It was a great responsibility to be trustees of the future. It was some responsibility also to be inheritors of the great past of ours and between that great past and the great future that we envisaged, we stood on the edge of the present and the weight of that occasion, I have no doubt, impressed itself upon this honourable House."

"And so, I placed this resolution before the House and I had hoped that it would be passed in a day or two and we would embark on other work immediately. After a long debate this House decided to postpone further consideration of this resolution and I confess that I was a little disappointed because I was impatient that we should move. I felt that we were not true to the pledges we had taken by lingering on the road. It was a bad beginning, I thought, that we should postpone even such an important resolution about objectives. Would that imply that our future work would go along slowly and be postponed from time to time? Nevertheless, I have no doubt that the decision that this House took in its wisdom in postponing the resolution was a right decision, because we have always to balance two factors. One is the urgent necessity of researching our goal and the other is that we should reach it in proper trim and with as great unanimity as possible."

"And it was right, therefore, if I may say so with all respect, that this House decided to adjourn consideration of this motion and thus not only demonstrated to all the world our earnest desire to have all those people here who have so far not come here but assured the country and everyone how anxious we were to have the co-operation of all."

The resolution, said Pandit Nehru, would not by itself feed the hungry or the starving but it brings promise of many things, it brings promise of freedom, promise of food and opportunity for all, and therefore, the sooner we set about it the better. So we waited for those six weeks and during the six weeks the country thought about it and pondered over it and other countries and other people who are interested also gave thought to it."

Pandit Nehru expressed gratitude to Dr. Jayakar and Mr. Sabay for withdrawing their amendments. "Dr. Jayakar's purpose," said Pandit Nehru, "was largely served by the postponement of this resolution and it appears now that there is no one in this House who does not accept fully this resolution as it is. It may be that some would like it slightly differently-worded or the emphasis placed more on this part or that, but taking it as a whole, it is a resolution which has already, even before the voting, received the full assent of this House and there is little doubt that it has received the full assent of the country."

There had been some criticisms of it, notably from some of the Princes. Their first criticism had been that such a resolution should not be passed in the absence of the representatives of the States. In part he agreed with that criticism; he should have liked all the States and every part of India being properly represented in the House when it passed this solemn resolution. "Even during the last six weeks or a month, we have made some effort to get in touch with the Committee representing the States Rulers to find a way for their proper representation here. It has not been our fault that there has been any delay. We are anxious to get everyone in, whether they are the representatives of the Muslim League or the States or anyone else.

We shall continue to persevere in this endeavour so that this House may be as fully representative of the country as it is possible to be. But we cannot postpone this resolution or anything else because some people are not here."

NO INTERFERENCE IN STATES' AFFAIRS

"The resolution," said Pandit Nehru, "makes it clear that we are not interfering in the internal affairs of the States. I even said (on the previous occasion) that we are not interfering with the system of monarchy in the States if the people of the States wanted it. I gave the example of the Irish Republic in the British Commonwealth and it is conceivable to me that within the Indian Republic there might be petty monarchies if the people so desired. That is entirely for them to determine.

"This resolution and presumably the constitution we make, will not interfere in that matter. Inevitably we want a uniformity in the freedom of various parts of India. It is inconceivable to me that a part of India should have democratic freedom and certain parts should be denied it. That cannot be; that will give rise to trouble just as in the wide world to-day there is trouble because some countries are free and some are not. Much more trouble will there be if there is freedom in one part of India and lack of freedom in other parts of India. But we are not laying down in this resolution any strict scheme in regard to the governance of the Indian States. All that we say is this: that they or such of them as are big enough to form units or group themselves to form units, will be autonomous units with a very large measure of freedom to do as they choose subject no doubt to certain central functions in which they will co-operate with the Centre and in which the Centre will have control. So that in essence this resolution does not interfere with the inner working of those units.

"They will be autonomous and as I have said if these units choose to have some kind of constitutional monarch at their head, they are welcome to do so. For my part I am a republican in India and everywhere else (Cheers). But whatever my views may be on that subject it is not my desire to impose my will on others and whatever the views of the House may be on this subject, I imagine that it is not the desire of this House to impose their will in these matters. So the objection of a Ruler of an Indian State to this resolution becomes an objection in theory to the theoretical and practical implications of the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people. To nothing else can any one object; that is an objection which cannot stand for an instant."

INDIA PLEDGED TO WORLD CO-OPERATION

After re-affirming the desire to be friendly with all, including the British people and the British Commonwealth, Pandit Nehru observed: "But these labels are fast changing their meaning and in the world to-day there is no isolation.

You cannot remain apart from others. You must co-operate or you must fight. There is no middle way. We seek peace. We do not want to fight any nation if we can help it. The only possible real object that we, in common with other nations, can have is the object of co-operating in building up some kind of a world structure. Call it One World, call it what you like. The beginnings of this world structure have been laid down in the U. N. It is feeble yet and it has many defects. Nevertheless it is the beginning of a world structure and India has pledged herself to co-operate in that work. If we think of that structure and our co-operation in it with other countries, where does the question come of our being tied up with this group of nations or that group? Indeed the more groups and blocs are formed the weaker does that big structure become. Therefore, in order to strengthen that big structure, it is desirable for all countries not to insist, not to lay stress on separate groups and separate blocs.

"I know there are separate groups and blocs to-day and because they exist there is hostility between them. There is even talk of war among them. I do not know what the future will bring to us, whether peace or war, for we seem to stand on the edge and there are various pulls on us, a pull in favour of co-operation and peace and another push towards the precipice of war and disintegration. I am not prophet enough to know what will happen, but I do know that those who desire peace must deprecate this formation of separate blocs which necessarily become hostile to other blocs. Therefore, India, in so far as it has foreign policy, has declared that it wants to remain independent and free of all these blocs and it wants to co-operate on equal terms with all countries. It is a difficult position because when people are full of fear of each other, any person who tries to be neutral is suspected of sympathy with the other party.

"We can see that in India and we can see that in the wider sphere of world politics. We are criticised sometimes, and recently an American statesman criticised India in words which showed how lacking in knowledge and understanding even the statesmen of America are. Because we follow our own policy, this group of nations thinks we are siding with the other and that group of nations thinks that we are siding with this. That is bound to happen, but what I wish to place before this House is that all these labels of the past are rapidly going and if we seek to be a free, independent, democratic Republic, it is not to dissociate ourselves from other countries but rather as a free nation to co-operate in the fullest measure with other countries for peace and freedom, to march with Britain, the British Commonwealth, with the U. S. A., with the Soviet Union and with all other countries, big and small. Real co-operation will only come between us and these other countries when we know that we are free to co-operate and are not being imposed upon and forced to co-operate. So long as there is the slightest trace of compulsion, there can be no co-operation."

"India", said Pandit Nehru, "is a great country, great in her resources, great in her man-power, great in her potential in every way, and I have little doubt that a free India on every plane will play a big part on the world stage, even on the narrowest plane of material power and strength. We hear a lot about the atom bomb and the various kinds of energy that it represents and in a sense to-day there is a conflict in the world between the atom bomb and what it represents and the spirit of humanity. I hope that while India will no doubt progress in all these material spheres, she will always lay stress on that spirit of humanity. I have no doubt also in my mind that ultimately in this conflict that is convulsing the world the human spirit will prevail over the atom bomb."

Referring to Mr. H. J. Khandekar's suggestion to postpone the adoption of the resolution to January 28, the Independence Day, Pandit Nehru said that it was not desirable to put off commendable and urgent business like that even by an hour. "It comes in the wake of a number of resolutions and pledges and is in fact an expression of the sentiments embodied in them. It has the spirit of the momentous 'Quit India' resolution and the time has come now for us to implement our pledges."

REVOLUTIONARY CHANGES IMPENDING

"There is no group in India, no party, no religious community which can prosper if India does not prosper, said Pandit Nehru. "If India goes down, we go down, all of us, whether we have a few seats more or less, whether we get a

slight advantage or not. But if it is well with India, if India lives as a vital, free country, then it is well with all of us, to whatever community or religion we may belong I am not placing before the House what I want done or what I do not want done, but I should like the House to consider that we are on the eve of revolutionary changes - revolutionary in every sense of the word. Because when the spirit of a nation breaks its bonds, it functions in peculiar ways, and it should function in strange ways. It may be that the constitution that this House may frame may not satisfy that free India. A free India will do what it chooses. This House cannot bind down the next generation or the people who may succeed us in this task.

"Therefore, let us not trouble ourselves too much about the petty details of what we do. These details will not survive for long if they are achieved in conflict. What we achieve in human liberty by co-operation is likely to survive. What small points we may gain here and there by conflict and by over-bearing manners and by threats will not survive long. It will only leave a trail of bad blood behind it."

Pandit Nehru concluded: "May this resolution bear early fruit and may the time come when in the words of this resolution, this ancient land attain its rightful and honoured place in the world and make its full and willing contribution to the promotion of world peace and the welfare of mankind." (Loud cheers)

After Pandit Nehru's speech, the President, in putting the resolution to the vote, said, "Remembering the solemnity of the occasion and the greatness of the pledge and promise which this resolution contains, I hope every member will stand in his place and vote on it."

Members rose in their place and passed the resolution in silence, which was later broken by a burst of cheering as they resumed their seats.

Negotiations with Bhutan and Sikkim

The House thereafter agreed to Pandit Nehru's further resolution extending the scope of the States Committee of the Assembly so as to give it power to confer and examine the special problems of Burma and Sikkim.

Pandit Nehru said that since the earlier resolution setting up the States Committee was passed, the question had arisen as to how that Committee should deal with areas such as Bhutan and Sikkim which were not like other Indian States, but were in a sense independent under the protection of India. He did not know what the future position of Bhutan would be in relation to India. That was a matter to be determined in consultation with Bhutan's representatives. There was no question of compulsion in the matter.

As regards the terms of reference of the States Committee, Pandit Nehru said these were limited because the problem of Indian States was going to be dealt with by representatives of Indian States, who would come to the Assembly. The Constituent Assembly, however, had the power and authority to deal with other representatives of States too.

Pandit Pant seconded the resolution, which was passed.

MOTION OF BUDGET

Mr. N. V. Gadgil moved that estimates of expenditure of the Assembly for the years 1946-47 and 1947-48 be sanctioned.

Mr. K. Santanam suggested that the House should go into committee to discuss the budget.

Mr. Somnath Lahiri (Communist) opposed the suggestion. The President put Mr. Santanam's suggestion to the vote and declared it carried.

The Assembly went into committee and adjourned after about half an hour. The House did not sit on the next day, but resumed on Friday morning.

Fourth Day—New Delhi—24th January 1947

Advisory Committee on Minorities

The Constituent Assembly to-day agreed to Mr. Satyanarain Sinha's motion for the election of a Vice-President and later accepted Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant's motion for the election of an Advisory Committee to deal with the rights of minorities, the rights of citizens and questions relating to the tribal and excluded and partially excluded areas.

Speaking on his motion, Pandit Pant said that according to the procedure prescribed in the State Paper, the Assembly was expected to take up this item immediately after the election of the President. We refrained from doing so out

of regard for the absentee members. "We wanted to facilitate the entry of the members of the Muslim League and also to secure their co-operation in this Assembly. It is a matter of regret that our efforts in that direction have not succeeded so far. Not only did we postpone consideration of this item, but the Congress went further and unequivocally accepted the interpretation put by His Majesty's Government and the Muslim League on some of the contentious clauses of that Statement. It also accepted a large part of the declaration made by the British Cabinet on December 6. The Congress on January 5 unequivocally declared its acceptance of the interpretation put on the Grouping clauses by the League.

"Not only has the Muslim League not passed any formal resolution to this day in favour of their entry into this Assembly, but the statements made by persons who claim to be in a position to know the mind of the League still point to the other way. No suggestion has been made to the office-bearers of this Assembly, to the Secretary or anybody else, by any responsible representative of the Muslim League for the postponement of this Assembly or of any item of business, including the item in the order paper. Under the circumstances, we cannot but proceed with the business that has been already prescribed, determined and formulated for us.

"The responsibility for the course that is being adopted, if it embarrasses or inconveniences anybody, rests on those who have chosen to keep aloof. I think every reasonable and dispassionate person will accept that the Congress and the members of this Assembly have done more than what could be expected of them in order to facilitate the participation of the Muslim League in the deliberations of this Assembly. But they have all the same stuck to their original attitude of negation and have not cared to join this Assembly in the great and sacred task that lies ahead of it and in which it has been engaged so far. I consider it necessary to make these remarks, especially in view of some articles that have appeared in the Press and in one of the local daily papers. It is unreasonable on the part of any person to suggest further postponement of this item which ought to have been taken up at the very outset. The tender solicitude shown by the honourable members of this House for the absentee members of this House has not only not been appreciated but it has been misunderstood.

"There is another aspect of this question. The people of this country are watching the proceedings of this Assembly in order to see what progress we are making and how near we are to the goal before us. Every day's delay is causing them disappointment and on the other side there is propaganda suggesting that this Assembly will end in smoke, that all its efforts, deliberations and endeavours will prove futile and nothing will come out of them. In the circumstances, anyone interested in the success of this Assembly must realise the responsibility that rests on the shoulders of the members of this House. They cannot afford to put off indefinitely the business of this House. Hope cannot be deferred till it is stilled altogether."

Left to ourselves, said Pandit Pant, we would have preferred a committee for each of the subjects and perhaps two committees for dealing with the problems relating to the north-west frontier on one side and north-east frontier on the other. "But as the scheme envisaged only one committee, we thought it appropriate not to depart from that direction or proposal. The Committee has consequently to be bigger than it would have been had there been a separate committee to deal with each subject. We have tried to do justice to all interests and to all elements and at the same time to limit the figures to a reasonable and workable limit."

"Out of the fifty members to be elected initially only 12 would be representatives of the general section. Others would represent the minorities and the tribal and excluded areas. The minorities would be represented in the following manner; Hindus of Bengal, Punjab North-west Frontier, Baluchistan and Sind, seven; Muslims of U.P., Bihar, C.P., Madras, Bombay, Assam and Orissa, seven; Scheduled Castes, seven; Sikhs, six; Indian Christians four; Parsis three; Anglo-Indians three and tribal and excluded areas 13. There would be ten nominations by the President.

"In any case, whatever be the number, the voice of the minorities and representatives of the excluded and tribal areas will preponderate in the committee. They would be in a position to record their decision and no section would be in a majority. So this will fully reflect the opinion of the minorities and the backward tribes and will, I hope, be able to reach decisions which will fully secure their position and ensure the protection of their rights."

The resolution proposed that sub-committees should be appointed for the north-west and north-eastern tribal areas and the excluded and partially excluded areas. These sub-committees were also empowered to co-opt two members from each specific territory whose questions might be under consideration.

Mr. K. M. Munshi moved a number of amendments standing in his name. The principal one was to increase the personnel of the Committee from 68 to 72. Initially it was proposed that the Committee should consist of 59 members whose names he read out. Explaining the provision for increasing the number of members to be nominated by the President to 22, Mr. Munchi said that it was to facilitate the participation of the Muslim League. He said that if the Muslim League decided to come in after the session, seven Muslim representatives from the Hindu majority provinces could be nominated by the President which meant it would not be necessary to call for a session of the Assembly for that purpose.

A short debate followed after which Pandit Pant accepted the amendment and the resolution was then passed.

Sir N. Gopalaswamy Iyengar moved an amendment prescribing the quorum for the Advisory Committee and its sub-Committee.

Mr. Jaipal Singh (Adivasi representative) said that the tribal and backward people in India looked to their own countrymen and leaders for a square deal and not to any outside authority.

Mr. Frank Anthony (Anglo-Indian representative) referred to the remarks of Mr. Jaipal Singh on the representation given to Anglo-Indians in the Committee and explained that in accordance with the State paper, the Advisory Committee would deal with a specific issue. The Cabinet Mission was not concerned with the numerical proposition of the minorities.

He recalled that the Cabinet Mission and particularly Sir Stafford Cripps had specifically mentioned that it was their intention that representation should be given on this Committee, particularly to Indian Christians, Anglo-Indians and tribal areas. Although the Anglo-Indians had accepted representation on the Committee, they had made it clear that the real intention of the State Paper had not been implemented in the allotment of seats at any rate to the Anglo-Indian community. He denied that the Anglo-Indians were over-represented in the Committee and argued that the intention of the Cabinet Mission was that numerically small and vital interests had to be protected in the general political structure.

Mr. Damber Singh Gurung deplored that no Gurkha had been included in the Committee. The Gurkhas, he said, were a distinct minority group and educationally and economically they were backward. He asked the Assembly to give them representation in the Committee.

Mr. K. Sankhanam urged that the Advisory Committee should not extend its scope by going into such questions as joint or separate electorates and queer the pitch for the sections and the Assembly. He suggested that the reports of the Committee should be circulated to the members of the House as soon as they were ready because they would require days of study and the Assembly, when it met, could proceed with the discussion without any delay.

Mrs. Velayudhan referred to the seven seats provided for the scheduled castes in the Committee. She said that Harijans were a part of the Hindu fold and they should be entitled to represent Hindus as such in the Muslim and in the Hindu provinces.

Mr. Lakshminarain Sahu asked why no representation was given to the Hindus in Orissa, while a seat had been given to the Muslims. He said that the majority community should not go unrepresented. About two thirds of Orissa, he said, was either partially excluded or excluded areas. Thirteen representatives would deal with the tribal and excluded areas, but there was none from Orissa.

Mr. Jairamdas Daulatram said it would not be proper for anyone to restrict scope of the Advisory Committee's work. Representatives of the majority and minority communities from practically every part of the country were on it and in terms of the State Paper they were free to discuss and decide what were adequate provisions for the protection of minorities.

Mr. S. Nagappa (Scheduled Castes) said that the Harijans were a minority in all the eleven provinces and they should have been given more than the allotted seven seats. But the Harijans were not going into the Committee to advance any sectional interest but to work for the prosperity of all the communities.

Rev. Nichols considered the resolution satisfactory though he would have preferred the inclusion of a Christian from Orissa. He hoped when the

Sub-Committee on tribal areas visited the North-Eastern frontier, it would co-opt representatives of the tribes concerned.

Mr. B. Das hoped that any decision which the Advisory Committee would arrange at, would take note of the economic condition of Orissa. It might be the Committee might recommend certain measures for the economic amelioration of the minorities in the provinces. In so doing it should remember that provinces like Bombay, Bihar, Madras and others which were better off would be able to bear the burden but it would not be possible for a poor province like Orissa to accept an all-India pattern.

Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, replying to the debate, accepted the amendments moved by Mr. Munshi and Sir N. Gopalaswami Iyengar. In regard to the personnel of the Committee, Pandit Pant said that members of every group had been virtually elected by their own colleagues belonging to that group. He agreed that certain provinces had been omitted and more persons could have been profitably added to the Committee but there were practical limitations if the structure was not to break down by numbers. Deficiencies must be tolerated. If they looked to a utopia or for the establishment of a Plato's republic, they would never be able to do anything practically. He believed committees of this kind would not arrive at a decision by taking votes. Everyone should co-operate with the other and a spirit of accommodation and give and take should pervade.

The House passed the resolution unanimously after which it went into committee to consider Mr. Gadgil's motion on the budget of the Constituent Assembly.

Fifth Day—New Delhi—25th January 1947

Scope Of Union Centre

The Assembly held a brief 75-minute meeting this morning at which it agreed to set up the order of Business Committee and the Union Subjects Committee and thereafter adjourned till the 28th. April.

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad announced the election of Dr. H. C. Mookherjee as Vic-President. The announcement was greeted with cheers.

The Assembly agreed to Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramayya's motion to appoint a Committee consisting of Sir N. Gopalaswami Iyengar, Mr. K. M. Munshi, and Mr. Biswanath Das to recommend the order of further business of the Assembly in framing the constitution for all-India and to submit its report before the commencement of the next session.

Dr. Pattabhi said that the appointment of such a Committee was a matter of importance. The Assembly had traversed the first part of the journey and before embarking upon the second part, it was necessary for it to acquire a proper idea of the way and the difficulties that lay ahead of it. This Committee would draw up a concrete plan of the future work for the Assembly.

Sr. C. Rajagopalachari moved for the appointment of a Committee to define the scope of the Union subjects. He explained that there was a great deal of correlation to be decided upon before they could carry out the intentions of the Cabinet Mission's statement or the resolutions of the Assembly. "If it is argued that what is asked to be done at various sittings should be the only things that should be done at those sittings and nothing else, we will be hindered in a great deal of difficulty at the end, even in order to carry out the explicit intentions of the Cabinet Mission's statement. Considering all these matters, we have found it necessary to move this motion for the appointment of a Committee which should do the thinking on these matters and report to this House so that we may fix our programme in accordance with it as far as possible".

"This Assembly," said Sr. C. Rajagopalachari, "has to consider very serious matters and we will have to do a great deal of thinking. We cannot simply go on the assumption that we are here only to register previously arrived at decisions or opinions or programme. We have to do a lot of substantial thinking in the Constituent Assembly and in the nature of things, therefore, we would require the assistance of a select committee to consider the enormous difficulties that might arise in the course of our work. It is with that object that this Committee has been proposed. It is not with the object of undermining the essential intentions of the Cabinet Mission's statement or anything of that kind. It is to help us to think out our difficulties and to find solutions for those difficulties."

Referring to the Muslim League, Mr. Rajagopalachari said: "It is not only a matter of culture and good breeding but statesmanship to think of those who are absent, to think of other people than ourselves when we deal with any matter. That is why in proposing every motion honourable members have had to deal with

the intentions and purposes of those who are not yet present in our Assembly. We find a great many possibilities of misunderstanding and we try to anticipate these difficulties and remove possibilities of misunderstanding as far as we can.

"I would mention, therefore, that those who are absent should not misunderstand the purposes of the Committee I am proposing. The Muslim League policy has been to secure a separate sovereign state of their own. If they had only resorted their claims to what legitimately should be asked in pursuance of their policy possibly they might have achieved their object and they would not have been in the present difficulty. Let me put it frankly. The greatest difficulty for the Muslim League now is that they have to join this Assembly on the explicit condition that they must accept the single sovereign State ideal for India and that is why they find it difficult to come in."

"That is why all this postponement," said Mr. *Rajagopalachari*. That was why the League fixed its dates always after the meetings of other political parties. That is why, even after the last adjournment, the League has been unable to come and join us. Let us understand the difficulties of the other side. If the League comes in, it comes in on the express understanding that India shall be only one sovereign State. That is why it is hesitating to come. Let us realise those difficulties and not misunderstand the delays that we have to face. Therefore it is that we are proceeding with the work as far as we can, understanding very well the difficulties of the Muslim League members in the way of their coming and joining us at this stage. Let them think it over. Let us give them ample time to come. But that does not mean that we can stop our work, that we can stop thinking and, that we ought to stop doing any thing whatsoever until they make up their minds. That will only lead to indefinite postponement. Hence I have no hesitation in recommending to this House that we should appoint a committee of twelve members as proposed and that they should think all the difficulties out and help us to frame a constitution which will leave no difficulties behind and which will lead to a stable strong constitution for the Centre and a stable, strong series of constitutions for the provinces to work under the Centre in the single State that is being contemplated."

Certain amendments to the resolution were moved by Mr. *Satya Narain Sinha* on behalf of Mr. *K. M. Munshi*, who was absent. A short debate followed in reply to which *Sj. Rajagopalachari* said that the personnel of the committee would be confined mainly to men who were experienced in the art of framing laws. The President had been given the power to choose members from among those not present now. The States also would have to nominate their quota of members. The remaining seats if any would be filled by the President.

Sj. Rajagopalachari accepted the amendments and the amended resolution was carried.

COMMUNIST MEMBER'S COMPLAINT

The President made a reference to a letter he had received from *Sj. Somnath Lahiri*, Communist member, complaining that his house had been searched and papers relating to the Constituent Assembly's proceedings as well as his notes prepared of speeches had been seized and asking whether such acts against a member of the Assembly were justified and whether the President could do any thing to preserve the privileges of members inviolate. *Dr. Rajendra Prasad* said that he had referred the matter to the Constitutional Adviser and had just received a note from him. He would study that note and see whether the matter called for any step which it was in his power to take. If he found he had had no power, he would inform Mr. *Lahiri* accordingly.

Speeches were made congratulating *Dr. Mukherjee* on his unanimous election as Vice-President of the Constituent Assembly.

The Constituent Assembly then adjourned to meet again on the 28th. April.

Third Session—New Delhi—28th April 1947.

The third preliminary session of the Constituent Assembly met at New Delhi on the 28th April 1947 when representatives of eight States took their seats in the House.

The States' Representatives were loudly cheered as the Secretary, Mr. H. V. R. Iyengar called out their names to sign the Register. The first to sign the Register was the Dewan of Baroda Sir D. L. Mitter and he was followed by *Darbar Gopal Das*, the well-known Gujerat leader and a close associate of *Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel* in the Bardoli Campaign.

The following representatives of the States took their seats to-day:

Mr. P. Govinda Menon (Cochin); Sir T. Vijayaraghavachariar (Udaipur), Sir V. T. Krishnamachari, Mr. Maneklal Sarm, and Pandit Hiralal Chastri representing Jaipur; Mr. O. S. Venka achari and Mr. Jainarain Vyas, representing Jodhpur; Sardar K. M. Panikkar (Bikaner); Raja Shiv Bahadur Singh and Lal Yadhavendra Singh representing Rewa; and Sardar Yadev Singh and Sardar Gyan Singh representing Patiala.

Besides the following representatives from the Provinces took their seats to-day: Dr. Kailash Nath Kaju, Prof. K. T. Shah, Mr. Mahabir Tyagi, Mr. Bhubendranath Burman and Velayudha Pani.

Dr. Rajendra Prasad's Address

Dr. Rajendra Prasad in a speech briefly reviewed the task before the Constituent Assembly and appealed to the members not to be daunted by the immensity of the task nor be diverted from their purpose of developments which might take place, but to go ahead with faith in the country which had sent them there.

Dr. Rajendra Prasad said: "We are meeting just three months after the last session of the Assembly. In the meantime some important developments have happened to which I consider necessary to make a short reference. Before doing that I have to give to the House the sad news of the death of three of our members: Raja Maheshwar Dayal Seth from U. P., Sir Azizul Haque from Bengal and Mr. K. Mazumdar from Baroda."

The death of the last named gentleman has come as a shock because of the tragic circumstances in which it took place. I understand that he was on his way to attend this session of the Assembly and the railway compartment in which he was travelling caught fire as a result of which he lost his life. I seek the permission of the House to convey to the members of the bereaved families our sympathy with them in their bereavement.

I may on behalf of the House be permitted to extend a cordial welcome to the representatives of the States who are attending this session and I hope representatives of other States will also be coming soon to assist in the great work which this Assembly has undertaken. I need hardly point out that the tremendous task in which we are engaged requires and expects assistance from all sons and daughters of this country whether they are living in States or in British India and whether they belong to one community or another. The future of the country very largely will depend upon the constitution which we are able to frame and not only the people of this country but the people all over the world are watching our efforts with interest, not unmixed with anxiety and it is up to us, to whatever part of India we belong, to make our contribution towards the accomplishment of this task.

News has come from our neighbour and erstwhile partner Burma that a Constituent Assembly has been elected there with objects similar to our own. May I on behalf of the House convey to that august body our greetings and good wishes and our great interest in the accomplishment of the task and the attainment of the object of a Free Burma that the people of that country have before them?

"Since we last met, the British Government have declared their intention to transfer power to Indians by June 1948. This has naturally added urgency to our work and we must proceed in a business like way to draw up our constitution in as short a time as we can. The British Government are pledged to take preparatory measures for transfer of power in advance and while this is being done on the one hand, on the other, we must be ready with our constitution well in advance of the dead line to assume responsibility in accordance with the constitution framed by us. I am, therefore, hoping that the Assembly will proceed with all expedition. There are undoubtedly difficulties which the Assembly will have to face, but if we proceed with determination we shall be able to conquer them.

"It will be recalled that the Assembly appointed several Sub-Committees. The reports of four of these Committees will, I understand, be placed before the House in due course. I suggest that the Assembly should proceed to appoint Committees to formulate the principles on which the constitution to be framed will be based and when those principles have been approved the work of drafting the constitution could be undertaken by a suitable agency and finally the constitution so drafted could be considered in detail by this Assembly. My suggestion to the Assembly will be that the Sub-Committee framing the principles should be asked to submit its report in time for consideration by the Assembly some

time in June or July and after the report has been considered by the Assembly the drafting could be done and the Assembly itself could meet in September and finalise the constitution by the end of October. This is roughly the time-table as the order of Business Committee and I envisage it. It is necessary that the constitution should be finalised as early as possible so that there may be time thereafter for the process of transfer to be completed within the time fixed by the British Government. What I have suggested is tentative, as developments are taking place and no one can say for certain what steps the Constituent Assembly may have to take to fulfil its functions. We have already defined our objective and the constitution that has to be framed will naturally have to conform to it.

"Whatever the nature of the constitution that may have to be drafted whether for one undivided India or only for parts of it, we shall see to it that it gives satisfaction to all coming under its jurisdiction. While we have accepted the Cabinet Mission's statement of May 16, 1946, which contemplated a Union of the different Provinces and States within the country, it may be that the Union will not comprise all the Provinces. If that unfortunately comes to pass we shall have to be content with a constitution for a part of it. In that case we can and should insist that one principle will apply to all parts of the country and no constitution will be forced upon any unwilling part of it. This may mean not only a division of India but a division of some Provinces. For this we must be prepared and the Assembly may have to draw up the constitution based on such division. Let us not be daunted by the immensity of the task or diverted from our purpose by developments which may take place but go ahead with faith in ourselves and the country which has sent us here."

Adoption of States' Comm. Report

The main resolution of the day called for the adoption of the States' Committee's report, welcomed the States' representatives and expressed the hope that more States would join the Assembly. Moving the resolution, *Pandit Nehru* said:—

"With reference to some confusion which has possibly arisen in regard to subjects and powers to be retained by the States, we go on what the Cabinet Mission's Statement specifically says. The Cabinet Mission's Statement said: 'The States will retain all subjects and powers other than those ceded to the Union. That is perfectly clear, we accept that Statement, we accept that entirely. Generally speaking, those are the matters that came up yesterday in the course of discussion, and perhaps we might proceed on that basis and consider matters now.'

"We further explained that the Constituent Assembly could not possibly take up the position that they were not prepared to discuss matters with States not represented on the Chamber of Princes Negotiating Committee, or with representatives of States perhaps, as that would involve an element of confusion which was contrary to their conception of the scheme.

"A general understanding having been arrived at, as a result of the above exchange of views, the States Negotiating Committee proceeded to consider the two matters on which we had been asked to negotiate by the Constituent Assembly. After a preliminary discussion, it was decided that the question of the distribution of the 93 seats should be referred to the Secretaries of the Constituent Assembly and the Chamber of Princes, and their recommendation placed before the next meeting of the two Committees on the 1st March, 1947.

NEGOTIATION WITH BARODA

"In the meanwhile, the Dewan of Baroda has asked for direct negotiation with us on the representation of Baroda in the Constituent Assembly. We accordingly met Sir B. L. Mitter on the 9th February. In the course of discussion he made it clear that it was the decision of the Baroda State, both the Ruler and the people, to give the fullest co-operation to the Constituent Assembly in its work and that they were prepared to take steps forthwith for the selection of representatives so that these could take part in the work of the Assembly at the earliest possible date. It was agreed between us and the Dewan that Baroda should, having regard to its population, send three representatives and that these should be elected by the Dhara Sabha (the State Legislature) on the principle of proportional representation, by means of the single transferable vote, and that only elected and non-elected non-official members should take part in the election.

"The next joint meeting of the two Committees was held on March 1, 1947. At this meeting we urged that H. M. G.'s Declaration of the 20th February had introduced an additional element of urgency in our task and that it would be greatly to the advantage of the States, no less than to the British Indian representatives

The following representatives of the States took their seats to-day:

Mr. P. Govinda Menon (Cochin); Sir T. Vijayaraghavachariar (Udaipur), Sir V. T. Krishnamachari, Mr. Maneklal Sarm, and Pandit Hiralal Chastri representing Jaipur; Mr O. S. Venka achari and Mr. Jainarain Vyas, representing Jodhpur; Sardar K. M. Panikkar (Bikaner); Raja Shiv Bahadur Singh and Lal Yadhavendra Singh representing Rewa; and Sardar Yadev Singh and Sardar Gyan Singh representing Patiala

Besides the following representatives from the Provinces took their seats to-day: Dr. Kailash Nath Ka-ju, Prof. K. T. Shah, Mr. Mahabir Tyagi, Mr. Bhupendranath Burman and Velayudha Pani.

Dr. Rajendra Prasad's Address

Dr. *Rajendra Prasad* in a speech briefly reviewed the task before the Constituent Assembly and appealed to the members not to be daunted by the immensity of the task nor be diverted from their purpose of developments which might take place, but to go ahead with faith in the country which had sent them there.

Dr. Rajendra Prasad said: "We are meeting just three months after the last session of the Assembly. In the meantime some important developments have happened to which I consider necessary to make a short reference. Before doing that I have to give to the House the sad news of the death of three of our members: Raja Maheshwar Dayal Seth from U. P., Sir Azizul Haque from Bengal and Mr. K. Mazumdar from Baroda."

The death of the last named gentleman has come as a shock because of the tragic circumstances in which it took place. I understand that he was on his way to attend his session of the Assembly and the railway compartment in which he was travelling caught fire as a result of which he lost his life. I seek the permission of the House to convey to the members of the bereaved families our sympathy with them in their bereavement.

I may on behalf of the House be permitted to extend a cordial welcome to the representatives of the States who are attending this session and I hope representatives of other States will also be coming soon to assist in the great work which this Assembly has undertaken. I need hardly point out that the tremendous task in which we are engaged requires and expects assistance from all sons and daughters of this country whether they are living in States or in British India and whether they belong to one community or another. The future of the country very largely will depend upon the constitution which we are able to frame and not only the people of this country but the people all over the world are watching our efforts with interest, not unmixed with anxiety and it is up to us, to whatever part of India we belong, to make our contribution towards the accomplishment of this task.

News has come from our neighbour and erstwhile partner Burma that a Constituent Assembly has been elected there with objects similar to our own. May I on behalf of the House convey to that august body our greetings and good wishes and our great interest in the accomplishment of the task and the attainment of the object of a Free Burma that the people of that country have before them?

"Since we last met, the British Government have declared their intention to transfer power to Indians by June 1948. This has naturally added urgency to our work and we must proceed in a business like way to draw up our constitution in as short a time as we can. The British Government are pledged to take preparatory measures for transfer of power in advance and while this is being done on the one hand, on the other, we must be ready with our constitution well in advance of the dead line to assume responsibility in accordance with the constitution framed by us. I am, therefore, hoping that the Assembly will proceed with all expedition. There are undoubtedly difficulties which the Assembly will have to face, but if we proceed with determination we shall be able to conquer them.

"It will be recalled that the Assembly appointed several Sub-Committees. The reports of four of these Committees will, I understand, be placed before the House in due course. I suggest that the Assembly should proceed to appoint Committees to formulate the principles on which the constitution to be framed will be based and when those principles have been approved the work of drafting the constitution could be undertaken by a suitable agency and finally the constitution so drafted could be considered in detail by this Assembly. My suggestion to the Assembly will be that the Sub-Committee framing the principles should be asked to submit its report in time for consideration by the Assembly some

died as a result of burns in a railway compartment while on his way to attend the session.

Declaring that the Indian States were an integral part of India, Sir B. L. Mitter stated: "We wish to share in the freedom of India. We, therefore, want to share the responsibility of framing the constitution. We are here by right of being Indians (cheers). We claim that we are in a position to make a substantial contribution to the common task we have before us.

"One hundred and fifty years of unitary British rule has resulted in a measure of uniformity in British India, but in the Indian States there is still a great variety. Some are advanced as British India where the people are associated with the administration. Some are absolute monarchies, some are feudal. All these things have to be taken into account in the framing of the constitution so that the ninety-three million people of the States may fit into it according to our capacity. We want unity in diversity and I appeal to my British Indian colleagues to exercise patience with us.

Sir B. L. Mitter added: "We want to march along with you but the pace has to be regulated, without impeding the forward movement. We are at one with you in that the Indian Union should be strong at the Centre so that India may hold her head high in the comity of nations. We do not believe in isolated independent existence which can only weaken the Union. We have come in a spirit of whole-hearted co-operation and not in a spirit of securing special privileges at the cost of the Union, (cheers). We shall endeavour to make the constitution develop according to the genius and capacity of the different units so that we may make it natural and healthy."

"SYMBOL OF UNITY TO COME"

Sardar K. M. Panikkar (Bikaner) said this was indeed a day which we (the Indian States) had been looking forward to. At no time in India's history had such a representative gathering, able to speak on behalf of the whole of India, met and taken counsel to decide their future. "I consider that the taking of seats by representatives of certain States to-day has a symbolic value, which far outweighs the actual number of representatives who have actually joined or the insignificance of the members who have taken their seats. It is a symbol of the unity to come. In the co-operation between representatives of States and Provinces which begins to-day, we can happily look forward to the new India".

Sardar Panikkar paid special tributes to the Constituent Assembly Negotiating Committee whose work had made it possible for the States' representatives to attend the Assembly. "But for the wisdom and courage and vision with which the British Indian representatives approached the question, it would not have been possible for those of us who desired to come in to take our seats here."

While it was true that those present to-day represented only a number of States and not all of them, *Sardar Panikkar* made the point that they were by no means an insignificant minority. "We represent actually some twenty million people out of the ninety-three million people in the Indian States. Those who have firmly and publicly announced their intention to come in form another fifteen millions. So that, actually we have a very substantial portion of the Indian States represented in the Constituent Assembly."

Referring to suggestions that the Indian States were being coerced to join the Assembly, *Sardar Panikkar* said: "I should like to make it clear that we are here by no means as a result of any coercion or pressure. There has been no coercion or pressure used on us. The Assembly is a voluntary association—this has been made clear from the beginning. Any person who declares that it has been due to coercion speaks without a knowledge of facts. To suggest that we are here under coercion is really an insult to us: because are we so disinterested in the affairs of India that we have to be coerced to take action in a matter in which it is our right and duty to take part? I want to say clearly that there has been no coercion. It will not be in the wisdom of things to talk of coercion of one part by the other."

The Indian States, *Sardar Panikkar* declared, would not ask for any special favours. "All that we ask, is to be heard and that our problems should be viewed by this august body in a sense of friendliness as part of India and we promise in all humility to work for the betterment of India and for the Union of India which we are all anxious to have."

COCHIN'S ATTITUDE

Mr. Panampillay Govinda Menon (Cochin), said all the discussions, controversies

and negotiations in respect of the States could have been avoided if the question had been tackled from the correct perspective—i.e., from the standpoint of the people of the Indian States. "They have no differences of opinion. The one hundred million people of the Indian States have never said they were different from their three hundred million brothers and sisters living in what is called British India. During the past 27 years under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi and other great leaders, India has been fighting for her independence. In that fight the people of the Indian States have always taken their due shares. They do not feel nor do they take up the attitude now that their lot lies elsewhere. We feel it is our duty and right to participate in the deliberations of the Assembly."

In the matter of joining the Assembly as well as in regard to many other matters, Mr. Govinda Menon said, the attitude of the Maharaja of Cochin had been unequivocal from the beginning." As early as June 1946, long before these questions came up to the fore, the Maharaja had declared that the people would elect their own representatives to the Constituent Assembly.

"WE MUST WORK LIKE TRUE SONS OF INDIA"

Sir T. Vijayaraghavachari (Udaipur) stating that he was thrilled to be present in the Assembly which would go down the corridors of time as a historic occasion, said: "My feeling is that though we may come from different Provinces and States we are not here on behalf of any particular part of India. We are all members of India. (Cheers). It is in that spirit that I feel certain we shall all do our work here—not on behalf of any parochial interests or any sectional interests but on behalf of the interests of the one nation of India."

Stating that the Assembly was not the forum for discussing local issues but all-India problems, Sir T. Vijayaraghavachari hoped that everyone would do his work that our children and grandchildren will say 'our fathers and grandfathers sat here in 1947 at Delhi and framed a constitution which will stand the test of time on which the future history of India will be built.' It is not for us to take any narrow views; let us so conduct ourselves that in the future history of India they will say that we did our work properly and we acquitted ourselves like men—true sons of India and not true sons of any particular community."

Sr. Jainarain Vyas (Jodhpur) thanked the members of the Constituent Assembly on behalf of the States' peoples for their efforts to see that they received representation in the Assembly. The Government of India Act (1935), Sir Stafford Cripps in 1942 and the Cabinet Mission in 1946 and the Chamber of Princes had all ignored the existence of the States' peoples recognising only the Princes. The States' peoples would, he assured the House, co-operate fully in the task of framing a constitution for India. They were indeed one with the people of India. All the barriers between the States' peoples and the people of British India were, he said, breaking down.

Raja Shiv Bahadur Singh (Bewa) thanked the President for his cordial welcome and expressed the hope that the other Indian States who had not come in would do so as early as possible.

PANDIT NEHRU REVIEWS NEGOTIATIONS

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru then moved that the Assembly record the report of the States' Negotiating Committee.

Stating that the negotiation between the two Committees—the Assembly's and the Princes—has served to clarify a number of points which the Princes had raised in the course of the discussions, Pandit Nehru gave a resume of his talks. Throughout the negotiations he and his colleagues were anxious to get going and remove any misapprehensions that might exist in the minds of the Ruler's representatives. There had been no difficulty about this really, for most of the things they had to explain had already been said in the House. Recalling his statement at the last session that while the Assembly was deciding in favour of a Republic for India as a whole, there was no bar to monarchical forms of Government continuing to exist in the Indian States, Pandit Nehru said that this had been explained to the Princes Negotiating Committee. A second question raised was about the scope of the Assembly's work. "How far we accepted the Cabinet Mission's Statement of May 16, 1946? This was an unnecessary question because obviously we have accepted and are functioning in accordance with that Statement. There the matter ends. I do not know what future changes may take place and how we will try to fit in those changes into our work."

This question, Pandit Nehru said, obviously led to the scope of the Union powers. This had been clearly laid down in the Cabinet Mission's Statement. Subjects

not to be dealt with by the Union were subjects to be dealt with by the Units. What the Union subjects might be or might not be was a matter of further consideration now or at a later date.

The question of joining the Assembly or not joining the Assembly as *Sardar Panikkar* had pointed out was entirely voluntary. There could be no coercion either on States or on Provinces or on any other part of India to participate in this Assembly. There could be no coercion except of course the coercion and compulsion of events, which no one could ignore.

But, "it is true that after certain units or parts of India decided to come in, they accept certain responsibilities and get certain privileges. Those who do not come in do not get those privileges or shoulder those responsibilities. Once decisions were taken however, there would be a widening of the gulf between the two."

On the question of continuance of monarchies, *Pandit Nehru* said he was personally not in favour of them. He thought in the world to day this system could not be considered popular. It was a passing institution; he did not know how long it would last. "But in this matter, my views are of little moment. What matters is what this Assembly desires and what it is going to do. We have made it clear on previous occasions that we do not wish to interfere in the internal arrangements in the States. It is for the people of the States to decide what they want and what they do not want. The question does not arise in this Assembly. We are dealing here with Union matters, Union subjects, fundamental rights and the like. The question of monarchies does not arise here. So far as we are concerned we are not going to raise it here."

Referring to the question of future territorial adjustments, *Pandit Nehru* said that there were bound to be future adjustments on India, but it had no connection with the Indian States as such. There was provision for suitable units coming into existence as obviously it would be impossible to have tiny parts coming in separately. The question of division of provinces was also bound to arise in the future. The partition of Bengal and the Punjab were already being publicly discussed for certain other reasons.

The question of distributing the ninety-three seats allotted to the Indian States was referred to the Secretariats of the Constituent Assembly and the Princes Chamber. Within two hours they had produced an agreed procedure. The fact that this intricate and difficult question had been settled in such a short time showed that if we could sit together, even intricate problems could be solved rapidly.

Since the agreed procedure was framed, there had no doubt been small difficulties in implementing it. A Joint Sub-Committee of the two Negotiating Committees was ironing out these difficulties. For instance, there were some States which were very keen on coming in, but which would not do so until the group to which it had been assigned came into existence. Cutch was an instance. These difficulties would no doubt be got over.

Appealing to the Indian States to participate in the Assembly, *Pandit Nehru* reminded them that "the task we have undertaken is difficult. We are building for the future and we want to make sure that we build on strong foundations.

"Above all, we meet at a time when destructive forces are at work in India. It is unfortunate. There is a great deal of passion and prejudice in the air. We must take care that our minds are not affected by these. We must not let these matters of the moment make us forget the ultimate problems we have to solve. We have to take final decisions and they are big decisions. We have to be realists. It is in this spirit of realism and idealism that the Negotiating Committee approached the task."

Pandit Nehru deprecated talks of assurances and said: "What assurance is this House going to give to anybody in India except the assurance of freedom. Even that will ultimately depend on the strength of the Indian people afterwards. If we are not strong enough and wise enough to go the right path, the structure might be shattered. With what assurances have we struggled for the freedom of India all these years? We have looked forward to it and dreamt. Perhaps it is coming and perhaps not in the shape in which we have wanted. We have no guarantees about ourselves or about our future. In the normal course of events, the only partial guarantee we had was the guarantee of tears and trouble; and we had plenty of them. It may be we will have plenty of that in the future too but we shall face it, the house will face it and the people of India will face it."

MOTION ADOPTED

The time was coming soon, Pandit Nehru said, when Rulers or anybody else, would consider it a privilege to be the free citizen of a free India rather than be called by any other appellation or title.

"We guarantee nothing to anybody", Pandit Nehru reiterated and said: "There is the freedom which we hope to achieve and we invite them to participate and welcome them to join us". Inevitably to-day there was the difference between those who had come in and those who had not and they would march on different paths and even so those paths would meet again and again and meet soon and not later.

People, he said, seemed to attach a great deal of importance to words and phrases. He asked whether what he had said on behalf of the Committee was not good enough. The Committee had nothing to hide.

Mr. Somnath Lahiri (Communist) asked how many of the representatives of the States who took their seats to-day were elected by the people and how many nominated by the Rulers.

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, said that of the 16 representatives eleven were elected and five were nominated.

Dr. Kailashnath Katju supported Pandit Nehru's motion and expressed the hope that all States would join the Assembly soon.

The House agreed to the motion.

Powers on Indian Union

GOPALASWAMI IYENGAR COMMITTEE REPORT

Sir Gopalaswami Iyenger then presented the report of the Union Powers Committee.

The following is the text of the report:

"We the undersigned members of the Committee appointed by the resolution of the Constituent Assembly of the 25th January to examine the scope of Union powers, have honour to submit this our report. Sir V. T. Krishnamachari and Sir B. L. Mitter were nominated to the Committee on April 10, 1947 and the rest of us have had an opportunity of going over the entire ground again with them. We consider that the scope of the subjects, defence, foreign affairs and communications in the Cabinet Delegation's statement of May 16 covers the following:

A—"Defence" connotes the defence of the Union and of every part thereof and includes generally all preparation for defence, as well as all such acts in times of war as may be conducive to its successful prosecution and to effective demobilisation after its termination. In particular "defence" includes—

(1) The raising, training, maintenance and control of naval, military and air forces and employment thereof for the Union and the execution of the laws of the Union and its units; the strength, organisation and control of the existing armed forces raised and employed in Indian States; (2) defence industries; (3) naval, military and air force works; (4) Local Self-Government in Cantonment areas, the constitution and powers within such areas of Cantonment authorities, the regulation of house accommodation in such areas and the delimitation of such areas; (5) arms, fire-arms, ammunition and explosives; (6) atomic energy, and mineral resources essential to its production.

We recommend further that in order to enable the Union Government effectively to discharge its responsibility for defence, it should be vested with the powers similar to those contained in Section 102 and 126-A of the Government of India Act 1935.

B. Foreign Affairs connotes all matters which bring the Union into relation with any foreign country and in particular includes the following subjects: (1) Diplomatic consular and trade representation; (2) United Nations Organisations; (3) Participation in international conferences, associations and other bodies and implementing of decisions made thereat; (4) War and peace; (5) The entering into and implementing of treaties and agreements with other countries; (6) Trade and commerce with foreign countries; (7) Foreign Loans; (8) Naturalisation and aliens; (9) Extradition; (10) Passports and visas; (11) Foreign jurisdiction; (12) Admiralty jurisdiction; (13) Piracies, felonies committed on the high seas and offences committed in the air against the law of nations; (14) Admission into, and emigration and expulsion from, the Union; (15) Port quarantine; (16) Import and export across customs frontiers as defined by the Union Government; (17) Fishing and fisheries beyond territorial waters.

COMMUNICATIONS

C.—The term "communications" although it is wide enough to cover any connection between places should for the present purposes of the Union, in our opinion include the following:—(1) airways; (2) highways and waterways declared by the Union to be Union Highways and Waterways; (3) shipping and navigation on inland waterways, declared by the Union to be Union Waterways, as regards mechanically propelled vessels, and the role of the road on such waterways, carriage of passengers, and goods on such waterways; (4) (a) posts and telegraphs provided that the rights existing in favour of any individual State unit at the date of the establishment of the Union shall be preserved to the unit till the same are modified or extinguished by agreement between the Union and units concerned, subject however, to the power of Union to make laws for regulation and control of the same; (b) Union telephones, wireless, broadcasting and other like forms of communication; the regulation and control of all other telephones, wireless, broadcasting and other like forms of communication; (5) Union railways; the regulations of all railways (other than minor railways) in respect of safety, maximum and minimum rates and fares, station and service terminal charges, interchange of traffic and the responsibility of railway administrations as carriers of goods and passengers; the regulation of minor railways in respect of safety and the responsibility of the administrations of such railways as carriers of goods and passengers; (6) maritime shipping and navigation, including shipping and navigation on tidal waters; admiralty jurisdiction; (7) Major ports, that is to say, the declaration and the constitution and powers of port authorities therein; (8) Aircraft and air navigation; the provision of aerodromes, regulation and organisation of air traffic and of aerodromes; (9) Lighthouses, including light-ships, beacons and other provision for the safety of shipping and aircraft; (10) Carriage of passengers and goods by sea or by air; (11) Union meteorological services; (12) Inter-unit quarantine.

FINANCIAL POWERS OF UNION

D.—The expression "the powers necessary to raise the finances required for the Union Subjects in the Cabinet Delegation's Statement necessarily includes the power to raise finances by taxation and loans. In existing circumstances, we recommend the following sources of revenue for the Union :

(1) Duties of customs, including export duties; (2) excise duties (3) corporation tax; (4) taxes on income other than agricultural income; (5) taxes on the capital value of the assets, exclusive of agricultural land, of individuals and companies, taxes on the capital of companies; (6) duties in respect of succession to property other than agricultural land; (7) estate duty in respect of property other than agricultural land; (8) fees in respect of any of the matters in the list of Union Powers, but not including fees taken in any court, other than the Union Court.

We realise that in the matter of industrial development, the States are in varying degrees of advancement and conditions in British India and the States are in many respects dissimilar. Some of the above taxes are now regulated by agreements between the Government of India and the States. We, therefore, think that it may not be possible to impose a uniformity of taxation throughout the Union all at once. We recommend that uniformity of taxation throughout the units may, for an agreed period of years after the establishment of the Union not exceeding 15 be kept in abeyance and the incidences, levy, realisation and apportionment of the above taxes in the State units shall be subject to agreements between them and the Union Government. Provision should accordingly be made in the constitution for implementing the above recommendation.

This is in addition to the recommendations of the Sub-Committee on Fundamental Rights regarding internal customs duties.

3. It is impossible to enumerate the power implied or inherent in or resultant from the express powers of the Union. We think that in any case the following powers come within the category:—(1) Union Judiciary; (2) Acquisition of property for the purposes of the Union; (3) Union agencies and institutes for the following purposes, that is to say, for research, for professional or technical training, or for the promotion of special studies; (4) Census; (5) Offences against laws with respect to any of the matters in the list of Union powers; (6) Enquiries, surveys and statistics for the purposes of the Union; (7) Union services. (8) Industrial disputes concerning Union employees, (9) Reserve Bank of India. (10) Property of the Union and the revenue therefrom, (11) Public

debt of the Union. (12) Currency coinage and legal tender. (13) All subjects in respect of Union areas, (14) Powers to deal with grave economic emergencies in any part.

4. We are of the opinion that provision should be made in the new constitution for the recognition throughout the Union of the laws and public acts and records of the judicial proceedings of the units and for judgments and orders delivered in one unit being enforced in other units. We note that a provision to this effect has already been made in the list of Fundamental Rights.

5. In addition to the above subjects which, in our view, come within the scope of Union Powers in accordance with the Cabinet Delegation's Statement, we hope that the following subjects will also be included in the Union list by agreement:

(1) Insurance; (2) company laws; (3) banking; (4) negotiable instruments; (5) patents, trade marks, trade designs; copyright; (6) planning; (7) ancient and historical monuments; (8) standard weights and measures.

Such an agreement will ensure uniformity throughout the territories of the Union, in matters bearing trade and commerce as has in fact been recognised in many federal constitutions. We have included Planning in the above list for the reason that although authority may rest in respect of different subjects with the units, it is obvious it will be only in their interest to have a co-ordinating machinery to assist them.

6. We recommend the insertion in the constitution of a provision on the lines of Article XXXVII of Section 51 of the Australian Constitution Act (covering matters to be referred to commonwealth by Parliament by States' Parliaments).

7. We also recommend that by agreement there may be a list of concurrent subjects as between the Union and the units.

The signatories to the report are: Jawaharlal Nehru, Govind Vallabh Pant, B. L. Mitter, Jairamdas Daulatram, N. Gopalaswami Iyengar, K. M. Munshi, V. T. Krishnamachari, Dr. B. Pattabhi Sitaramayya, Biswanath Das and A. Krishnaswami Aiyar.

POSTPONEMENT OF DEBATE URGED

Sir N. Gopalaswami Iyengar said that such a vital matter connected with the framing of the constitution should be considered carefully and read through. Emphasising that the Committee had to work within the scope of the Cabinet Mission's Plan, Sir Gopalaswami referred to the absence of the Muslim League members and said that if the possibility of the League members participating in the Assembly materialised, it would be only just and reasonable that the debate on the subject should be held over till such time. Whether they would come in or not would be definitely known before the June or July session of the Constituent Assembly and that was the main reason why they were not proceeding with the adoption of the report in the current session.

Then there were a large number of States yet to come in. They were vitally interested in the report and it was desirable that they should be in the Assembly before the House discussed the subject.

Lastly, Sir N. Gopalaswami Iyengar said that there was the question of the present political conversations. Decisions on these conversations were not available yet, but they would be available in all probability before the Constituent Assembly met again in June or July. Decisions would be of the most important character and they would have very important repercussions on the plan of work which this Constituent Assembly would have to adopt in framing the constitution. If that decision took the shape of anything like a division of India into two or more independent States, it might become necessary to deviate from the rigid formality of the Cabinet Mission's Statement. Perhaps, it might be necessary to consider afresh and thoroughly examine the relation between the Union and the units as regards the exercise of legislative and administrative powers. Therefore, Sir N. Gopalaswami Iyengar said, the present report should not be taken as the final report of the Committee as it might need to be overhauled for the considerations he had mentioned.

The House agreed to his motion seeking permission to submit a further report, if necessary.

Second Day—New Delhi—29th April 1947

Report on Fundamental Rights.

When the Constituent Assembly took up Sardar Patel's motion for considera-

tion of the report on fundamental rights, a note was circulated to the members along with the list.

Following are the more important justiciable fundamental rights in the Report of the sub-Committee which were taken up clause by clause:

All existing laws, notifications, regulations, customs or usages in force within the territories of the Union inconsistent with the rights guaranteed under this part of the constitution, shall stand abrogated to the extent of such inconsistency, nor shall the Union or any unit make any law taking away or abridging any such right.

Every person born in the Union or naturalised in the Union, according to its laws and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, shall be a citizen of the Union.

The State shall make no discrimination against any citizen on grounds of religion, race or sex.

There shall be no discrimination against any citizen on any ground of religion, race, caste or sex in regard to (a) access to trading establishments including public restaurants and hotels, (b) the use of wells, tanks, roads and places of public resort maintained wholly or partly out of public funds or dedicated to the use of the general public.

There shall be equality of opportunity for all citizens in matters of public employment, and in the exercise of carrying on of any occupation, trade, business or profession.

Nothing herein contained shall prevent the State from making provision for reservations in favour of classes who, in the opinion of the State, are not adequately represented in the public services.

No citizen shall, on grounds only of religion, race, caste, sex, descent, place of birth or any of them, be ineligible for possession of property or exercising or carrying on any occupation, trade, business or profession within the Union.

ABOLITION OF UNTOUCHABILITY

"Untouchability" in any form is abolished and the imposition of any disability on that account shall be an offence.

No heritable title shall be conferred by the Union.

No citizen of the Union and no person holding any office of profit or trust under the State shall, without the consent of the Union Government, accept any present, emoluments, office or title of any kind from any foreign State.

There shall be liberty for the exercise of the following rights subject to public order and morality or to the existence of grave emergency declared to be such by the Government of the Union or the unit concerned whereby the security of the Union or the unit as the case may be is threatened:

RIGHTS OF CITIZENS

The right of every citizen to freedom of speech and expression; the right of the citizens to assemble peaceably and without arms; the right of citizens to form associations or unions; the right of every citizen to reside and settle in any part of the Union, to acquire property and to follow an occupation, trade, business or profession.

Provision may be made by law to impose such reasonable restrictions as may be necessary in the public interest including the protection of minority groups and tribes.

No person shall be deprived of his life or liberty, without due process of law, nor shall any person be denied the equal treatment by the law within the territories of the Union. Subject to regulations by the law of the Union, trade, commerce and intercourse among the units by and between the citizens shall be free. Provided that nothing in this section shall prevent any unit from imposing on goods imported from other units the same duties and taxes to which the goods produced in the units are subject; Provided further that no preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue by a unit to one unit over another.

Traffic in human beings and forced labour in any form including *begar*, and involuntary servitude except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted are hereby prohibited and any contravention of this prohibition shall be an offence.

No child below the age of fourteen years shall be engaged to work in any factory, mine or any other hazardous employment.

All persons are equally entitled to freedom of conscience, and the right freely to profess, practise and propagate religion subject to public order, morality or health, and to the other provisions of this chapter.

CARRYING OF KIRPANS ALLOWED

The wearing and carrying of kirpans shall be deemed to be included in the profession of the Sikh religion.

The above rights shall not include any economic, financial, political, or other secular activities that may be associated with religious practice.

The freedom of religious practice guaranteed in this clause shall not debar the State from enacting laws for the purpose of social welfare and reform.

No person may be compelled to pay taxes, the proceeds of which are specifically appropriated to further or maintain any particular religion or denomination.

No person attending any school maintained or receiving aid out of public funds shall be compelled to take part in the religious instruction that may be given in the school or to attend religious worship held in the school or in premises attached thereto.

Conversion from one religion to another brought about by coercion or undue influence shall not be recognised by law.

Minorities in every unit shall be protected in respect of their language, script and culture, and no laws or regulations may be enacted that may operate oppressively or prejudicially in this respect.

All minorities whether based on religion, community or language shall be free in any unit to establish and administer educational institutions of their choice.

RIGHT ON PROPERTY

No property, movable or immovable, of any person or corporation, including any interest in any commercial or industrial undertaking, shall be taken or acquired for public use unless the law provides for the payment of compensation for the property taken or acquired and specifies the principles on which and the manner in which the compensation is to be determined.

No person shall be convicted of crime except for violation of a law in force at the time of the commission of that act charged as an offence, nor be subjected to a penalty greater than that applicable at the time of the commission of the offence.

No person shall be tried for the same offence more than once nor be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself.

The right to move the Supreme Court by appropriate proceedings for the enforcement of any of the rights guaranteed by this part is hereby guaranteed.

Without prejudice to the power that may be vested in this behalf in other courts, the Supreme Court shall have power to issue directions in the nature of the writs of habeas corpus, mandamus, prohibiting quo warranto and certiorari appropriate to the right guaranteed in this part of the constitution.

The right to enforce these remedies shall not be suspended unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion or other grave emergency, the public safety may require it.

The Union Legislature may by law determine to what extent any of the rights guaranteed by this part shall be restricted or abrogated for the members of the armed forces or forces charged with the maintenance of public order so as to ensure fulfilment of their duties and the maintenance of discipline.

The Union Legislature shall make laws to give effect to those provisions of this part which require such legislation and to prescribe punishment for those acts which are declared to be offences in this part and are not already punishable.

PANDIT KUNZRU'S CRITICISM

Pandit Hirdaynath Kunzru said that the report included certain matters which could not be included in fundamental rights and dealt with some fundamental rights which were not strictly justiciable.

Giving an instance of the former, *Pandit Kunzru* referred to clause ten in the report which provides for freedom of inter-State commerce. This could not be included, he said, among fundamental rights as it was a matter which impinged directly on the rights of the provinces. It might be dealt with when considering the powers of the Union and the provinces.

Pandit Kunzru then gave two instances where matters which could hardly be called justiciable had been included among justiciable fundamental rights in the report. Clause eight referring to freedom of speech, right of assembly etc. had been ringed in by safeguards. No doubt these safeguards were considered necessary everywhere in the world. But it was well known that these safeguards practically made the above-mentioned rights non-justiciable. "You might confer general rights on the citizens of India but if these rights were to be surrounded by restrictions then such rights would cease to be justiciable," he said.

Pandit Kunzru also referred to clause eight (e) which refers to the "right of every citizen to reside and settle in any part of the Union, to acquire property and follow any occupation, trade, business or profession", with the provision that by law such reasonable restrictions as might be necessary in public interests be imposed, including the protection of minority groups and tribes. It was very desirable that there should be freedom of movement in the Union but he could not accept, without qualification, the right of people from one province to settle in another province. The provinces must have the right to decide what the extent of its population at any time should be. They could not be asked to allow an unlimited number of people from the neighbouring provinces to enter Assam and settle down there?

A number of members—Dr. Ambedkar, Dr. Pattabhai Sitaramayya and Mr. Frank Anthony—pointed out that Pandit Kunzru could not go on analysing in detail the report at the consideration stage. But Pandit Kunzru explained he was merely making general observations and illustrating his points by a few references.

When Dr. Ambedkar pointed out that the proviso to clause eight (e) had made provision for reasonable restrictions on immigration, Pandit Kunzru said a special interpretation would have to be put on the clause if it was to serve this purpose. Again if the proviso was as wide as Dr. Ambedkar contended, then it could cease to be justiciable.

He submitted there was no particular advantage in considering the report at this stage. It might be considered along with the other fundamental rights which had still to be dealt with by the Fundamental Rights Committee.

Sj. P. R. Thakur said that only justiciable rights should be considered at this stage.

Sj. Somnath Lahiri, the Communist member, criticised many features of the report and asked why there was no explicit reference to the freedom of the Press. He characterised the report as "fundamental rights from a policeman's point of view and not for a free India." He supported the objections put forward by Pandit Kunzru.

Sj. R. K. Sidhwa said that many of the criticisms were untenable because this was mainly an interim report and personal and political rights would have to be elaborated at a future stage.

Sj. N. G. Ranga refuted the allegation that the report was a "policeman's document". He pointed out how both in Germany and in Russia the liberal fundamental rights provided for in their respective constitutions were utilised by the Nazis and the Communists to build up totalitarianism and dictatorship. The Constituent Assembly must be guided by the experience of those countries and it was their duty to make such provisions which would prevent similar mischief.

SARDAR PATEL'S REPLY TO DEBATE

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, replying to the debate, pointed out the report was not the product of any haphazard attempts. There were two schools of thought in the Committee which consisted of eminent lawyers and every sentence including punctuation marks had been very critically scrutinised. One school of thought in the Committee considered it advisable to include as many rights as possible which could be made justiciable issues. The other school of thought considered it advisable to restrict fundamental justiciable rights to a few essential issues. Between these two schools of thought there was considerable discussion and a mean was drawn.

It must not be understood, Sardar Patel said, that this report was just an interim report and that second report would be a bigger or more important report. It could not be in the nature of things that the principal report would be of less importance than the supplementary report. Incidentally, the present report had been gone through by three committees.

Then there was a third school of thought which was absent, Sardar Patel continued. According to that school there should be no police, no jails, there should be complete freedom for lathis and bullets and in fact everybody should be free to do anything he liked. He was not concerned with this school at present.

In drafting the report, the Committee went through the fundamental rights provided for in several constitutions. The House, however, was entitled to suggest modifications and as many as 150 amendments had been received within the last ten hours. On general principles, there was not much room for discussion and he hoped the House would proceed with the discussion of the clauses.

DISCUSSION ON CLAUSES

The House then took up clause by clause discussion of the justiciable fundamental rights.

A debate arose on the definition of "Citizenship" and it was decided to ask the President to nominate a small committee of legal experts to go further into the question.

The original clause moved by Sardar Patel read: "Every person born in the Union or naturalised in the Union according to its laws and subject to the jurisdiction thereof shall be a citizen of the Union". But, he said, he would accept an amendment (moved by Mr. K. M. Munshi) to add at the end of the clause the following: "Further provisions governing Union citizenship may be made by laws of the Union."

The Sardar said it was absolutely necessary that this clause should be passed if the justifiable rights sought to be conferred upon citizens were to be enforceable by law.

Sr. B. Das (Orissa) thought it would not be wise to state that every person born in the Union shall be a citizen of the Union. What about aliens born in the Union? Would they enjoy the same rights and privileges?

Sr. Alladi Krishnaswami Aiyar pointed out that this clause had been borrowed from the American constitution. There were two ideas of citizenships—the continental variety based upon blood and race, which had nothing to do with birth in a particular place and the Anglo-American variety of citizenship which conferred citizenship on a person born in a particular place. The clause under discussion had chosen the latter variety. Even to-day if an Indian was born in America, he becomes a citizen of the U. S. A. The question of naturalisation was of course different. The words "subject to the jurisdiction" had been put in the clause to cover cases of children being born to diplomats and such others in the Union. Such children would not get citizenship because they would not be subject to the jurisdiction of the Union.

The main principle underlying the clause, however, was that if a person was born here he must get citizenship even if he was a foreigner. No doubt there would be difficulties in regard to applying this principle to children born when people were away from the country. But such things would be taken care of by a separate Nationalities Act. The first part of the clause under discussion laid down the fundamental principle that every person born in the Union shall be a citizen. The second part referred to naturalisation, which would be guided by the laws in force. If the principle was departed from, we might land ourselves in difficulties.

The President: What happens if a child is born to a foreigner who is passing through this country?

Sr. Alladi explained that in such cases, the American Supreme Court had ruled that such children would not get citizenship rights. Any attempt to classify all such exertions in detail at this stage would have made the report very lengthy.

The President: What happens to children born to foreigners who are not merely passing through this country but have been here for some years for trade purposes or in the services?

Sr. Alladi said they would have citizenship rights but this by no means meant they should have all the other rights which an Indian might have. For instance, they need not be entitled to all the political rights which an Indian might enjoy. The constitution could be so framed, he suggested, as not to concede all the political and other rights on such persons.

Sr. Alladi continuing, stated the House had to make up its mind whether to follow the birth-principle of the Anglo-American countries or the racial principles governing citizenship in Continental countries.

The President: We should define our own citizenship rights. (cheers.)

Sr. Alladi: We cannot, of course, forget that it would become a problem if our ideas of citizenships are altogether new.

Answering Mr. Ananthasayanam Iyengar, who raised the problem of double nationalities, Sr. Alladi said these intricate things would have to be dealt with in a separate nationality law and it would not be possible to deal with the complications that might arise overnight.

Mr. Iyengar suggested that the question be thrashed out in detail and taken up for consideration to-morrow.

Sr. K. K. Sidhwa said that in respect of aliens, time limit of ten or fifteen years' residence in the Union should be set before they became entitled to citizenship.

WARNING AGAINST RACIAL THEORIES

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel said that the question was whether our idea of nationality should be broadbased or narrow based. The Indians in South Africa

were to-day claiming South African nationality because they were born there. The constitution that would ultimately be framed could be revised after a period of ten years. Further, there was the proviso covering all the difficulties mentioned by the various speakers. How many foreign men and women were coming to India for giving birth to children in this country? (Laughter). To deal with such a small issue, it would not be wise to introduce any racial theories into the question of citizenship.

The new Indian constitution would, *Sardar Patel* reminded the House, be scrutinised all over the world. There was no reason to be apprehensive about what would happen if foreigners claimed citizenship. The proviso to the clause that further provisions governing citizenship would be made by laws of the Union would amply take care of these things. He moved that the clause as amended be adopted.

Sj. Rajagopalachari pointed out that the clause was being introduced for the positive purpose of establishing unitary citizenship.

Dr. Kailasnath Katju referred to cases of children being born to Indian diplomats abroad and said there should be a provision in the clause to govern them.

Mr. Munshi pointed out that originally such a clause was sought to be inserted but it had been dropped. There could, of course, be no doubt that such children would be citizens of India so long as their parents were Indian citizens. But these things could all be introduced and specified in the nationality law. What was intended at the moment was merely to indicate the indispensable conditions of Indian citizenship.

DISCUSSION ON CLAUSE POSTPONED

The President, *Dr. Rajendra Prasad*, said he himself was not convinced whether the clause should go as it stood, but it was, of course, open to the House to decide what they should do. He pointed out that the proviso would relate only to additions that might be made, but could not be used to amplify the original provisions. He could sense there was considerable feeling in the House that the consideration of the clause should be postponed.

The House agreed to postponing discussion on the clause.

The President appealed to the lawyers and jurists, who were members of the House, to give thought to this clause and if possible produce something which would be acceptable to every one.

On *Sir Alladi's* suggestion, it was decided to set up a small sub-committee of legal experts. *Pandit Nehru* said that the President should be left to nominate the personnel. This suggestion was adopted.

RIGHT OF EQUALITY

An interesting discussion arose on a number of amendments, which *Sardar Patel* opposed, on the clause pertaining to right of equality. *Sardar Patel* explained that amendments on details would be inappropriate to a clause which merely laid down that there shall be no discrimination in regard to the exercise of certain fundamental rights.

Opposing an amendment moved by *Sj. Somnath Lahiri* which sought to include "political creed" among the subjects against which the State shall make no discrimination, *Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel* said that a non-discrimination clause should be in general terms and it could have nothing to do with political creeds, but confine itself to religion, race, caste or sex. "Political creeds" might be of any kind and certain political creeds might be highly objectionable to society which would deserve not only discrimination, but suppression as well.

Sardar Patel also opposed an amendment moved by *Sj. Robini Kumar Chaudhuri* who wanted that there should be no disability on grounds of "dress worn by any nationality". He said that it would be absurd to include such items in the fundamental rights which was to be incorporated in the constitution.

Mr. Chaudhuri said that there was discrimination even to-day in certain hotels managed by Europeans.

Speaking with warmth *Sardar Patel* said that such difficulties as *Mr. Chaudhuri* referred were not present to-day. Of course, if anyone was undressed he would not be allowed. (Laughter.) People were going about to-day anywhere they liked clad in any dress and there was no discrimination at all. In regard to dress restrictions which *Mr. Chaudhuri* pointed out *Sardar Patel* said that such things were gone and soon not even a shadow of them would be left.

These two and some dozen other amendments to this clause were rejected. The House agreed to certain verbal amendments moved by *Mr. K. M. Munshi* and adopted the clause.

Discussions on a clause relating to the rights of a citizen for public employment, occupation, etc., were held over till to-morrow.

The House adopted the clause abolishing untouchability in any form and the imposition of any disability on that account to be an offence.

The House adjourned for the day.

Third Day—New Delhi—30th April 1947

Constitution for Union Centre

The Assembly to-day decided to set up two committees, one to report on the main principles of the Union constitution and the other on the principles of a model Provincial constitution. Earlier, the House decided unanimously that the Indian Union shall not confer any titles.

A reference to the demand for the division of the Punjab and Bengal and to the continued absence of the Muslim League members was made in the Assembly when *Sj. K.M. Munshi* moved that the report of the Order of Business Committee be recorded. *Sj. Munshi* explained that due to the changing political conditions in the country it had not been possible for the order of Business Committee to draw up a final report because these changes had a vital bearing on the procedure of the Constituent Assembly. Since the Committee was appointed, British Government had declared its decision to withdraw from India by June 1948. In view of this it has been suggested that the Assembly should finish its work by the end of next October. But the task of arranging the order of business was mixed up with the rapidly changing political conditions.

Proceeding, *Mr. Munshi* said that the Muslim League, in spite of many concessions, had still not decided to join in the work of the Assembly and there seemed no immediate possibility of a change in their attitude. There was also the demand that the Punjab and Bengal should be divided. While the Constituent Assembly could not indefinitely postpone the drawing up of a constitution, certain changes in procedure would be necessary. He would therefore request permission for his Committee to submit a further report at a subsequent date. He also suggested that two sub-committees be appointed—one to report on the main principles of the Union constitutions and the other on the principles of a model Provincial constitution. This, *Mr. Munshi* said, would facilitate the work of the Constituent Assembly. The Constituent Assembly should meet at the end of June or early in July to consider the report of the two committees and thereafter to decide the question of going into Sections. The final meeting of the Constituent Assembly could then be held in September.

Order of Business Committee Report

The House recorded the report of the Order of Business Committee, gave it permission to submit a supplementary report and agreed to set up two sub-committees as suggested by *Mr. Munshi*.

Earlier, the House took up discussion on some clauses of the Fundamental Rights Committee's report relating to freedom of worship, expression, assembly, association and movement: the right of every citizen to reside and settle in any part of the Union; acquire, hold or dispose property; exercise any occupation, trade or profession subject to such restrictions as may be necessary in the public interest or in the interest of minority groups or tribes. Restrictions may also be imposed in cases of grave emergency.

The House also adopted a clause guaranteeing equality of opportunity in all matters of public employment. This however shall not prevent special provisions in favour of classes not adequately represented in the services.

The question of the right of Provinces to discriminate against persons domiciled in other Provinces in the matter of public employment was discussed at some length. *Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel* said that the rights of the units in these matters would not be restricted.

Sj. Jaipal Singh (Adibasi) referred to the absence of the report of the Tribal and Excluded Areas Committees and said that it would be unwise for the Assembly to proceed with clauses which vitally affected the people of those areas. He moved an amendment that the existing laws for the protection of tribes should continue.

Rev. Nichols Roy (Assam) said that aborigines should also be included as part of the tribal areas treated as protected classes.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, intervening in the debate, said that the House was dealing with the fundamental issue of fundamental rights and not with mat-

ters of the moment. They were all anxious that the people of the tribal areas who unfortunately were very backward through no fault of their own should be brought to the level of the rest of the country. But these were not things to be incorporated in the Constitution. They should be dealt with by legislative action.

Replying to the debate, *Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel* said that it had been made clear that the existing laws would not be repealed except in so far as they conflicted with fundamental rights. As for the protection of backward tribes, instead of remaining backward and protected they should be helped to come abreast with the rest of the country and be treated as equals.

Abolition of Titles

The debate on titles was initiated by *Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel* when he moved Clause 7 of the Fundamental Committee's report. The original clause said that "no heritable title shall be conferred by the Union." He said that after considerable discussion in the Committee, it had been decided to drop the word "heritable." Public opinion in the country was against the conferment of titles by the State as they were corrupting the public life of the country.

Mr. Govind Das (C. P.) said that in a Free India those who had received foreign titles should be relieved of their burden. The clause should therefore have retrospective effect.

Sj. Balkrishna Sharma (Oswnpore), opposing the motion, said it was contrary to the traditions of a country which was used to granting titles. Even in Russia some time after the revolution, it was felt that deserving generals, workers and the like should be given titles and medals.

Sj. Sri Prakasa (Banaras), joining issue with *Sj. Balkrishna Sharma*, pointed out that what was being abolished was merely the conferment of titles by the State. The people would still be free to confer their own titles unofficially on persons whom they respected and revered. Who could, for instance, prevent the people from paying their spontaneous homage to Mahatma Gandhi by calling him Mahatma? Supporting the motion before the House, *Sj. Sri Prakash* said it was very necessary to ask for freedom from the imposition of titles from the State—freedom from having to curry favour from authority in order to gain a distinction from other citizens. If the State wanted to honour any citizen for distinguished services, there were thousands of ways in which it could do so.

Sj. Dhulekar said he could not understand *Sj. Balkrishna Sharma* saying it was the Indian tradition to confer titles. In fact, if there was one country in the world where people did service without seeking any worldly recognition, that country was India.

Sj. H. V. Kamat said that the day the Union constitution came into force, all titles being held by Indians should cease to be in existence. A free India would not want these vestiges of alien domination clinging to her.

Replying to the debate, *Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel* said the Assembly was legislating for the future and not for the past. There was no point in discussing the question of titles being held already by people in the country. Many titles had been surrendered during the past two years. They had lost their value. There were still some people, no doubt, who were clinging to the past, but it was not necessary to dilate on the topic. Striking a humorous note, the *Sardar* added: "After all, some of the people who have got titles may carry them even after death. (Laughter). After all, they had spent so much money. You have no idea how titles are got. But let us forget all about them. What we want to do is to take care of the future." The clause did not propose to take away titles conferred by the people on their leaders as a tribute to their virtues. Mahatma Gandhi was Mahatma not because the people conferred the title on him. It was their tribute to his greatness and virtue that made them call him Mahatma. The State had of course nothing to do with it.

The clause as amended was passed.

Earlier, the Assembly passed the clause on equality of opportunity for all citizens in matters of public employment with a few amendments, after a brief debate.

Mr. E. Das asked whether in the Indian Union, the descendants of the Afghan Princes who were at the moment prevented from taking up any public employment or trade would be eligible for public employment. These Afghan families had been living in India, he pointed out, for three generations now.

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel replied he could not envisage any difficulty on the point. If the children of the Afghan Princes proposed to stay here, it was quite possible they would seek naturalisation in the future India.

Mr. Mahabir Tyagi said it was the practice in certain provinces to give prefer-

ance to their own citizens in respect of employment. This was a necessary part of self-government. If no regard was paid to the place of birth, then the inhabitants of the areas concerned might suffer. Replying to this point, Sardar Patel said the clause only provided for eligibility of public employment, but did not restrict the right of Provinces in any way. The Provinces could legislate in the way they wanted.

Chaudhary Surajmall by an amendment raised the point that rights of agriculturists should be protected. But as the provisions dealing with occupations, trade, business or profession in the original clause were deleted from the amended clause, the President ruled that no vote would be taken on it.

Citizens' Rights

The House agreed to a number of amendments to the Clause on the rights of freedom of citizens. The amendments deleted the provisos to the sub-clauses which empowered the State to restrict the liberty of the citizens under certain circumstances.

The Clause, as amended and adopted, read: "There shall be liberty for the exercise of the following rights subject to public order and morality and except in grave emergency declared to be such by the Government of the Union or the unit concerned whereby the security of the Union or the unit, as the case may be, is threatened—

(a) The right of every citizen to freedom of speech and expression; (b) the right of the citizens to assemble peaceably and without arms; (c) the right of citizens to form associations or unions; (d) the right of every citizen to move freely throughout the Union; (e) the right of every citizen to reside and settle in any part of the Union, to acquire, hold and dispose of property and to exercise or carry on any occupation, trade, business or profession as may be necessary in the public interest, including the protection of minority groups and tribes."

Mr. Somnath Lahiri urged that the word "security" in the preamble should [be deleted and substituted with defence".

Sardar Patel, opposing the amendment, said that the word "security" was deliberately put because "defence" connoted a different meaning. He was not prepared to provide for internal chaos which would be the obvious consequence of the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Future of Tribal Areas

Speaking on the clause, *Rev. J. J. M. Nichols-Roy* urged that apart from tribes, tribal areas should also be included for the purpose of protection under the clause. He said that people in Assam looked at the future with misgivings and were afraid they might be exploited. Suspicion had reached such a stage that many of them would wish to cut away from Assam or join Burma. As it was, there was a great deal of confusion now and he would very much like *Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru*, in his capacity as External Affairs Member, to make a statement and allay their fears.

Mr. Jaipal Singh said that in the absence of the reports of the Tribal and Excluded Areas Committee, it would be unwise and inexpedient to proceed with the present clause. Tribal and backward people required definite assurances and continuity in the legal protection which they enjoyed now. Land was their bulwark and freedom should not lead to their being dispossessed.

Mr. K. M. Munshi pointed out that the freedom sought to be conferred now would not abrogate the existing laws affording protection to tribal areas.

Referring to the appeal made by *Rev. Nichols Roy*, *Pandit Nehru* confessed to a feeling of confusion at the discussion before the House. The numerous amendments moved and not moved did not add to clarify but, in so far as he understood the resolutions as amended, he supported it. It also seemed to him there was confusion on the part of certain speakers because they forget that the House was dealing with fundamental rights and was not legislating. No doubt various desirable things were brought to the notice of the House and they could be considered separately when the constitution proper was being laid down.

He agreed with much of what *Mr. Jaipal Singh* spoke but they had nothing to do with fundamental rights. The tribal areas people should be protected in every way and the existing laws would continue.

Pandit Nehru said that he had been called upon to make a statement in his capacity as a member of the Interim Government in charge of the External Affairs Department. "I am not here", he said, "as a Member of the Government, but I am here as a representative of the people of the United Provinces. But forgetting my representative capacity, I should like to say, and indeed the House in accepting

the Objectives Resolution made this point clear; that the protection of the tribal areas and other unfortunate brethren of ours who are backward through no fault of theirs is our concern. It is our desire to help them as much as possible and to protect them and make them advance in every way possible. I think this is bound to be the policy of any Government in India." The sympathy of the whole country was with them. He, however, appreciated the feelings of Rev. Nichols Roy and Mr. Jaipal Singh because if they were not vigilant of the rights of the people they represented, their rights would be jeopardised.

Replying to the debate, *Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel* said that the Constituent Assembly was not engaged in repealing any existing Act and there need be no fear that the protection afforded under the present law would be abrogated. He would, however, ask one question, namely, was it the intention of the representatives of the tribal areas to keep the people there permanently as tribes? He did not think that such a stand would be in their interest and, in fact, it should be the endeavour of all to raise the level of the backward people to that of Mr. Jaipal Singh himself so that after ten years there should be no need for such provisions in the law. The backward classes, tribal problems, and untouchability, remained as they were to-day because of 200 years of foreign rule. The Government in the past, he said, was interested in maintaining such divisions. "It is not our desire or ambitions, he said, "to keep them in their present conditions."

The House agreed to the clause.

The House also agreed to another clause which stated, "no person shall be deprived of his life, or liberty, without due process of law nor shall any person be denied equality before law within the territories of the Union".

Report of Order of Business Committee

Sj. K. M. Munshi submitted to the House the report of the Order of Business Committee. The following is the report:

"The statement of His Majesty's Government made in Parliament on February 20, 1947, has imported an element of urgency into the work and proceedings of the Assembly and, in our opinion, it is essential that the constitution should be prepared well before the end of this year. The task of arranging a time-table is, however, by no means easy. The political situation is developing with great rapidity, and the changes that are taking place inevitably affect the work of the Assembly. We are not, therefore, in a position at this stage to make final recommendations except in regard to the immediate future, and we request that we be permitted to submit a further report at a subsequent stage."

The report continues: "We recommend that two separate Committees be appointed, one to report on the main principles of the Union constitution and the other to report on the principles of a model provincial constitution. We consider that there are many advantages in having two Committees, perhaps, with an element of common membership working side by side and considering the inter-related principles of the Union and provincial constitutions. The work of the Committees will be of an exploratory nature to facilitate and expedite the work of the Union Assembly or the sections thereof, as the case may be.

"After the Committees have been set up, we recommend that the meeting be adjourned to a date to be fixed by the President at his discretion. We suggest this flexible arrangement partly in order that the Assembly may avoid difficulties likely to arise from the fixation of a date in advance and partly because experience has shown that Committees are not always able to work up to a rigid time table.

"The Constituent Assembly should complete its work by the end of October this year. A meeting will be necessary at the end of June or the beginning of July to consider the reports of the various Committees and thereafter the matter of going into sections. A meeting of the Assembly to finalise the constitution should be held in September.

(Signed) *K. M. Munshi, N. Gopalaswami and Biswanath Das.*

League's Attitude

Moving that the report be "recorded", *Sj. Munshi* said that political conditions in the country were fast changing and the changes were having their repercussions on the programme of the Assembly. It, therefore, became impossible for the Committee to submit its final report. Two factors had come into forefront during the last few weeks, *Sj. Munshi* said. They were, firstly, the overwhelming insecurity in the two provinces of the Punjab and Bengal which, in turn, had brought to the foreground the question of partition of these two unfortunate pro-

vinces which, he hoped, would be an accomplished fact within a few weeks and to which the President had referred in his preliminary remarks: and secondly, the Muslim League had not yet seen its way to come into the Constituent Assembly. There was no immediate prospect of the League coming in, even though every consideration had been shown to them. As it had already been stated both by the Congress and on behalf of the Constituent Assembly, they would not desire to impose a constitution on the unwilling parts of the country. But at the same time if an unwilling part stayed out, it was not their desire that the Constituent Assembly should wait on for every one and certain changes in its programme would become necessary. So far as he understood the position, the House might not take into account the whole of India in the framing of the constitution, though it was their hope and trust that the time would come when even the unwilling areas would, within a short distance of time, join the Union. The Constitution to be framed, S. J. Munshi said, must enable the return of the the "prodigal sons" and they would be welcome whenever they chose to come.

Again there was another consideration, namely, the statement of February, 20, which weighed in the formulation of the programme. S. J. Munshi explained the scope of the two committees, Union Constitution Committee and the Provincial Constitution Committee, and formally moved that the President be empowered to appoint the two committees with a strength of fifteen and twenty-five members respectively.

S. J. Poonaya (Coorg) said that these two committees should also examine the question of the present Chief Commissioner's Provinces. He suggested that a small committee of three, one drawn each from the two committees and the Centrally Administered Areas, should go into the question.

Dr. Pattabhai Sitaramayya referred to the question of linguistic provinces and asked whether, as assured to him earlier at the party meeting, the two committees would consider this question as well.

The President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, hoped that the two questions raised would be considered at the appropriate time. For the present, these two committees were required to produce only model constitutions.

The House agreed to S. J. Munshi's motion and adjourned.

Fourth Day—New Delhi—1st. May 1947

Freedom of Religion

The Assembly Committee this morning passed the clause relating to religious freedom without debate. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel accepted an amendment moved by Mr. K. M. Munshi to the original clause.

The clause as adopted read: "All persons are entitled to freedom of conscience and the rights freely to profess, practice and propagate religion subject to public order, morality or health and to the other provision of this chapter. (Explanation 1) The wearing and carrying of kirpans shall be deemed to be included in the profession of the Sikh religion. (Explanation 2) The above rights shall not include any economic, financial, political or other secular activities that may be associated with the religious practice. (Explanation 3) The freedom of religious practice guaranteed in this clause shall not debar the State from enacting laws for the purpose of social welfare and reform and for throwing open Hindu religious institutions of a public character to any class or section of Hindus."

Eighteen other amendments to the original clause which had been tabled were not moved by the members.

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel congratulated the House on passing the clause which, he said, had raised controversies in the Fundamental Rights Committee. He was glad that the Committee had found all-round acceptance in the House. The Committee had tried its best to accommodate all sections of people.

ABOLITION OF FORCED LABOUR

Clause 11 in the Fundamental Rights report prohibiting traffic in human beings and forced labour in any form including 'begar' and involuntary servitude except as a punishment for crime was held over after a debate, which raised doubts as to whether military conscription would also be prohibited as a result of an amendment which Mr. Munshi moved and which Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel expressed readiness to accept.

The effect of Mr. Munshi's amendment was to do away with an explanation to the original clause stating that "nothing in the sub-clause shall prevent the

State from imposing compulsory service for public purposes without any discrimination on the ground of race, religion, caste or class."

Dr. Ambedkar raised doubts as to whether the omission of this explanation would not create difficulties for the State if Military conscription became necessary even in respect of 'begar'. There were certain varieties of it which were demanded, for instance in Bombay, for public purposes. He suggested that the clause be held over for discussion by a committee of experts.

Mrs. Dakshayani Velayudhan, Mr. B. Das, and Mr. P. K. Sen welcomed the abolition of forced labour. Mr. Das pointing out that large number of women from Bengal and Orissa were being spirited away by crooks and gangsters to the Punjab and North-West Frontier, asked whether these would be covered by the provision. During the Bengal Famine very large numbers of women had also been supplied to the British Army in Assam. He urged the Indian States' representatives present to appeal to their brother States as well to do away with "begar."

Mr. P. K. Sen, while supporting the abolition of forced labour, pleaded that the original clause be retained so that certain forms of necessary forced labour for public purposes might be possible.

Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Aiyar said the retention of the explanation (mentioned above) was not necessary to enable the State to introduce military conscription. He pointed out that despite the existence of the slavery and anti-slavery clauses in the U. S. constitution, the Supreme Court had held that there was nothing to prevent military conscription being introduced. They had after referring to various writers of international law held that the very existence of State depended upon military forces, and that slavery and anti-slavery clauses could not be considered as debarring the State from imposing conscription. The retention of the explanation might on the other hand raise a lot of other difficulties.

Mr. Ananthasayanam Iyengar said that although he was at first prone to agree with Sir Alladi, on reconsideration he had found that it would be better to retain the original clause. The Indian Penal Code provided for the prohibition of forced labour and traffic in human beings but has left to the Legislatures to stipulate conditions under which the State might enforce labour—such as during floods when the villagers might be asked to put up a bridge. Now that these rights were to be raised to the status of fundamental rights, it might be better to be very careful. He supported Dr. Ambedkar's plea for re-examination of the clause by an experts committee.

The House agreed to hold over the clause.

Clause 13 stating that "no child below the age of 14 years shall be engaged to work in any factory, mine or any other hazardous employment" was passed.

Inter-State Freedom of Commerce

The Assembly next passed the Clause relating to inter-State freedom of commerce with Mr. K. M. Munshi's amendment which was accepted. The clause as adopted read: "Subject to regulation by the law of the Union, trade, commerce and intercourse among the units by and between the citizens shall be free, provided that no preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue to one unit over another; provided that nothing in the Section shall prevent any unit from imposing on goods imported from other units the same duties and taxes to which the goods produced in the unit are subject and under regulations and conditions which are non-discriminatory, and further provided that any unit may by law impose restrictions in the interest of public order, morality or health or in any emergency."

There was considerable discussion on the clause relating to conversion from one religion to another. The clause as amended by Mr. K. M. Munshi read: "Any conversion from one religion to another brought about by fraud, coercion or undue influence, or of a minor under the age of 18, shall not be recognised by law."

Mr. Frank Anthony welcomed the earlier clause adopted by the House which recognised the right to propagate religion but thought the above clause placed an embargo in regard to people below the age of 18. He entirely agreed that forced conversions should not be recognised but if a ban was placed on the conversion of people below 13 years of age, it would mean that parents changing their faith would be cut off from their minor children.

Mr. P. R. Thakur said there should be clear definition of the word "fraud".

Many people took advantage of the position of the scheduled Castes and converted them by questionable means.

Religious Conversion of Minors

Rev. *Nichols Roy* said that no person, whatever his age might be, should be prevented from following the dictates of his own conscience. If a child of 14 or 15 felt strongly in favour of a particular religion, the law should not prevent him changing his faith.

Mr. *Purushottam Das Tandon*, supporting the clause as amended by Mr. *Munshi*, said that Congressmen in general were against the propagation of one religion or another and conversions. Nevertheless they agreed to the previous clause conferring rights on citizens to propagate religious beliefs with a view to carry the minorities with them but he would strongly oppose any freedom for the conversion of minors.

Mr. *Ramaiah Goenka* asked whether Mr. *Munshi's* amendment which prohibited the conversion of minors below the age of 18, would be in order in view of an earlier clause which conferred the right on all persons equally to freedom of conscience and the right freely to profess, practise and propagate religion.

Mr. *K. M. Munshi* pointed out that the right was subject to certain provisions mentioned in the clause itself.

Mr. *Dhiren Dutt* refuted Mr. *Purushottam Das Tandon's* suggestion that all Congressmen were not in favour of propagation of religion. In view of the complex nature of the clause under discussion, he suggested that it should be referred back to the Advisory Committee for further consideration.

Father *Jerome D'Souza* also supported the suggestion that the clause should be referred back to the Committee for scrutiny because the issue raised was of a very complex and technical nature. He pointed out that even among Christians it might be that Protestant or Catholic parents desired to change their denomination and they would not be able to do so because they could not convert their children as well.

Mr. *Algorai Shastri* and Mr. *Nagat Narain Lal* supported the clause as amended by Mr. *Munshi*.

Dr. *Ambedkar*, opposing Mr. *Munshi's* amendment, pointed out that the original clause was so framed by the Fundamental Rights Sub-Committee after considerable discussion. The Minorities Committee and the Advisory Committee had also thrashed out the question. Enumerating a number of difficulties which Mr. *Munshi's* amendment would raise, Dr. *Ambedkar* asked what would happen to orphans under eighteen who had no lawful guardians if there was a law that there should be no conversion under the age of eighteen. They could not be given any kind of religious instruction even by someone who happened to take a kindly interest in them. This was not a result surely which the House would contemplate with equanimity. Even in respect of children with parents or guardians there were difficulties. Firstly, there were children converted without the knowledge of notices of parents and, secondly, there were parents who were converted. While it was desirable to prohibit conversions without knowledge of parents or guardians, what would happen in the case of children whose parents changed faith? Was it suggested that their children under the age of eighteen should not be converted. Suppose a child died and the parent who had taken to Christianity, gave him a Christian burial, would that be an offence on the part of the parent? It would not also be possible, Dr. *Ambedkar* added, to separate children of three or five from their parents merely because such parents changed faith. The Fundamental Rights Committee had taken all these difficulties into account when it framed the clause. He submitted that a reference back to the Committee would not produce any further result.

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel brought the discussion to an end at this stage by agreeing to the motion being referred back to the Advisory Committee. He pointed out that there was no need to import heat in discussing the problem which was controversial. It was, however, well-known, that there had been mass conversions in India. There had been conversions by force, by coercion and undue influence. It could not be disguised that children had also been converted. Without going into the reasons for such conversions, he would urge the members to realise that they had all to live together in the country, and find a solution to the problem. The question had been considered by the three Committees of the Constituent Assembly. Yet, as was evident from the debate, no agreed solution had been found. He suggested that one more attempt be made to do so by referring the clause back to the Advisory Committee now.

Clause seventeen regarding "conversion from one religion to another brought about by coercion or undue influence shall not be recognised by Law" was thereupon referred to the Advisory Committee.

Cultural Rights of Minors

The Assembly then passed the following provisions in clause 18 relating to cultural and educational rights of minorities:—

"Minorities in every unit shall be protected in respect of their language, script, and culture and no laws or regulations may be enacted that may operate oppressively or prejudicially in this respect.

"All minorities whether based on religion, community or language, shall be free in any unit to establish and administer educational institutions of their choice.

"The State shall not, while providing State aid to schools, discriminate against schools under the management of minorities whether based on religion, community or language."

A fourth sub-clause stipulating that "no minority whether based on religion, community or language shall be discriminated against in regard to admission into State educational institutions" was referred to the Advisory Committee on the suggestion of Mr. K. M. Munshi, who pointed out that since this provision was framed, certain difficulties had been brought to light.

Mr. Mohanlal Saxena sought to refer the whole clause back to the Advisory Committee but withdrew his amendment later.

Supporting the plea for referring the whole clause back to the Advisory Committee, Mr. Mahabir Tyagi said: Occasion might arise in the future when the Governments joining the Union might want to know what was happening to the minorities in areas which did not join the Union. Such non-joining areas might either belong to Pakistan or be independent. The question of minorities ought therefore to be left over until such time that we definitely knew whether there was to be a united India or a divided India. If there was to be partition, then we ought to wait and see what would happen to the minorities in the non-Union areas.

Seth Govind Das disputed this suggestion and said that there was no need to bother about the point whether India would be divided or not. He wanted of course an undivided India but this should not stop him from doing his duty which was clear. He urged that the clause should be adopted as it stood.

Mr. Dharendra Dutta thought that the provision guaranteeing protection of minorities' scripts might lead to complications. He wanted that every unit in the Union should have only a single script.

Mr. Rohini Kumar Choudhry referred to tribal people in Assam who had lost their original language and script but who had now been tutored to adopt the Roman script and said it would be difficult now if they went back and insisted on having their original script. He also criticised the provisions ensuring non-discrimination in the matter of aid to minorities' educational institutions and said it was putting a high premium on communal institutions.

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar said the only point which he sensed—although it had not been expressly stated—in favour of postponement of consideration was that the rights of minorities should be relative, i. e., we must see what rights the minorities are to get in the Pakistan areas." Rejecting this suggestion, he urged that the rights of minorities must be absolute and should have no consideration as to what another party not within the Union jurisdiction might do. "If we have certain minorities in which we are interested within the jurisdiction of another State, and if they have not got the same rights as we have given to minorities in our territories, it would be open for the State to take up the matter and see that the wrongs are rectified. But no matter what other party might do, I think we ought to do right in our judgment."

Mr. Lakshminarayan Sahu from Orissa welcomed the provisions but asked how "minorities" would be defined. Unless this was done carefully, some of them might suffer. For instance, in Orissa, the Oriyas who numbered six lakhs in the 1891 census had been reduced to some forty-forty-five thousand in 1931 census.

Mr. Munshi's amendment seeking to hold over sub-clause two (mentioned above) was carried and the remaining sub-clauses were passed.

Fifth Day—New Delhi—2nd. May 1947

Language of the Constitution

Before the Assembly adjourned to-day the President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, announced that he was going to get the constitution, as it took shape, translated into the national language so that the future constitution of Free India could be enshrined in the language of the country. This was received with cheers by all sections of the House.

Dr. Rajendra Prasad said that all the proceedings were at present being conducted in the English language because there were many members who were not acquainted with the national language. So, the drafts were also being prepared in the English language. In future—he did not say immediately—the time might come when they would cease to depend upon English and if the original constitution was framed in the English language, any question of interpretation would have to be referred to the language in which the constitution was originally framed. The question therefore whether they should continue in future to interpret the constitution in the English language and whether they should expect their judges in future to be always acquainted with English to interpret the constitution. If the original constitution was drafted in English this would be the natural consequence.

It was difficult at the present moment to make any suggestion to resolve the difficulty but he was wondering whether any translation could be made of the drafts which were now being passed by the Assembly in English, so that ultimately the whole of the constitution could be drafted in the language of the country. If this was done, to deal with any ambiguity arising on questions of interpretation the English draft would also be available for reference. He would personally like that the original constitution should be adopted in the language of the country.

Earlier, the President announced that the resolution on linguistic and cultural provinces would be considered by the two Committees appointed by the House to draw up the principles of the Union Constitution and the model Provincial Constitution.

Discussion on Fundamental Rights

The Constituent Assembly to-day passed Clause 19 in the Fundamental Rights Committee report stating that "no property movable or immovable of any person or corporation, including any interest in any commercial or industrial undertaking shall be taken or acquired for public use unless the law provides for the payment of compensation for the property taken or acquired and specified the principles on which and the manner in which the compensation is to be determined." An amendment moved by Raja Jagannath Baksh Singh seeking to specify that the compensation paid would be "just" was withdrawn.

During the debate, Mr. Ajit Prasad Jain said the question of compensation was full of difficulties. Many of the Provincial Legislatures were already facing some of the difficulties. The Zamindars were trying to interpret the word "compensation" to mean full compensation and threatening to go to the courts on this issue. It was not possible for the State to pay full compensation when every large estate was acquired. When acquiring property of public use, the State might pay normal compensation or in some cases no compensation at all—not full compensation. He thought that the incorporation of this provision among the fundamental rights would bar social and economic progress such as the nationalisation schemes which many of the Provincial Governments were embarking upon.

Mr. R. K. Sidhwa deplored the fact, that at a time when the Legislatures in the country were trying to abolish Jagirdari and Zamindari systems by payment of small compensation or no compensation the House should be asked to make a definite rule to pay compensation for all property that would be acquired by the State.

Question of Compensation

Sr. Bishwamber Dyal Tripathi made a plea for a review of the whole clause and strongly opposed Raja Jagannath Baksh Singh's amendment. If there was any justification for the amendment then it was much more necessary that before any compensation, which he did not oppose in principle was paid, there should be enquiry into the manner in which the property had been acquired and it should also be determined whether the owner had not made enormous profits out of it. In many cases, he said, and this was particularly true in Oudh, property had been acquired during the mutiny of 1857 and no rent had been paid on it for 90 years.

He did not think that people who had sided with the British against the people of the country should be entitled to any compensation. Even the clause as it stood, he apprehended, would be contrary in spirit to the objects so often stated by the Congress and in effect would stand in the way of the economic and social progress of the peasant and the worker. If compensation meant a living or maintenance allowance to enable the owners of property to be able to merge into the new society then he would not be opposed to it. But he feared that this would not be the legal interpretation of the clause. Above all, he felt that the statement that compensation would be paid would make it impossible to abolish such things as the zamindari system and would lay a great burden on the peasant for another twenty-five years because the money for the compensation would ultimately have to come from his pocket.

Sj. Lakshminarain Sabu referred to the absentee landlordism prevalent in Orissa which had been disastrous to the interests of the people.

Sj. Phool Singh said the clause would bar economic progress of the country. The inclusion of the clause as it stood among the fundamental rights would make nationalisation of industry and abolition of zamindari different.

Messrs. Nagappa, Sureshchandra Banerjee and Kesava Rao also participated in the debate.

Future of Zamindars

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, winding up the debate said the debate had gone on the wrong lines. All those who had participated seemed to think the provision was intended to acquire Zamindaris. The clause actually dealt with many other things besides property belonging to landholders. As regards the plea put forth by representatives of the zamindars that they ought to get just compensation, Sardar Patel said it was not for them to plead their own case. Time was against them. Zamindari was bound to be liquidated in a year or two. Legislation for this purpose had been brought forward in many of the provinces already. There was no use going into the question whether some of the Zamindars had been patriotic or not in the past.

The clause was adopted without any amendment.

A number of clauses dealing with miscellaneous rights and constitutional remedies were passed without debate.

Citizenship Clause

The citizenship clause which had earlier been remitted to an Ad Hoc Committee of experts was then taken up. But despite a lengthy debate the issue remained unsolved and had to be referred back to the Committee for further consideration. The re-drafted clause as submitted to the Assembly to-day by the Committee read:

"Every person born in the Union and subject to its jurisdiction, every person either of whose parents was at the time of such person's birth, a citizen of the Union, and every person naturalised in the Union, shall be a citizen of the Union.

"Further provision regarding the acquisition and termination of Union citizenship may be made by the law of the Union."

Mr. K. Santanam, by an amendment, sought to include after the first paragraph the following: Every person born or naturalised in India before the commencement of the Union and subject to its jurisdiction shall be a citizen of the Union."

Mr. Santanam pointed out that without this addition, the clause would only cover people born after the Union came into being who would be the citizens the day the Union came into existence. Further, there was the possibility that the Union territory might be the smaller than the territory of India.

Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel though it was unnecessary at this stage to consider the question.

Mr. Anantasaayam Iyengar: "We are not born in the Union. We were long before the Union came into existence. What about us? (Laughter.)

Mr. O. Rajagopalachari cited a concrete instance where difficulties might arise. Suppose he was born in Mysore; if Mysore did not join the Union, he would have been born in the Union. Would he, on that score, have no citizenship rights? The point was important and must be considered.

Mr. B. K. Sidhwa (Sind) asked what would happen to the very large number of people in his province if Sind decided to stay away from the Union. Such persons should not be deprived of their citizenship.

Sir Alladi Krishnaswami Aiyar, who was one of the members of the Ad Hoc Committee which re-drafted the clause, confessed that this point had not been considered by the Committee. The question was, however, important and it might therefore be inadvertent to put in hasty amendments. As regards those who were born in the territories which came into the Union, there was no difficulty because when it was said all those who were born in the Union would be "citizens" what was meant was the geographical Union. In respect of others born in territories which did not come into the Union, a number of political questions would arise. It may not be possible to give citizenship rights to every person merely because he was born in India.

Supposing some of the Indian States did not come into the Union, then the question would have to be considered whether people from these States living in Union territories should be given citizenship rights unless they made British India their home permanently. He suggested that with the reservation that these questions would be considered at a later stage the clause be passed.

Mr. Rajagopalachari, again intervening in the debate, pointed out that there were numerous persons in India who would continue to be within the jurisdiction of the Union, however restricted it might be, who were born in parts of India which might not come into the Union. These persons might also continue to make Union territories their permanent homes. There should be some provision by which such persons might get Union citizenship automatically. The clause might, therefore, be remitted back to the Committee once again.

Mr. K. M. Munshi said these were questions to be decided in the light of the political situation obtaining at the time when the constitution was finally passed. To-day, one did not know what would be the shape of the Union in the matter of territories. The second point was about persons born in territories which might not come into the Union. Supposing an Indian State did not come into the Union and made a law that person born in India, though residing in that State, shall not be a citizen. These were intricate questions which would have to be considered at a later stage.

Dr. Ambedkar said obviously the clause referred to only persons who would be born in the future. What would be the position of those who were born before the Union came into being? Provision had to be made in respect of them. He suggested that all persons born in India as defined in the general clause and residing in the Union and subject to the jurisdiction of the Union shall be citizens of the Union." This provision would, he suggested, cover the cases of people born in India and who would be subject of the Union, when the Union came into being. Without some such provision, the clause would be incomplete and create a lot of difficulties. He supported the reference back to the Committee.

The President, thereupon, announced that the clause would be held over for re-examination by the Ad Hoc Committee.

Another report of the Experts Committee on the clause dealing with traffic in human beings and forced labour was also held over for re-examination. The clause as reported on by the Committee to day read: "Traffic in human beings and *beggar* and other similar forms of forced labour are prohibited and any contravention of this prohibition shall be an offence provided that nothing in the clause shall prevent the State from imposing compulsory service for public purpose without any discrimination on the ground of race, religion, caste or creed."

The Assembly adjourned to meet on a date to be fixed by the President.