

# Servant of India

EDITOR : S. G. VAZE.—OFFICE : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY'S HOME, POONA 4.

VOL. XIII No. 2.

POONA—THURSDAY, JANUARY 9, 1930.

INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.  
FOREIGN 15s.

## CONTENTS.

	Page.
TOPICS OF THE WEEK ... ..	13
ARTICLES :—	
Forge Ahead ... ..	16
Stand Fast by Friends ... ..	17
Mr. Jawahar Lal and the Congress by Nares C. Sen- Gupta, M. A. ... ..	18
Liberal Party's Statement ... ..	19
REVIEWS :—	
Early Mahomedan India by Prof. R. P. Patwardhan	20
American Shipping by J. K. Mehta ... ..	21
Short Notice ... ..	22
MISCELLANEOUS :—	
Liberal Federation Resolutions ... ..	22
Congress Resolutions ... ..	33
All-India Muslim League Resolutions ... ..	23

## Topics of the Week.

### The late Mr. Mazhar-ul-Haq.

IN the death of Maulvi Mazhar-ul-Haq India has lost a sincere and devoted worker. His was one of the rare cases of people who resigned Government service in order to be free to undertake political work for the Motherland. He was a staunch Congressman right through and believed in nationalism and was opposed to communalism. In collaboration with Mr. Hassan Imam he founded in 1906 the All-India Muslim League in order to rouse the Muslim population to a lively sense of its responsibilities in building up Indian nationalism and Swaraj. He was a member of the Imperial Legislative Council for some time and did good work there. His contribution to Hindu-Muslim unity is invaluable, and will be long remembered.

### Political consistency.

MR. M. R. JAYAKAR, in his statement on the Congress resolutions, accused Messrs Gandhi and Motilal Nehru as being the victims of logic and political consistency, and persuaded himself that "less honest" men would have allowed their better judgment to prevail over logic. Mr. Gandhi defended the declaration of independence on the express ground that the nation had pledged itself to it at the Calcutta Congress and had to be consistent. When, however, he was asked why he insisted on the boycott of the councils and the local bodies but not of law courts and educational institutions and co-operative societies, etc., he remarked that inconsistency in politics was not a crime! Mr. Jayakar himself has, unconsciously perhaps, fallen a victim to logic. He laments the boycott programme of the Congress and believes in working the Councils and in going to the Round

Table Conference. And yet he congratulates Pandit Motilal Nehru on having ordered Congressmen to come out of the Councils! For the sake of consistency in politics! Mr. N. C. Kelkar, sees no inconsistency between the declaration of independence and the oath of allegiance and co-operation in the councils. For, argues the subtle Mr. Kelkar, the Congress has not yet set up a parallel government. After all, one must owe allegiance to somebody, and until a parallel government is set up, the present British Government may have it.

\* \* \*

### Unpopularity a Crime.

ACCORDING to a Free Press message Mr. Gandhi is reported to have advised Mr. Rajbhoj that the leaders of the untouchables should postpone their Satyagraha campaign against their exclusion from the caste-temples in consideration of the fact that there was awakening among caste Hindus and sincere efforts were being made by the caste Hindus themselves to secure for the untouchables the right of entry to the temples and that they should not precipitate matters without giving the caste Hindu leaders an opportunity of doing their duty. How we wish Mr. Gandhi had acted on this principle in his dealing with the Government over the constitutional question. Here too, the Government have given every proof of their sincere desire to advance India's cause. And yet, without giving them a chance, the Mahatma chose to precipitate matters. Inconsistency is no crime, but unpopularity is!

\* \* \*

### The Ginger Group.

So it has come to pass: Mr. Gandhi has become a moderate and he needs a ginger group to keep him up to the mark! The Congress Democratic Party under Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar, Mr. Subash Chunder Bose and Dr. Alam have kindly undertaken this very useful job. These gallant knights of independence do not trust Mr. Gandhi's faith in independence and they fear that he might slip away. Mr. Jawhar Lal plumed himself on his burning love for, and zealous espousal of, democracy, socialism and the interests of the peasants and down-trodden workers. The Congress Democratic Party do not think much of his achievement: for they feel the urgent necessity of reforming the Congress Executive "on a broader and more democratic basis with special provision for direct representation of the Workers, Peasants, Youths and the peoples of the Indian States". They further seek to "reform" the Congress franchise, though they do not indicate the direction of the reform. Do they really propose to assail Mr. Gandhi's khaddar franchise? They have already challenged Mr. Gandhi's principle of non-violence. To complete the picture, they ask for provincial autonomy. That will enable them to shake off Mr. Gandhi's nostrums inconvenient to them.

**Shahbash!**

THE abandonment of the Nehru Report by the Congress does nothing to lift the dark clouds of communalism which have long cast a gloom on the political horizon. The Minority Report of Sir Zulfikar Ali Khan and Dr. Shurawardy to the Nair Report deepens the gloom and almost dispels the hope of India ever growing into a united nation. But there is a silver lining, which is a matter for much thankfulness and relief. Mr. Yakub Hasan has always been a staunch nationalist and opposed to communalism. He has recently helped to form the "Nation First Party" in Madras. Under the auspices of that Party he delivered a public lecture in Madras which he has since made available in printed form. It is a very timely and useful contribution. He holds Turkey as an exemplar to India and gives apposite and effective extracts from the *Memoirs* of Halida Hanum, the gifted Turkish writer, to bring out vividly the progress that Turkey has made by superceding religion by nationalism. Mr. Yakub Hassan does not advocate the suppression of religion, as was done in Turkey and in the Soviet Republic of Russia, but the relegation of it to its proper place, the individual conscience. He would resist its interference with the common concerns of the people. Not only that, he would like to make Nationalism as great a motive power as religion has been in the past: nationalism to be the super religion of India.

Dr. Shafiuddin Kitchlew is another votary among Muhammadans of this new religion. In his Welcome Address at the Lahore Congress he unreservedly condemned communalism and held aloft the torch of nationalism. And now comes the formation of the Nationalist Muslim Party to fight communalism among Muslims. Dr. Ansari, Moulana Abdul Kalam Azad, Mr. Brelvi, Dr. Kitchlew and several others have banded together for the purpose. We hope the Party will grow from strength to strength and redeem India from the bane of communalism.

\* \* \*

**The Sarda Act.**

THE action of the local Governments to give wide publicity, at the instance of the Government of India, to the provisions of the Sarda Act is most timely and commendable. We hope local bodies and all other public institutions interested in the matter will likewise exert themselves to give the widest possible publicity to the Act. In this respect Social Reform organisations and in particular, women's organisations, have special responsibilities in view of the opposition to the Act from orthodox quarters both among Hindus and Muslims. It must, however, be remembered that women's conferences have almost unanimously welcomed the Act. As pointed out by the Delhi Correspondent of the "Guardian" there is much force in the contention of the Muslim lady of Delhi, herself coming from one of the most conservative families of that ancient city, that "in the affairs relating to their sex, it is the opinion of the women, that shall prevail." It must be noted that Lady Abdul Quadir, in her Presidential Address to the Delhi Provincial Conference of Women held in November last, lent her strong support to the Act, and all the Muslim ladies in the Conference except one voted for it. The opposition to the Act is mostly from men. And as the Muslim lady of Delhi asked, "when have men welcomed the assertion of their rights by their womenfolk?" To meet the opposition to the Act it will be necessary and desirable that Social Reform bodies should print and broadcast a connected account of the evidence that led to the passing of the Act. The number of child marriages that have been taking place all over the land to forestall the

Act is a matter for regret and shame. We would like to believe that every such marriage was protested against by the local community before it took place. There are still nearly four months during which much wrong may still be done. The young men and women of the country who would rescue India from foreign domination may well begin with rescuing the innocent girls from the grave wrongs which their misguided parents would inflict on them.

\* \* \*

**The Bombay Social Service League.**

THE seventeenth report of the Social Service League, Bombay, records a large amount of varied activity in different spheres of social work. The League conducted 9 night-schools, attended mostly by working classes, of which two are of the high school grade, and ran successfully a textile technical school, students from which have secured higher posts in mills. The League has done a considerable amount of sanitary work by revealing defects in several wards and getting them removed and has continued to maintain a charitable dispensary for women and children, which during the year treated nearly 22,000 patients. One of the most useful activities of the League has been the training of women in home industries and ministering to their intellectual needs by means of lectures, debates and classes. The League managed the Industrial Criminal Tribes Settlement at Belgaum where every inmate is made to do some useful work and is weaned from crime. The League managed during the year, through Mr. P. G. Naik, one of the life-workers the Bombay Presidency Released Prisoners' Aid Society and lent their aid to the Children's Aid Society which carries out the provisions of the Bombay Children Act. The activities of the League in providing recreation for the working classes have been well kept up and propaganda work has been carried vigorously by means of two quarterly journals, publication of booklets and maintenance of an Information Bureau which collects reports of institutions carrying on social work in other parts of India, in England and America. For the last five years the League has been conducting social workers' training classes, at which eminent teachers and social workers have delivered lectures. It is disheartening to read that the finances of the League are far from satisfactory, in spite of all attempts at retrenchment; and we endorse the appeal made in the report to the well-to-do classes to render financial assistance in order to enable the League to pursue its useful activities. An organization like this cannot make much headway with the total receipts just reaching the figure of Rs. 55,000 in a city like Bombay.

\* \* \*

**The Delhi Shipping Conference.**

THE breakdown of the Shipping Conference recently held at Delhi at the instance of the Government of India is greatly to be regretted, though in the nature of things it was almost inevitable. Only the display of supreme sympathy, understanding and mutual accommodation could have produced any agreed settlement, for the points of view of the British and Indian shipping interests are diametrically opposed. The Conference deliberated in secret; and no official report of the proceedings have been issued. But from such information as has been gathered by the news agencies, it is clear that both the Viceroy and the Government of India gave unmistakable indications of their sympathy for the Indian desire to build up an Indian Mercantile Marine and for the Indianisation of coastal traffic and for the participation of Indian shipping in the ocean trade of India. They wished the Conference to concede that there was a limit to the tonnage that

could economically work the coastal traffic and sought the advice of the Conference for the gradual Indianisation of this tonnage and the elimination of non-Indian interests. They tentatively proposed that Indian shipping companies might purchase the non-Indian rights and pay compensation for goodwill. They were prepared to find the compensation for goodwill from the general revenues of the country. The Indian shipping representatives, who always stood for the right of India to develop its own shipping and who did not seek the conference with the British interests, but agreed to meet them at the instance of the Viceroy to explore the possibilities of mutual accommodation, asked for a time limit to the Indianisation of coastal shipping and saw no justification for compensation to be paid to British interests. If a State gives protection to its industries in order to develop them, it certainly is not bound to compensate the foreign interests for the loss of their trade. But the Conference had not to go so far as to discuss all these proposals, for the representatives of the British interests, which control 5,00,000 out of 6,00,000 tonnage engaged in Indian coastal traffic, declined to accept the very basic proposition of the Government that only a limited tonnage could work the coastal trade economically. They obstinately stood out for the *status quo* and only relented so far as to make some insignificant concessions to the Scindia Steam Navigation Company. Even the Correspondent of the "Times of India" reports that "from all accounts those who represented the British interests were not disposed to meet the other side." The position is now clear for the Government and the country. They must proceed with Mr. Haji's Bill disregarding the protest of the intractable British monopolists. The Government and the Indian interests went on out of the way to give them a chance to help India to develop her Mercantile Marine: they preferred to strangle her desire.

#### India's Economic Future.

MANY valuable suggestions are contained in the presidential address which Mr. N. S. Subba Rao delivered to the thirteenth session of the Indian Economic Conference. His principal suggestion is about the formation of a National Economic Board which will make investigations *Suo moto* as the result of a comprehensive plan of campaign instead of passing judgements on matters brought before it at the request of parties who are interested only in sectional investigation into their own affairs. Such a Board ought to consider the direction in which Indian economic development may be expected to proceed; and in the opinion of Mr. Subba Rao a large country like India ought to attain self-sufficiency and produce all the essential industrial products, provided temporary protection is afforded to industries. In this connection he entered a caveat against bolstering up local industries where the natural and other advantages are lacking and his recommendation is that the National Board should look at this matter from a larger and national point of view and prevent the distribution of units of production of a moderate size all over the country and the consequent waste of resources. His condemnation of the matriculates and graduates as parasites in the economic system contributing very little towards national production is thoroughly justifiable; to cure this defect he suggested the diversification of secondary education by introducing vocational education so as to help each individual to reach that particular vocational gateway which leads where he will benefit himself most as well as contribute most fully to the good of all. In fact, he would overhaul the whole system of education in India and prepare a new educational programme so as to suit the requirements

of India's agriculture, trade and industries. This is certainly necessary in view of the fact that our secondary education has been too much stereotyped and has proved wasteful for a large number of boys. For preparing a programme of industrial education he thinks it is indispensable to make a thorough survey of the economic position in the country, with a forecast as to probable developments in the near future; it is for the National Board to perform this task by viewing the Indian economic problem as a whole.

A suggestion similar to that made by Mr. Subba Rao about the National Board has been made by Sir Alfred Chatterton in a discourse recently delivered in Madras. He recommended the enlargement of the existing Tariff Board in order to constitute an All-India Industrial Board whose principal duty would be to promote industrial development of a varied character. In cases where it is demonstrated that similiar goods can be manufactured in India Sir Alfred is even prepared to go so far as to prohibit imports and to grant monopolies to indigenous producers. Such a Board could, in his opinion, be empowered to negotiate with private concerns for the grant of concessions which would attract capital and technical experience. Along with Mr. Subba Rao, Sir A. Chatterton deprecates the present educational system which fails to develop originality and stifles individuality by a succession of examinations suitable only for the selection of mandarins. Sir Alfred frankly admits that the facilities which have been created for the penetration of sea-borne trade and the expenditure of the commercial energy of the country in building up a foreign trade directed towards the export of raw materials and the import of manufactures have been one of the chief obstacles to the rapid industrial progress of India. All leading Indian economists since Ranade have been harping upon this theme for the last half a century and it is a good augury that at long last economists like Sir Alfred are realizing the truth if it. The proper remedy is, as he says, a well-considered industrial policy to resist the peaceful penetration of the country by the mammoth commercial concerns of Europe and America. But unless the Provincial industrial departments are galvanized into greater activity there is not much hope of such a policy bearing fruit, however well-conceived it might be.

#### The World Conference for International Peace.

WE are glad to find that the Preliminary Conference of all the religions held in Geneva in 1928 has not become abortive; the Executive Committee elected by this Conference held its second sitting at Frankfort in August and completed the organization begun at Geneva. This Frankfort Conference has appointed four International Commissions for investigating the influences that make for war and the spiritual resources of mankind with which these influences can be met; for suggesting methods by which these resources could be set in motion and coordinated and for making a survey of the efforts made by different religions to further inter-racial peace. All of those present agreed that the Conference can be made to contribute materially to a better understanding among the nations by basing its discussions upon careful scientific studies. The report of the General Secretary's trip through the East describes what he achieved in India, China, Japan and Indo-China; and he says that wherever he went he felt a real hunger for fellowship based on a genuine consideration of the meaning of brotherhood and a willingness to cooperate in every plan which promises peace. He is convinced that the proposal to hold a World Conference for International Peace through Religion is timely and is in accord with an

almost universal movement. He is right in believing that the holding of such a Conference will give to the agencies such as the World Court, the League of Nations and similar organizations the moral backing of the united religious forces of the world. The General Secretary further suggests that arrangements should be made to send deputations to the various countries for establishing friendships and points of contact and carrying on discussions with the adherents of different religions; this in our opinion is a very wise suggestion and one pregnant with great possibilities. In India he has succeeded in forming an "All-India Committee" which will represent Indian life and thought in the World Conference and which will contain representatives of every religion and every class in India. It may be noted that Prof. R. M. Joshi and Mr. A. Yusuf Ali have been appointed members of the Nominating Committee whose task is to consider nominations for the offices and commissions authorised by the Executive Committee. The following words of Dr. S. Mathews of Chicago, the Chairman, make clear the object of the Conference:—"We have gathered together not for the purpose of the discussion of faiths but for the discussion of ideals which we hold irrespective of our particular religious relationship and that particular ideal to which we are to devote ourselves is the development by virtue of our religious connections to a better international feeling."

\* \* \*

#### The Maritime Session of the International Labour Conference.

THE thirteenth session of the International Labour Conference was devoted solely to questions relating to the living and working conditions of seamen. The agenda consisted of the regulation of hours of work, protection in the case of sickness, the liability of the shipowner towards injured seamen, promotion of seamen's welfare in ports and the establishment of a standard of capacity in the case of captains and other officers. All the maritime countries except Norway were represented. With regard to hours of work the conference invited the International Labour Office to ascertain the views of Governments on the main points settled in a draft convention. On the question of protection of seamen the principle of compulsory sickness insurance for all persons employed on board ships, excepting the ships of war was adopted. The Conference invited the I. L. Office to consult Governments about the adoption of legislative measures combating the danger of alcoholism and narcotics and the protection of the health of seamen against tuberculosis and provision of treatment for venereal diseases as also about the provision of suitable hostels, recreation rooms and libraries in ports. The Conference also passed resolutions dealing, among others, with the conditions of life and labour of Asiatic seamen and equitable treatment of seamen employed on board vessels plying within the territorial waters of the country of which the seamen are citizens. Mr. Daud, the Indian workers' delegate, speaking on the resolution concerning Asiatic seamen, drew attention to the invidious distinctions existing in respect of wages, hours of work etc. of Indian seamen and the woeful lack of housing accommodation for them. The same resolution requested the Governing Body to direct the I. L. Office to devote special attention to the condition of Asiatic seamen in the conduct of its general inquiry into the conditions of labour. This is a great point achieved and Mr. Daud and Mr. Liang, the Chinese workers' delegate, ought to be congratulated on moving the Resolution.

\* \* \*

## Articles.

### FORGE AHEAD.

THE hectic week of Indian politics is over; the congresses and conferences have met, deliberated and dispersed. It will be interesting to take stock, as it were, of the present situation, though in a tentative way, since the ashes are still hot and things have not settled down and set. The centre of attention is naturally the offer of the Round Table Conference by the British Government to discuss the future political constitution of India. It was an offer of self-determination for India. Though the terms of reference and the personnel of the Conference have not yet been announced, the Secretary of State for India, Mr. Wedgwood Benn, has stated in Parliament that all important interests would be represented and there would be no limitations on the range of discussion in the Conference. It is a matter of ordinary convention and commonsense that the larger the support that the decisions of the Conference receive from its members the more weight they will carry with the British Government. If on any decision the Indian representatives are unanimous its acceptance by the Government is almost certain. It is open to those who believe in independence for India to press their view and canvass support for their view. Of course, much will depend on the personnel of the Conference. If Lord Birkenhead had made the offer of a Conference, we might be fairly certain that he would have called together the most impossible persons from India, set them by the ears, chuckled over their mutual recriminations, and manoeuvred justification out of their own mouths for a reactionary policy. But nobody, not even Mr. Gandhi, questions the honesty and sincerity of Mr. Benn and Lord Irwin. They are not out to exploit our differences; they would rather help to compose them. They are not likely to wreck the Conference by manipulating its composition. Even so, it is open to public bodies to press for the right type of personnel, and even stipulate for it. Before, however, the terms of reference and the personnel of the Conference are announced, before the public have had a chance to examine them and find them satisfactory or otherwise, it were premature to refuse to go to the Conference, particularly as nobody is thereby precluded from taking his own line of action if the conclusions of the Conference or the decisions of the Government should turn out to be unsatisfactory.

And yet the Indian National Congress, certainly the premier political organisation in the country, has, under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, declined to go to the Conference. The resolution was carried by an over-whelming majority in the open Congress. The British friends of India, and all those who stood by Lord Irwin and Mr. Benn, all those who fondly hoped that, with the advent of the Labour Government in England, a new policy of reconciliation and rapid progress may be successfully followed in India and who hoped to enlist the co-operation of the non-co-

operators, and who, more than anything else, hoped to save India from the distressing experiences of Ireland—all these may well ask in vexatious disappointment what is the good of proceeding with the Round Table Conference; they may well throw up their hands in resignation and despair. Trying and vexatious as is the action of the Congress, there is no occasion for throwing up the sponge. It is true that Mr. Gandhi's resolution was carried by a large majority in the open Congress. But that majority consisted mostly of young men who naturally were carried off their feet by Mr. Gandhi's personality and his appeal to their emotions. Several senior leaders like Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Mr. Satyamurty, Mr. N. C. Kelkar, Mr. M. R. Jayakar, Mr. Aney, all members of the Congress, have dissented from Mr. Gandhi's resolution. And if press reports be true, Mrs. Naidu and Dr. Ansari were also in the opposition. It is significant that Messrs Malaviya, Kelkar, Mitra and Moonjee have publicly appealed to Congressmen in the legislatures not to act immediately upon the Congress resolution regarding the boycott of the councils. Mr. Satyamurty declared himself in favour of going to Conference and of reviving the Swaraj Party of Mr. Das. It would be incorrect to say that the majority of the Congress leaders are seriously in favour of boycotting the Round Table Conference. It may take them some time to declare themselves openly. Why, Mr. Kelkar, who was in the thick of the fight at Lahore, declared in an interview that, according to his reading of the situation, even Mr. Gandhi would accept Dominion Status! In the event it may turn out that the Congress might act on Mr. T. Prakasam's rejected amendment: the Congress may not be directly represented on the Conference but will not oppose the Conference and will watch the results in benevolent neutrality. The only irreconcilables will be the Congress Democratic Party under Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar and Mr. Subash Chunder Bose. But they do not cut much ice yet, and their opposition may be ignored.

The Responsivists have issued a statement deploring the decisions of the Congress and asking its members not to resign their seats on the Councils. From the intimate though unrevealed part that Mr. Jayakar took in promoting the idea of the Round Table Conference, it is certain that he is in favour of going to the Round Table Conference. So is Mr. M. A. Jinnah. The National Liberal Federation of India has given its hearty support to the Conference. And so have the Punjab and Frontier Hindu Conference, the Muslim League, the All-India Christian Conference, and several other bodies. It may confidently be expected that the next few weeks will see more desertions from the Congress and more support to the Conference. The path of wisdom lies in forging ahead with the Round Table Conference.

#### STAND FAST BY FRIENDS.

SINCE the Congress changed its creed the British Press and the Anglo-Indian Press have shown an extraordinary solicitude for the Liberals and Moderates in India. The London "Times" is reported

to have welcomed the emergence in force of the Liberals. "What really matters most is that for the first time there seems some prospect of an organised force emerging in Indian politics with a sense of realities and determination to face them. . . . If they will only show a courage equal to their commonsense their adherents may prove incomparably more numerous during the next few months than they suspect." The "Manchester Guardian" is reported to have said, "The Congress having decided to base its policy on emotions and ideals and to ignore facts, the Indian Moderates have a chance of regaining the control of India's course", and to have lamented that "Mr. Sastri and his distinguished colleagues have no organised party and no definite practical policy". It is well for our contemporaries to realise the difficult position of the Liberals in India. The problem in India today is not one of policies to be pursued by the Government but the attainment of self-government, the acquisition of power. As long as both the Moderates and Extremists have no occasion or need to deliver the goods, certainly the Extremists, who talk of ridding the country of foreign rule at once, have an advantage over the Moderates whose plea for ordered, if slower, progress is easily misrepresented as a plea for the continuance of foreign domination. The impotent Moderates who can show no striking results have no chance with the public against the Extremists who shout the tallest anti-foreign slogans.

The Moderates were not lacking in courage. They faced enormous public opposition from the non-co-operators headed by no less a person than Mr. Gandhi, when they undertook to work the Montagu constitution. If they were adequately and enthusiastically supported by the Government since then, they would not have been reduced to the plight in which they find themselves now. With the dismissal of Mr. Montagu from the India Office reaction set in, and the Moderates were discredited in India. Their advice was rejected, and themselves were treated with contempt and thrown on the dust heap. It is only by showing positive and beneficial results that the Moderates can satisfy the people and convince them of the superior advantages of their policy over that of the non-co-operators. And for that purpose they must have power in the councils of the Government. The British Government must cordially co-operate with the co-operators. The Government hold the trump card. With them lies the power and the opportunity of strengthening the forces either of ordered progress or of revolution.

In saying this the Liberals lay themselves open to the unfair charge that they are simply exploiting the Extremists in order to strike a more advantageous bargain for themselves. So riendly and well-informed a paper as the "Manchester Guardian" is reported to have said that "there is no future for a party which demands today what the Extremists demanded yesterday". There was and is no difference between the Moderates and Extremists regarding the goal of India: complete and undiluted self-government for India on a democratic basis. In this respect the British Government too have

come into line with the unanimous opinion of India, thanks to the Montagu declaration. The only difference that divides the Moderates and the Extremists is India's relation to England. The former would be friendly to England because they realise the mutual advantage of it. The latter are, we hope only for the moment, unfriendly, even hostile, to England. The former relation is expressed by Dominion Status; the latter by Independence. The only other point of difference is the pace at which India is to move towards complete self-government. If the Moderates are willing to go a little slower and make reservations, it is not with a view to perpetuate British domination but to accommodate their aspirations to the inescapable facts in India; the facts of race, religion, history and geography.

Once again the Liberals have shown commendable courage and their sense of responsibility and love of the Motherland by undertaking, in opposition to the Congress and Mr. Gandhi, to rally round Dominion Status all the forces in India that make for peaceful evolution. Will their efforts be seconded on all hands by all parties that share their views—the Government, the British Press in England and the Anglo-Indian press in India, the Europeans in India and others? Certainly Lord Russel, the Under Secretary of State for India, has not by his uncalled for speech the other day made things easy for the Liberals in India. While his Chief kept an open mind and proposed that the Round Table Conference should be free to discuss the nature of the constitution without prejudice, he went out of the way to declare that India was unfit for Dominion Status for a long time to come. This is the latest instance of the Government discrediting the Liberals in India and adding to their difficulties. We trust that Mr. Wedgwood Benn and Lord Irwin will hasten to repudiate the views of Lord Russel.

#### MR. JAWAHAR LAL AND THE CONGRESS.

THERE is such an extraordinary amount of sound sense and correct principle in the excellent address delivered by Mr. Jawahar Lal Nehru as President of the Indian National Congress that one feels all the more painfully the great lapses from logic and principle that the speech exhibits when it comes to grips with practical problems.

In the first place, on the problem of problems of the day, the question of participation in the Round Table Conference, Mr. Nehru is absolutely unconvincing. Two reasons are assigned by him why the Congress must abstain from the Conference. In the first place, the Congress in Calcutta gave one year's time for the adoption of the Nehru Scheme. The year has passed; and neither has the scheme been adopted nor any definite promise made for its adoption. Therefore, logically, the Congress can do nothing but fall back on independence. Secondly, the thing that evidently the British Government have in their mind is not the thing we want, because it means "the shadow of authority to a handful of Indians and more repression and exploitation of the masses."

With regard to the first of these reasons, it is a

somewhat novel principle in politics that because a national body decides on one thing one day it cannot change that programme the next year. Let us suppose that last year the Congress had given an ultimatum to England that unless some things were done in the course of a year, war would be declared, and England, in reply, had asked for a conference to discuss the matters. Would there be no way left to the Congress but to sigh and reply, "My poor friend, I am tied by a pledge, I cannot oblige you." Mr. Jawahar Lal knows too much and that too well to think that this would go down with anybody who has clear notions about politics.

It would be very different if the pourparlers proposed were merely a blind for the purpose of gaining time; in which case to accede to it would be yielding an unfair advantage to the enemy. If nothing is to be gained by a conference and valuable time would be lost, there would be considerable force in the argument for refusal.

Mr. Jawahar Lal labours to establish the first part of this proposition in the second argument I have adverted to before. He lays down, as an *ipse dixit*, if I may be pardoned for saying so, that the conference would at best lead to Dominion status which would mean giving a shadow of authority to a handful and the exploitation of the masses.

There is no pretence of an argument to support the conclusion except an analysis and criticism, which is manifestly unfair, of Mr. Wedgwood Benn's speeches. Let us assume, however, that Mr. Wedgwood Benn and the Labour Cabinet of England have at the back of their mind some such scheme which they will put forward in the conference, though, in passing, I may mention that such a supposition is wholly inconsistent with the compliments to the sincerity and earnestness of the Viceroy and the Secretary of State paid by both the President and Mr. Gandhi. What then?

A conference of this character between opposing parties always means that each party has its own view point which it seeks to induce the other to accept. If in the course of deliberations they can arrive at a formula upon which both parties can agree the Conference succeeds. Otherwise it fails. Now, if the British Cabinet wants to impose the special brand of Dominion Status held up by Mr. Jawahar Lal, the Congress might go there nevertheless, prepared to force its opposite view on the Conference. Even if they want independence, they may go and make a bid for it at the Conference. And if by the discussion something acceptable can be hammered out, well and good. If not, the Congress delegates will come back, no worse than they were before, to carry on whatever programme they thought fit for attaining their ends.

So then, the mere fact that the other party has a particular scheme in mind is no reason for refusing to discuss things with them, unless the facts unmistakably show that the Conference must necessarily fail. No reason has hitherto been assigned, and none is to be found in any of the speeches in the Congress, why the Conference must be deemed to be foredoomed to failure. The history of other conferences of the same

character does not encourage the scepticism. The conferences on the Irish question and on the Egyptian question have led to eminently successful results though the prospects at the start were anything but rosy. What foundation is there, then, for the prediction of failure unless it is derived from some prophetic dream of Mr. Gandhi or Mr. Nehru?

Even if it fails, how would the Congress be any the worse for it? How would they be losing? What strategic advantage would they have surrendered? Neither the Viceroy, nor Mr. Wedgwood Benn has laid down any conditions for the Conference. There is no plea for a cessation of hostilities—no armistice is asked for. The Congress is not required to suspend the least bit of whatever programme it may decide upon. They may declare independence, launch civil disobedience, promote strikes and even go to war if they think fit, and the Government will go on suppressing them as best they can. If for the success of the Conference the Government demanded a suspension of these activities, the Congress, in their turn, were free to demand as a *quid pro quo* that the Government should grant amnesty to political prisoners and withdraw political prosecutions.

And then, what is the great active work which must be done immediately if the Congress is to attain its objective? If, after the adoption of independence as its immediate objective, the Congress had adopted a programme of immediate work which would brook no delay, one could appreciate their refusal to waste time in conferences. But looking at the programme outlined by the Congress one fails to find the faintest suggestion of active work. The programme is a bare negation, abstention from participating in the Councils. There is nothing more. No resolve to establish a parallel government, no immediate general strike, no immediate programme of civil disobedience of any sort whatsoever. The Congress would be welcome to carry on this great programme of bare inaction and go to the Conference all the same, without losing anything by it.

The President has thus failed to convince with his arguments, and it is easy to see that in the controversy on the matter in the Subjects Committee the arguments of Messrs. Malaviya and Kelkar remained unanswered, though they were swamped by adverse votes. The defence put by Mr. Gandhi was the weakest of all. Mr. Gandhi has always been more famous as a prophet than as a logician, and in his speech in reply to the debate he was less convincing than ever. He does not even pretend to be logical, the sum and substance of his argument being "our word of honour is involved; a nation that does not keep its pledge goes down". A very shaky argument at best, and altogether demolished by the President himself when he said "No programme or policy can be laid down for ever, nor can this Congress bind the country or even itself to pursue one line of action indefinitely." And this plea of binding pledge sits with ill-grace on Mr. Gandhi who has changed the pledges and programmes of the Congress with amazing rapidity since he launched his programme of non-co-operation.

The lameness of logic on the side of abstentionists can point to but one of two things. Either they are incapable of clear thinking, a charge which will not certainly hold good of Mr. Jawahar Lal, or they have other reasons for reluctance which they dare not confess. Is it a lurking suspicion that if they went to the Conference they cannot trust themselves to hold their own or make a good showing?

NARES C. SEN-GUPTA.

#### THE LIBERAL PARTY'S STATEMENT.

The President read the following statement of the Liberal Party and announced that a Committee had been constituted consisting of Dr. Sapru, (convenor and chairman of the Committee), Dr. Besant, Sir C. Setalvad, Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, Sir M. V. Joshi, Messrs. C. Y. Chintamani, M. Ramachandra Rao, G. A. Natesan and Sir P. Sethna to give effect to the resolution moved by the Rt. Hon'ble Sastri that all Parties which accept the Round Table Conference should combine together for its realisation:—

The march of events during the last two months and particularly during the last few days makes it imperative that the Liberal Federation should make an appeal to those in the country who have hitherto pinned their faith to the achievement by India of Dominion Status as an integral member of the British Commonwealth of Nations. The announcement made by His Excellency the Viceroy on the 31st October last with the full consent and authority of His Majesty's Government evoked a remarkable feeling of response in the country and from the Indian Princes, which led us to believe that the solution of the difficulties with which we have been confronted was at last within sight. The debates that followed in the House of Lords and in the House of Commons unfortunately gave rise to a great deal of misunderstanding with regard to the meaning and effect, the purpose and scope of British policy adumbrated by His Excellency the Viceroy. Nevertheless, those of us who realise the political conditions surrounding the Labour Government in England were disposed and are still disposed to attach far greater significance and weight to the authoritative statements made by His Majesty's Government through the Secretary of State in England and the Viceroy in India than to their critics in Parliament or in the English Press.

As we read the situation, the essential condition of success at the Round Table Conference is that there should be the maximum amount of agreement among ourselves in India. If we can secure such agreement, our representatives at the Round Table Conference will be able to press with every hope of success for complete Dominion Status being established, subject to such safeguards and reservations including the protection of the interests and rights of minorities as might be necessary in the present conditions of India for the period of transition. We have always been anxious that in order to produce a favourable atmosphere the Government in India should implement the new policy by action.

calculated to remove all causes of irritation and produce calm and good will.

We must deplore that just at the moment when our attention should be fixed on matters affecting the future of this country, an attempt should have been made to wreck the train of His Excellency the Viceroy, who has, during the last few months, by identifying himself with the Indian cause, earned our gratitude and admiration in a special measure. Outrages of this character, wholly inconsistent as they are with the Indian outlook on life, so far from helping our cause, are bound to create, in the minds of our opponents, prejudice against us; but we sincerely hope and trust that the situation will be dealt with on its own merits, uninfluenced by the deeds of those who take a perverted view of freedom and patriotism.

We firmly believe that the only rallying cry which can unite Hindus, Muhammadans, Christians, Sikhs, Parsis, and Europeans, the propertied classes and the labouring and the depressed classes, can be Dominion status for India, not as a distant goal or ideal, but as an object capable of achievement within the shortest possible limit of time. In a constitution seeking to give India the status of a Dominion there will be no difficulty in making ample provision for the safeguarding of her security against internal trouble and foreign aggression during the period of transition. The mutual relations of British India and Indian States can also be satisfactorily defined and provision made for their future regulation consistently, on the one hand, with the Dominion status now contemplated, and, on the other, with the autonomy of the Indian States. Those of us who believe in the peaceful evolution of India cannot but deplore that any section of the people of this country should raise the cry of independence and involve our future in turmoil and confusion. Believing as we do that the Labour Government and Lord Irwin are in real earnest in seeking an acceptable solution of the constitutional problem we should be guilty of utter short-sightedness and lack of statesmanship if we fail to seize the opportunity that has been extended to us. We realise that the task of those who believe in Dominion status and who are prepared to work for it has become more difficult by reason of the attitude adopted by one leading political organisation in India and that their responsibility has become all the greater. But if all the other parties who believe in Dominion status will join hands together in pressing India's claim there is no reason why we should not achieve it. But this makes it necessary that the internal differences which divide one community from another should be composed in a just and generous manner. Believing as we do in principles of justice and equality and fairness to all parties and communities and interests, we make an earnest appeal to all those whose objective is Dominion status to devise a means of common deliberation. If such an attempt is made and we proceed about our business in a spirit of give and take we are confident of a settlement amongst ourselves which will expedite and facilitate the work of the round table conference in

London. It is in that hope and belief that we issue this appeal. As a necessary preliminary we shall appoint a small committee of our own Party with power to co-operate with representatives of other Parties for the purpose of taking the necessary initiative.

---

## Reviews.

---

### EARLY MAHOMEDAN INDIA.

THE CAMBRIDGE HISTORY OF INDIA, VOL. III, TURKS AND AFGHANS, Ed. By SIR WOLSELY HAIG. (Cambridge University Press.) 1928. 24cm. xxxi + 752p. 42/-

THE third volume of the Cambridge History of India, dealing with the early Muhammadan period, usually miscalled the 'Pathan' period, fully sustains the reputation for scholarship established by the Cambridge series of Modern, Mediaeval and Ancient Histories. The present volume is edited by Sir Wolsely Haig, who himself contributes no less than eighteen of the twenty-three chapters—an unusual proceeding, but one which in our opinion the reader will have no reason to regret, for we cannot easily think of a scholar more competent to deal with this period than Sir Wolsely Haig. Of the remaining five chapters, two are on Burma and Ceylon; one on Gujarat and Khandesh, contributed by Sir Denison Ross; one on the Hindu States in Southern India, by Prof. Krishnaswami Ayyangar of Madras and the last, a fascinating chapter on the monuments of Muslim India, by Sir John Marshall, Director-General of the Archaeological Survey of India. Not the least attractive part of the volume is the fifty-one magnificent plates at the end, illustrating the monuments of the early Muhammadan period.

One rises from a perusal of the present volume with a somewhat different conception of the fanaticism and ferocity of the early Muhammadan rulers of India than that of the text-books. The following passage is noteworthy in this connection:—

"The rhapsodies of Muslim historians in their account of the suppression of a rising or the capture of a fortress or towns and villages burnt, of whole districts laid waste, of temples destroyed and idols overthrown, of hecotombs of 'misbelievers sent to hell or dispatched to their own place' and of thousands of women and children enslaved might delude us into the belief that the early Muslim occupation of north India was one prolonged holy war waged for the extirpation of idolatry and the propagation of Islam, had we not proof that this cannot have been the case. Mahmud the Iconoclast maintained a large corps of Hindu horse; his son Masud prohibited his Muslim officers from offending the religious susceptibilities of their Hindu comrades, employed the Hindu Tilak for the suppression of the rebellion of the Muslim Ahamad Niyattigin, approved of Tilak's mutilation of Muslims, and made him the equal of his Muslim nobles; Muiz-ud-din Muhammad [Muhammad Ghori] allied himself with the Hindu Raja of Jammu against the Muslim Khusrau Malik of Lahore and employed Hindu legends on



his coinage; all Muslim rulers in India, from Mahmud downwards, accepted, when it suited them to do so, the allegiance of Hindu rulers and landholders, and confirmed them, as vassals, in the possession of their hereditary land; and one of the pretexts for Timur's invasions of India at the end of the fourteenth century was the toleration of Hinduism. . . . On the whole it may be assumed that the rule of the Slave Kings over their Hindu subjects, though disfigured by some intolerance and by gross cruelty towards the disaffected, was as just and humane as that of the Norman Kings in England and far more tolerant than that of Philip II in Spain and the Netherlands." (pp. 88-89.)

Similarly, Sir John Marshall observes, with special reference to the artistic gifts of the Muslim invaders:—

"The Muslims, moreover, who conquered India—men of Afghan, Persian and Turki blood—were endowed with remarkably good taste and a natural talent for building. The picture that some writers have drawn of them, as wild and semi-barbarous hill-men descending on an ancient and vastly superior civilisation, is far from the truth. That they were brutal fighters, without any of the chivalry, for example, of the Rajputs, and that they were capable of acts of savagery and gross intemperance, may be conceded. But these were vices common in those ages to most Asiatic nations and did not preclude them any more than they had precluded the Ghaznavids from participating in the prevalent culture and arts of Islam. Qutb-ud-din Aibak was ruthless enough to enslave *en masse* the population of Kalinjar, but he had also the genius and imagination to create a mosque as superb as any in Islam; and though Ala-ud-din Khalji slaughtered thousands of Mougals in cold blood at Delhi, he was the author of buildings of unexampled grace and nobility." (pp. 569-570).

The unique interest of the period of our history with which the present volume deals lies in the impact of Islam and Hinduism: "Seldom in the history of mankind," as the author who has been just quoted remarks, "has the spectacle been witnessed of two civilisations, so vast and so strongly developed—yet so radically dissimilar as the Muhammadan and Hindu, meeting and mingling together." That being so, it is to be regretted that no attempt has been made in the present volume to trace the results of this impact in spheres other than that of art—e. g. religion, and of what in Hinduism is so intimately connected with religion, social organisation. Again, we think the reader would have welcomed some account of the Afghan and especially the Turki invaders of India in their respective homes. Lastly, we do not expect such easily avoidable mistakes as the following in a publication of the Cambridge University Press:—'1114' for '1151' (p. 36, l. 25); 'the central authorities was strong' (p. 45 l. 29); 'become' for 'became' (p. 95, l. 31). etc.

R. P. PATWARDHAN.

## AMERICAN SHIPPING

THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE PROBLEM. (National Industrial Conference Board, New York) 1929. 22cm. 167p. \$2.50.

THERE are several post-war problems peculiar to the United States and the Merchant Marine problem is one of these. Prior to 1914 American interests in shipping had for many years been chiefly in the operation of vessels in the coastwise and nearby foreign trades. During the war the shipping industry in the United States was abnormally stimulated and thereafter the decline in world production and trade and the general economic disorganisation severely depressed the industry in respect of both building and operation. It is to throw light on this and other problems that the National Industrial Conference Board has published the book called *The American Merchant Marine Problem*. The problems which are treated in this book are not only important to the American public but also to the world at large. India is passing through a phase when she would welcome light thrown on any of the big political or economic problems with which her leaders are busying themselves at present. The question of developing her mercantile marine is one of these, and the Indian people have rightly felt that this is one of the fundamental pillars for the reconstruction of the Indian economic structure. India had once a highly developed shipbuilding industry of her own, and her ships travelled far and wide in the interests of Indian trade. All this shipbuilding and shipping, however, suffered immensely at the hands of foreign shipping which was encouraged by the State at the expense of indigenous shipping. Recently efforts are being made to revive Indian shipping and the awakened self-consciousness of the country will not be satisfied unless the country possesses an efficient and well-developed shipping of her own. The authors of the book try in the first place to remove a misunderstanding which threatens to be very common, which is that a country can not develop its shipping unless it has suitable economic and geographical factors. India, however, has such favourable factors, and there is no justification for taking shelter behind some shibboleth and saying that she will not be able to develop a merchant marine of her own. One may even proceed further and say that the argument advanced by the authors need not be taken too literally. It is often times adduced to prevent less developed countries from following the same path as has been trodden before by advanced countries. When Germany began to develop her mercantile marine and navy, the British people began to scoff and jeer on the ground that a successful navy could be run only by people with the instinct for seamanship in their blood. It was similarly said that people who had not the instinctive touch of a Lancashire man or woman could not succeed with their spinning and weaving industry so well as Lancashire. And yet India has succeeded largely and still more largely has Japan succeeded. Germany also has succeeded with her shipbuilding and shipping, and German sailors have been able to get up their own naval traditions in no way inferior to British naval traditions. It was a favourite theory of the Manchester School of Economics that every country had got a speciality for some particular industry. Some countries were meant to be industrial and others were meant to remain agricultural and to supply raw materials for the use of the former. Under this comfortable view of life England was to continue as an industrial country while we were to continue to supply her factories with the needed raw materials. All this has changed however and every country can with patience and perservance establish

any industry or train an army and navy. The book mentions some advantages which are possessed by the United States for the development of American merchant marine. These are (1) an extensive sea-coast, (2) open harbours which are not blocked as in Russia in the winter season, (3) possession of extensive natural resources. These advantages are possessed by India also and provided our people are prepared for putting into operation the same remedies as were adopted by the United States there is no reason why we should not have a successful merchant marine of our own. Mr. Haji's Bill, which is an attempt in this direction is stigmatised by English critics as an expropriation measure. They, however, readily forget that the means suggested therein have been adopted before now by several Western countries and that the term expropriation was not applied to them. The authors of the book have described what were the steps taken to develop the American merchant marine. These measures include the exclusion of foreign shipping from the coastwise and intercoastal trades, the admission of foreign-built vessels to American registry subject to the provision that they must be used exclusively in foreign trade and the assistance afforded under the Merchant Marine Act 1928. Ships of foreign nations have been excluded from the coasting trade of the United States since 1789. This policy was originally enforced by the imposition of discriminatory tonnage tax which was effective in excluding foreign vessels. In 1817 Congress substituted a specific prohibition which has since remained in force. The result of all such efforts is that at the present time the tonnage of American shipping in the coastwise and intercoastal trades is greater than that of the entire merchant marine of any maritime nation with the exception of Great Britain. On January 1, 1929, the coastwise fleet of the United States comprised 714 vessels of 1000 gross tons and over, with a gross tonnage of 3,490,319 tons. The United States is a much more powerful and wealthy country than India. Nevertheless, there is no reason to suppose that what the former has been able to achieve the latter will never be able to do.

J. K. MEHTA.

#### SHORT NOTICE.

**OLD RHODESIAN DAYS.** By HUGH MARSHALL HOLE. ( Macmillan, London ) 1928. 22cm. 139p. 10/6.

THE author of this very interesting and historically important document depicts the lives of early pioneers. The book is full of illuminating sketches of such pioneers as Rhodes and Jameson. His description of the Native races during those early days, their condition and the difficulties which the pioneers had to confront in dealing with them, and of the country and its natural scenery is superb. There are numerous piquant stories of the ways of the early settlers, missionaries and officials. The magistrates during those days in Rhodesia heard appeals against their own judgments! Once on hearing a notice of appeal the magistrate remarked: "Very well, but it is quarter to one now and time for tiffin, so I'll try the appeal tomorrow morning". The natives during those days were known as "niggers", "but", says the author, "we have become so timidly delicate of speech that I fear I should shock refined ears to use that good old word today . . ." It will not be out of place to mention here that during the last election in Britain, Mr. Lloyd George in one of his speeches referred to the English manufactured bicycles destined for the use of Africans of the West Coast as "nigger bicycles". Mr. Lloyd George perhaps is above all considerations of delicate and refined taste.

The book should be a valuable addition to any library.

S. A. WAIZ.

### Miscellaneous.

#### THE NATIONAL LIBERAL FEDERATION. RESOLUTIONS.

"This Federation strongly condemns the dastardly attempt to wreck His Excellency the Viceroy's train and conveys to Their Excellencies the Viceroy and Lady Irwin its congratulations on the providential escape of themselves and their party. The Federation places on record its abhorrence and detestation of the crime which is wholly repugnant to the spirit of Indian life and culture. The Federation authorises the President to convey this resolution to His Excellency the Viceroy by telegram.

The National Liberal Federation of India cordially welcomes the announcement made on October 31, 1929 by His Excellency the Viceroy as it authoritatively confirms the view that Dominion Status for India was what was intended by the Declaration of 1917, as it definitely recognises that British India and the Indian States should together form a greater united India and as it concedes India's claim to a right to confer on a footing of equality with the British Cabinet on the form of the future constitution of India.

The Federation further resolves that the Liberal Party do participate in the deliberations of the Conference contemplated in the announcement. This Federation strongly urges that the Round Table Conference should be held as early as possible in 1930, and that the progressive elements in the country should have preponderant representation.

This Federation urges upon all Parties in India which accept the recent announcement of His Excellency the Viceroy wholeheartedly and are prepared to secure its complete and immediate realisation to combine together for the purpose of securing a constitution based on Dominion Status, subject to such safeguards and reservations as may be necessary for the period of transition.

This Federation notes with gratification the acceptance by prominent rulers of Indian States of the implications of the announcement of H. E. the Viceroy and recognises that in any future constitution of India based upon Dominion status suitable guarantees should be provided for continuance of their rights and their obligations regarding the internal autonomy of Indian States.

This Federation trusts that the rulers of Indian States will themselves reorganise the system of administration in their respective States and level up the standards of administration in the States so as to approximate to the form of Government prevailing in British India.

This Federation views with grave alarm the recommendation in the report of Sir Samuel Wilson for an increase in the proportion of the representatives of the European community on the Legislative Council of Kenya to the serious detriment of the

interests of the African natives as well as of the Indian community in that Colony and is strongly of opinion that no constitutional advance be sanctioned in any of the East African Colonies till the natives are able to take an effective share in the representation by means of election on a common franchise in common electorates. The Federation therefore supports the recommendation of the Hilton Young Commission in favour of the substitution of common for the existing separate electorates and calls upon the Imperial Government to start inquiries with a view to establishing a common roll in the interest not only of the Indian community but of the whole Colony.

This Federation invites the attention of the Government to the necessity of asking the Whitley Commission to expedite their work and to take effective action on it with a view to ameliorate the present situation.

This Federation appoints a Committee of the following eight members to collect materials and prepare the case for Dominion Status and to authorise the President to meet the necessary costs from the Party funds. Sir P. S. Sivaswami Aiyar, Sir C. P. Ramaswamy Aiyar, Dewan Bahadur T. Rangachariar, Mr. C. Y. Chintamani, Sir Moropant Joshi, Sir Chimanlal Setalvad, Sir Sankar Rao Chitnavis, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru (Convenor).

## THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

### TEXT OF RESOLUTIONS.

THIS Congress expresses its appreciation of the supreme self-sacrifice of Jatindas and Phoongi U. Wizaya and offers its condolence to their families and is further of opinion that the foreign government in India is responsible for their self-immolation.

This Congress expresses its sorrow at the deaths of Pandit Gokarnnath Misra, ex-General Secretary of the A. I. C. C. and Prof. S. M. Paranjpye and Messrs. Bhaktavatsalu Naidu, Rohinikanta Hatibarua and R. K. Lahiri.

This Congress deploras the bomb outrage perpetrated on the Viceroy's train and re-iterates its conviction that such action is not only contrary to the creed of the Congress but results in harm being done to the national cause. It congratulates the Viceroy and Lady Irwin on their fortunate and narrow escape.

This Congress, whilst endorsing the action of the Working Committee in connection with the manifesto signed by the party leaders including Congressmen in connection with the Viceregal pronouncement of October 31 relating to Dominion Status, and appreciating the efforts of the Viceroy towards a peaceful settlement of the national movement for Swarajya, and having considered the result of the meeting between the Viceroy and Pandit Motilal Nehru and other leaders, is of the opinion that nothing can be gained in the existing circumstances by the Congress being represented at the proposed Round Table Conference and, in pursuance of the resolution passed at the Calcutta Congress last year this Congress now declares that 'Swarajya' in the Congress creed shall now mean 'independence';

Therefore, it declares the Nehru scheme of Dominions Status to have lapsed and hopes that all parties in the Congress will devote their exclusive attention to the attainment of complete independence, and hopes also that those whom the tentative solution of the communal problem suggested in the Nehru

Constitution has prevented from joining the Congress or actuated them to abstain from it, will now join or rejoin the Congress and zealously prosecute the common goal.

And as a preliminary step towards organising a campaign for independence and in order to make the Congress policy consistent with the change of its creed, the Congress declares a complete boycott of the Central and Provincial Legislatures and calls upon Congressmen to abstain from participating, directly or indirectly, in future elections and calls upon present members of the Legislatures to tender their resignations and calls upon the nation to concentrate its attention upon the constructive programme of the Congress.

The Congress authorises the All-India Congress Committee, whenever it deems fit, to launch upon a programme of civil disobedience, including non-payment of taxes, whether in selected areas or otherwise, and under such safeguards as it may consider necessary.

In view of the lapse of the Nehru Report it is unnecessary to declare the policy of the Congress regarding communal questions, the Congress believing that in an independent India communal questions can only be solved on strictly national lines. But as the Sikhs in particular, and Muslims and other minorities in general, had expressed dissatisfaction over the solution of the communal question proposed in the Nehru Report, this Congress assures the Sikhs, Muslims and other minorities that no solution thereof in any future constitution can be acceptable to the Congress that does not give full satisfaction to the parties concerned.

In the opinion of this Congress the time has arrived for the Ruling Princes of India to grant responsible government to their people and enact laws or issue proclamations safeguarding the elementary and fundamental rights of their people, such as freedom of movement, freedom of speech, freedom to hold public meetings and security of person and property.

This Congress is of opinion that the financial burdens, directly or indirectly imposed on India by the foreign administration, are such as free India cannot bear and cannot be expected to bear. This Congress, while reaffirming the resolution passed by the Gaya Congress in 1922, records its opinion, for the information of all concerned, that every obligation and concession to be inherited by independent India will be strictly subject to investigation by an independent tribunal and every obligation and every concession, no matter how incurred or given, will be repudiated if it is not found by such tribunal to be just and justifiable.

This Congress condemns the refusal of passports for return to India to Sjt. Shapurji Saklatwala, ex-M. P., and others who are living in England and other foreign countries.

This Congress congratulates Srimati Sarojini Naidu, who recently went to East Africa at considerable inconvenience to herself, and the Indians in East Africa on the clear national stand they took upon the Indian problem in that sub-continent. This Congress is of opinion that no solution of the question can satisfy the nation that accepts communal electorates and is based on discriminative franchise or that imposes disqualification on Indians holding property.

## ALL-INDIA MUSLIM CONFERENCE.

### RESOLUTIONS.

THE Executive Board of the All-India Muslim Conference representing the Indian Mussalmans

expresses its deep abhorrence of the dastardly bomb outrage committed on the Viceregal train at Delhi on Monday, Dec. 23rd, and tenders to Their Excellencies Lord and Lady Irwin the sincere congratulations of the Muslim community on the providential escape of Their Excellencies and their party.

The Executive Board of the All-India Muslim Conference greatly appreciates the efforts of the South African Mussalmans who had organized a Conference of the South African Mussalmans at Lourenco Marques in November last and is glad to affiliate it to the All-India Muslim Conference as desired by them.

The Executive Board of the All-India Muslim Conference approves of the decision of the Working Committee that a special session of the All-India Muslim Conference be held at such central place as the Working Committee may consider suitable, immediately after the publication of the Simon Commission's Report in order to give adequate expression to the views of the Indian Mussalmans regarding the scheme of constitutional reforms which may be acceptable to the Mussalmans of India.

The Executive Board of the All-India Muslim Conference welcomes the announcement made by His Excellency the Viceroy regarding the holding of a Round Table Conference in London between the representatives of His Majesty's Government, British India, and the Indian States as it indicates that the British Nation has been sufficiently impressed by India's desire for freedom, and earnestly wishes to have an agreed constitution for a self-governing India, framed by representatives of all vital interests, communities and parties concerned. Large sections of Mussalmans had regretfully come to the conclusion that the British Nation did not desire the freedom of India, and acting on the principle that full responsible government should be achieved, if possible with the British connection, and if necessary without it, had presumed that it had become necessary to achieve it without such connection. The Board now assumes that the invitation to the proposed Round Table Conference means that full responsible government is possible with the British connection, and having full confidence in the cause which the Muslims of India represent, advises the Mussalmans not to close the door of negotiation and to accept the invitation to the proposed Round Table Conference. The Board also deems it necessary to warn the Mussalmans against such state-craft as is only too evident to-day and designed to drive a bargain in the sacred name of freedom, and to secure monopoly of political rights for certain castes while formulating demands for freedom in the name of the nation. The Board trusts that the British Government are not unaware of the fact that no constitution will be acceptable to the Mussalmans until and unless adequate safeguards are provided for their rights and interests as laid down in the resolution unanimously adopted in the All India Muslim Conference held at Delhi on Jan. 1st, 1929, under the Presidency of His Highness the Agha Khan and unless they are effectively represented in the Conference by men who truly represent the community, respect the inviolability of the Islamic Law, possess the confidence of their co-religionists and give true expression to their views and sentiments.

The Executive Board of the All-India Muslim Conference places on record its emphatic protest against the system of electorates and the scheme of representation for the various communities in the Provincial Legislative Councils and the

Central Legislature as proposed by the majority of the Indian Central Committee. The Board regards that scheme as in the highest degree detrimental to the best interests of India, absolutely unjust to the Indian Mussalmans and as pointed out by the two dissenting Muslim members of the Committee, involving consequences prejudicial to the smooth working of the legislative machinery in the country.

The Executive Board of the All-India Muslim Conference is amazed to find that while recognising the fitness of the North-West Frontier Province for the introduction of a reformed legislative and administrative system, the majority of the Indian Central Committee have recommended the introduction only of the Minto-Morley Reforms in that Province.

The Board is of opinion that the invidious distinction thus sought to be drawn between that Province and the rest of India has no justification whatsoever and regards it as essential in the interest of India as a whole that the Province should have the same legislative and administrative machinery as may be set up in the other provinces of India and desires it to be clearly understood that Mussalmans cannot accept anything less than this for the North-West Frontier Province.

The Executive Board of the All-India Muslim Conference views with grave concern the attitude of the British Government and the Hindu leaders with reference to the due representation and protection of the interests of the Indian Mussalmans in the forthcoming constitutional reforms, and in consequence advises the Mussalmans to concentrate on constructive work and to rely exclusively on their own organised efforts to secure for themselves their legitimate position in the constitutional and administrative machinery of a self-governing India, co-operating at the same time with the other minorities in the country for the realisation of their legitimate rights, and to prevent the coming into existence of an oligarchy in this country.

The Executive Board of the All-India Muslim Conference congratulates Afghanistan on successfully emerging out of its recent troubles and is grateful to His Majesty Ghazi Muhammad Nadir Shah for having re-established a strong Islamic Central Government in Afghanistan and prays to Almighty God to spare Afghanistan in future from such troubles as it has recently passed through and to grant it continued progress and prosperity.

#### CURE FOR DEAFNESS.

#### FINE OLD REMEDY.

THE wonderful curative power possessed by many old herbs has never been surpassed by modern treatment, and one of the most important of these old-fashioned remedies is the "AURAL HERB COMPOUND," which has been found remarkably successful in cases of nasal catarrh, noises in the head and deafness. Severe and long-standing cases, which had resisted all modern remedies, have been quickly and permanently cured by this old herbal preparation. Recommended with the utmost confidence. Price Rs. 4 per tin, post free, direct from

**AURAL MEDICATION Co.,**  
160 Birkbeck Road, Beckenham, England.