

Swarajya Series—8.

FOR
INDIA AND ISLAM

BY
ALI BROTHERS.

1922.
SARASWATY LIBRARY
9, RAMANATH MAZUMDER St.
CALCUTTA

Price Rs. 1-8.

Published by
ARUN CHANDRA GUHA
SARASWATY LIBRARY
Ramanath Mazumder Street, Calcutta.

Top 11944.2
13.01.11

Printer : S. C. MAJUMDAR
SRI GOURANGA PRESS
71/1, Mirzapur Street, Calcutta.



Jamunalal Bajaj, Dr. Kitchlew, Mrs. Naidu and
Moulana Mohammed Ali.

Moh. P. Co., Cal.

FOR INDIA & ISLAM

CALCUTTA SPEECHES.

(Speech delivered at a meeting in Halliday Park.)

After Mahatmaji had spoken, Maulana Mahomed Ali arose and spoke thus :—

Yesterday we visited the office of the Bara Bazar Congress Committee. We know that our merchants have foreign cloth in stock worth lakhs of rupees. Mahatmaji realises the cause of their anxiety. It is about a year that the Swadeshi resolution was passed in the Special Congress in Calcutta. You took it to be a child's play and thought that it will pass away as did the Boycott movement of Partition days. It is usual with merchants to buy when the rates are cheaper and to sell when the price rises. But sometimes they suffer losses. I can say by my own experience and Mahatmaji can verify it by his still wider experience that Marwaries bear these losses manfully and without sighs. If you have filled your shops with foreign cloth, try to dispose of it by means available to you. If you are wiser, you will see that by this time foreign cloth has gone out of fashion. What is required of you is not cessation of business, but that you should cease to be the commission

agents of firms of foreign cloth and take to buy less of Swadeshi cloth, which will make you richer and bring salvation to India.

Bengal should be the first to atone for its sins as it was the Dewani of Bengal that was acquired first by the East India Company. It was Bengal that first of all conceived the idea of Swadeshi movement. Now Bengal should come forward and lead India to boycott foreign cloth.

As to Muhammedans, said Mr. Mahommed Ali, they seem to have lost faith in their religion. Had they been sincere towards Islam, they would have seen in its light that foreign cloth was soiled with the blood of the men, women and children of Smyrna, massacred by the Greeks who have been secretly helped by British money, portion of which was contributed by Indian Muhammedans by purchasing foreign cloth. Consequently they can not escape responsibility for the tears of Turkish ladies whose sons have been killed by the Greeks.

Mohammedans raise the shouts of "Alla Ho Akbar", which means God is Great. If God is great, it is certainly greater than foreign cloth, which they seem to prize over their religion.

If they are such devoted lovers of foreign cloth, they should raise the cries of "Videshi Akbar" instead of "Alla Ho Akbar."

Then the Maulana laid emphasis upon Hindu-Muslim unity and condemned the Moplah outbreak in the strongest terms. He said Indian Muham-

medans were cowards as compared to Turks, whose extinction will mean the final disappearance of faithful Muhammedans from the face of the earth. If the Moplahs attempted to convert Hindus to the Islamic faith, were they or other Indian Mussalmans true believers of Islam? If they love the Laila of Islam, they should be ready to sacrifice anything and everything for her. However, if they were cowards, it would be better for them to vacate India for Hindus and depart to some other place.

Purchase and use of foreign cloth was dealing the death blow to the Khilafat cause. Hence foreign cloth was more unholy for a Muhammedan than pig's flesh.

The Moulana concluded his address after laying great emphasis upon non-violence and repeating his argument about the boycott of foreign cloth, which was so appealing that people began to throw caps, handkerchiefs, coats and waistcoats and other foreign garments from all sides, to which a match was applied by Mahatmaji.

HARISH PARK SPEECH.

Mr. Mahomed Ali said that Bengal's responsibility in the struggle for freedom was the greater. In the first place, it was Bengal's weaving trade which the East India Company was the first to destroy. Secondly, Bengal was sending out Deshbandhu Das

as President of the Ahmedabad Congress which he hoped would prove to be the first sitting of the Indian Republic. He asked the students whether they were going to join the struggle for freedom. Let not the future historian say that while all India was struggling hard for freedom the Bengalee students were pouring over Shakespeare and Milton. Freedom could be won in two ways—by a maximum of sacrifice by a minimum number or a minimum of sacrifice by a maximum number. The latter kind is required of us. Let all put off foreign cloth to win freedom. If to win freedom we have to peel off our skin we should do so. We should not be ashamed to remain naked while the Draupadi of India was standing before the world all naked. Let all use the charka. Mr. M. Ali could not see the logic of those who deprecated the idea that India could clothe herself. They might as well say that India should send all her rice and wheat to England to be made into biscuits and wait till those come back to India.

MIRZAPUR PARK SPEECH.

(Delivered on 9-9-21.)

Maulana Mohammed Ali addressed the meeting thus:—He said that he would speak in English mainly what had been said by Mahatmaji. On addressing the Hindu and Muslim brethren he said

that he did not think that he should have many more occasions to address the public unless they all accompanied him to prison. Freedom was their goal and to achieve it one had to pass through prison gate. Even at the death-bed he would cry out for freedom.) Freedom is a noble thing and must be fought for. Slavery came to India through the breach between Hindus and Mussalmans, and the cure lay in undoing the rupture. The Malabar riot had caused great anxiety to all Indians and they were all ashamed of it ; he as a Muslim was doubly ashamed. During his internment at Chindwara he heard of the rupture between the Hindus and the Mahomedans at Arrah. Naturally he felt sorry but he would not and did not blame the whole Hindu community for that ; so also even in this case of Moplah outbreak he hoped that they would not blame the whole Mahommedan Community. He did not know how the riot arose. It might be an agrarian trouble or it might be due to provocations by the Government. ,

But for all that they disregarded the religious injunction. No Mahommedan would sanction a forcible conversion. It is against the tenets of the "Koran" which says that there is no compulsion in faith. So it is the dictum of the "Koran." But first and foremost was, who were our informants? It was they who said unto the Moslems that Hindus had bullied them at Arrah.

He then continued that he was not afraid

of the prison and he had already seen it. All that he feared was violence on the part of his countrymen either Hindus or Mahommedans. Referring to the Moplahs he said that there might be many such ruptures and this was one of the strongest weapons in the hands of the Government. Government's policy is force and fraud and there is fraud even in that force. Beware of it and be absolutely non-violent. He did not know why even inspite of his protestations every one in England and America believed that the Ali brothers were in favour of violence and non-violence was unknown to them. He believed in force indeed, it was the principle of his religion to resort to force when violence would be made to their religion. But as long as he accepted the creed of Mahatmaji he would never be in favour of violence. The "Englishman," the "Statesman" and other Anglo-Indian papers thought it to be an impossibility and that Mahatmaji was a toy in their hands.

THE LIVING PRESENT.

He then referred to their proposed prosecution. He said that whatever might be done in India the Ali brothers must be responsible for it, no matter they might be 100 miles away. His brother went to Malabar 20 months back and he proposed to go there in a week or so. The Government added this past with the future and divided by 2 to make it the living present and the Ali brothers must be sent to jail for it.

He then came to the question of boycott. Some call it to be economically unsound. He could not understand how it was: Indian cotton goes over seven thousand miles to be turned into yarn and to come back to India to be used in the making of Dacca "Series." How would we appreciate that amount of economy if a man would send his flour to seven thousand miles to be made into biscuits and then to be consumed at his breakfast table. Not one cotton tree grows in England but we send our cotton to enrich the British shippers, the British ship-builders, the British Railway men and to feed British belly. He then appealed to all to take to spinning in earnest. "We are to discard all the fineries. They are the bounds with which India is tied. We are not going to spin the Poet's gossamer but we are to spin tough and real Khaddar" He then entreated the ladies to use Khaddar. They might say that Khaddar would be heavier, "well what is heavier? Indian Khaddar or fetters of India? Indian Draupadi stands naked to-day, her cloth is in the hands of Manchester. For liberty's sake we should give our skin even while they were asking for cloth only. It was the better for India."

He again came to the question of the Moplah riots and concluded by saying that if they wanted violence they might have made it hot for the Europeans. If Mahatma had quelled the spirit of violence in India they had at least helped him in keeping down the Muhammadans. By the bye he

mentioned how one of the non-co-operators who were arrested in Behar for shouting Mahatma Gandhi ki Jai and for refusing to shout Mahatma Gandhi ki 'khai' (Destruction to Mahatma) replied to a Sub-Inspector of Police. He said, 'you are alone in the cell and we are seven, we can smash you if we like but do you know how you are saved? It is Mahatma Gandhi (for whom you asked us to shout 'kshai') who saves you alike. So to-day many a European owes his life to him.

GUZRAT KHILAFAT CONFERENCE SPEECH.

Maulana Mahommed Ali in the course of his presidential address at the Guzrat Provincial Khilafat Conference, Broach, said :—It was too late in the day to give any lengthy exposition of the Islamic doctrine on Khilafat especially as the Moslems in India had already shown by their unprecedented agitation, that there was hardly any Moslem,—man, woman, or child, who did not understand that the existence of Islam was bound up with the existence of Khilafat. He would content himself by alluding to the famous incident when the most loving companions of the Prophet left Him unburied for more than a day and considered it a most important duty to others as Mussalmans to settle the question of Khilafat than to attend to the obsequies of a Prophet whom they loved above all else in the world. For,

the regulation of Khilafat was the regulation of the lives of the Mussalmans in their corporate capacity. It was impossible for Indian Mussalmans to-day to give up the thought of maintaining power and prestige of Khilafat intact and of keeping sanctity of the island of Arabia inviolate, without giving up their faith here and the hope of salvation hereafter, and he asked everyone concerned to answer clearly that one question whether he could reasonably ask a man to renounce his faith for the sake of any other consideration and yet it is that the Indian Moslem supporters of Khilafat are in practice being asked.

The Maulana then emphasised the feeling about him in the presence of his Maker, in the presence of that assembly and if it were possible in the sight and hearing of the whole world he would only declare them. Neither he nor his brother would ever be a party to the framing or the publication of any statement which could be understood to mean that when a clear call of religion came to them they would do less than what the 313 warriors in the first battle of Islam did, under the guidance of their Prophet, to uphold the cause of Islam. Continuing the Maulana said that present time was the worst that Islam had experienced in its long history of thirteen hundred years and he appealed to all Moslems to rally round the Banner of Khilafat and Islam if they desired to remain Moslems. Only a few days ago occurred the anniversary of the battle of Badr the first occasion on which the poor persecuted inoffensive

Moslems were permitted to unsheathe the sword for pure self-defence. The speaker described the circumstances of that battle and added that only 313 Mussalmans including lads of 15 and some even younger were all that were then available for their faith. He considered that Islam was exposed to less danger in that first encounter in the field of the battle than to-day because the Mussalmans lacked that abounding faith in the Divine succour, and in their own love of Islam.

ALI BROTHERS' LETTER TO PRESS.

Referring to the Viceroy's speech at the Chelmsford Club dinner he said he knew of no speech of his or of his brother in which either had incited anyone to violence nor did they know of any speech which they had undertaken not to repeat. Their public pronouncement had been worded in the clearest possible manner and no one was entitled to read into its meaning that it did not contain. They certainly had expressed regret for the unnecessary heat of some of the passage. In some speeches of their to which some friends had drawn attention and they felt convinced that they owed it not to this Government which had still to make amends for the Jalianwalla Bagh and the crawling order but to the non-violent non-co-operation movement which was as pure as it was powerful and to which they were so deeply attached as their dearly beloved leader Mahatma Gandhi said that they should publicly express their

regret even for the heat of some stray passages which it was contended that some people could misinterpret as an incitement to violence. Unlike Government they had no personal prestige to maintain beyond the prestige of truth and they could not sacrifice honesty for prestige. Moreover their attachment to that powerful movement of non-violent non-co-operation was so deep and their belief in its ultimate and speedy success was so great that the moment they heard that the opponents of that movement were endeavouring to place some detached and stray passages of their speeches as obstacles in the way of the acceptance of the demands they agreed to issue a clearly-worded statement which they had published so that no possible excuse could thereafter remain for those opposed to the movement of Non-co-operation to continue their opposition to it. They held that no personality was important to-day that it would be permitted to jeopardise the success of their great movement and so far as they themselves were concerned they would never dream of allowing themselves to stand in the way of the speedy success which their movement was destined to achieve. They would rather stretch a point against themselves than hinder the speedy success of non-co-operation. But it was futile and far from honest for anyone to read into their published statement a recognition that any passage in their speeches reasonably bore the interpretation that it was intended to incite or actually incited to violence.

They refused to recognise such an interpretation as has been sought to be put upon some passage in their speeches and gave no undertaking for future which they had not already given in the past when they agreed to take their proper share in conducting the non-violent non-co-operation movement under the banner of their guide, philosopher, and friend Mahatma Gandhi and the fear of any impending prosecution did not influence their conduct in the least. It was the fear of God and the love of their country that were the motives of their conduct. It was to their country and their co-workers that their public assurance and promise were in the first instance given, though the Government and those who co-operated with it were equally welcome to their assurance and promise. Neither they nor anyone else on their behalf had ever dreamt of bargaining with this Government and to talk of giving up their prosecution.

AHIMSA.

They would once more emphasise that while their present policy coincided entirely with the creed of Mahatma Gandhi and those few who like him believed in Ahimsa alone, for all time their creed did not coincide with the Mahatma's but also permitted use of force in self-defence and in certain circumstances made the use of such force obligatory.

The Mussalmans could advocate *Ahimsa* like the Hindus only if they could be convinced that their

leaders were not asking them to give up *Himsa* for all time. They believed as much in the use of force as their Prophet and His companions believed but they also believe as much in non-violence and in the doctrine of Victory through suffering as their Prophet and His companions had believed when for 3 long years they underwent even suffering including three years of the most rigorous form of boycott during the stay in Mecca whence they had to migrate to Medina before ever they had to recourse to force in opposition to force. The Ali brothers wished to guard themselves against being understood directly or indirectly to be countenancing violence whilst non-violent non-co-operation was being prosecuted in the country. It was their firm opinion based upon experience of working the Non-co-operation Programme that the movement had taken deep roots in the country and that it would be absolutely enough for achieving their purpose, namely redress of Khilafat and the Punjab wrongs and the attainment of Swarajya even during the year, and they were fully convinced that the success of their movement depended entirely upon the continuance of the spirit of non-violence among the people. Whilst therefore gladly reiterating their faithful adherence to the programme of non-violent non-co-operation they must reserve their right to take up arms against the enemies of Islam should non-co-operation be found to have failed and should a *Jehad* be proclaimed in terms of the law of Islam. No follower of the faith could shirk clear duty if it

ever come to him as it had come to the warriors of Badr of responding to the call of *Jehad*. But when the Prophet of God, whose example every Muslim must seek to follow led his people on the field of Badr and effectively used his own lance on the field of Ohad? He had also during the greater part of his career as a Prophet kept his sword unsheathed and meekly bore every insult, humiliation and suffering that his enemies could inflict without causing in return the least suffering to them.

Continuing the Maulana said he and his brother knew Mussalmans better than any Non-Moslem could, and here the speaker described the Prophet's life and Islamic teachings in great detail. It was not because Mahatma Gandhi had preached *Ahimsa* that he is preaching it to Mussalmans but because their Prophet also had preached and practised before they were permitted in the fast and extremity to unsheathe their sword in defence of Islam against its implacable foes. The teaching of Mahatma Gandhi was dear to them because in similar circumstances it had been the teaching of their Prophet. But should circumstances change, nobody knew better than Mahatma and nobody honoured them more for it than he did that they would follow their own faith and their own conscience. What they certainly considered mean and despicable beyond measure to do was to sail under false colours and make use of the non-violent non-co-operation movement to create an atmosphere of preparedness for the use of violence. If nothing else,

the honour of Islam itself demanded from the Ali brothers and those whom they could influence a faithful and literal adherence to the joint programme worked by the Hindus and the Mussalmans and the followers of other faiths at two successive sessions of the Congress and initiated in the first instance by the Central Khilafat Committee itself. They were glad that Government had abandoned the idea of prosecuting them for adherence to their faith but they would have equally and gladly faced such a prosecution. What concerned them was the movement of non-co-operation and keeping faith with their co-workers not what Government chose to do or not to do. Had they feared an impending prosecution and recanted from their earlier beliefs the time to do that was at Allahabad some weeks ago when it was at first arranged to their knowledge that they would be arrested and prosecuted but they had only emphasised still further their beliefs on that occasion. If to-day they issued a public statement regretting the unnecessary heat of some detached passages in their speeches it was because of their friends who had drawn their attention to them and whom they were anxious to placate and obey as long as they could do it without prejudice to their faith and not because of a foreign Government to which they owed nothing but their present misery.

Concluding the Maulana told the Mussalmans that to-day only monetary sacrifice was required of them and not the sacrifice of life and made a stirring appeal

in connection with the forthcoming Id to rescue from starvation the orphans of those Turkish martyrs whom Indian soldiers and latterly the Greek had killed during the war. That was the least reparation that they could make for their past sinful conduct and thus save the race of those who had defended Islam with their lives during the last four centuries (prolonged cheers).

"EDUCATE THE MASSES."

Maulana Mahommed Ali delivered a lecture on "The Present Situation" at Jitkar's Wadi on Tuesday evening before a very large audience, Mr. Shaukat Ali presiding.

The President said his brother and he had determined to devote their lives to the service of their country. Their demands were the righting of the Punjab wrongs, the solution of the Khilafat question and the immediate grant of Swaraj. Whether Swaraj was granted to them or not, they were going to get it. They were determined to get it within the next eight months and get it they would.

Mr. Mahommed Ali said they could not have any distinctions in these days, and the classes had got to take political education to the masses. Mr. Jinnah was interrupted when he asked "what would you do when you go to the villages" by the remark that they would educate the masses. Mr. Jinnah turned round

and said "young men, the villagers know these things better than yourselves" He would tell Mr. Jinnah that the villagers knew better than even him. They were following the programme sketched out for them by Mr. Gandhi and the time would soon come when the villagers would be politically educated, and they would not be able to divide the people into classes and masses so far as Indian politics were concerned. That was the lesson to be brought home to men like Mr. Jinnah and Mr. Jayakar.

He had read what Mr. Jinnah had said many times and he had come to the conclusion that he really did not know the villagers. There were two kinds of leaders—those who came to you and spoke of politics and there were the angels of grace and ministers like Mr. Paranjpye—and when they were speaking about Mr. Gokhale they spoke about Mahatma Gandhi, and that was the case with all news-papers and people. Mr. Gandhi had pervaded the whole atmosphere and he was glad of that. Even the King could not spare him and for the first time he had spoken about Swaraj. Viceroy and Governors were unable to speak without speaking of co-operation. And the guide to the Non-Co-operation movement was Mahatma Gandhi.

WHAT WOULD GOKHALE HAVE DONE.

He did not know what Mr. Gokhale would have done if he were alive to-day. Such a speculation was something in the nature of an impertinence to

the dead. None of them knew what the great men, who were dead long ago, would have done if they had lived now, for the circumstances were entirely altered. Was there any reason why they should attribute any want of growth to these men? Their greatness really consisted in the fact that they grew with the times. To that extent they had found something to criticise in Gokhale, to that extent he had not grown. He did not know what Gokhale would have done, but he would tell them what he should have done and that was to stand by his country,—where the dignity and self-respect of his countrymen were concerned. To say that Mr. Gokhale would have been minister in the council like Bannerjea or that he would have taken a title like him was to libel his memory. For what after all were these ministers? A school boy when asked to define what were amphibious creatures, said—an amphibious creature is a creature that cannot live in water and dies on land. Such were their ministers. They could not live with the people, meet them at the Shantaram's chawl, could not address a meeting, and when they went to Government they could not get much satisfaction either. To say that Mr. Gokhale would have acted likewise was to repeat a libel on his memory.

N. C. O. THE ONLY REMEDY.

The real thing was what they had got to do to-day,—and there was only one course open to them,—and that was Non-co-operation. Mr. Jinnah with

a degree of assurance that was characteristic of him said "Young men take it from me that the villagers know many things better than you." He knew Mr. Jinnah was an authority on many subjects, but he had yet to know that he was an authority on the villagers ; he did not know much about the chawls, where they lived, and therefore they could not expect much from Mr. Jinnah. If Gokhale was anything like what they described him to be, then he would say that Mr. Gokhale had his weaknesses, and that he was not a man of the masses and that he was not one of them. Everybody said in those days that he represented the masses ; even the officials said that. The officials said that they represented the dumb masses of India—but if the masses were dumb how could they speak to the officials?

A PURELY CONSTITUTIONAL MOVEMENT.

Mr. Jinnah's grievance about the non-co-operation movement was that it was not a constitutional movement. To people like that, he would say this : Humanity could not be measured by the foot-rule we had had borrowed from Europe. If anybody had said that the history of England and Europe had been constitutional, then Indians knew they were proceeding just as those human beings had proceeded. All human beings had to proceed like that. He wanted to ask Mr. Jinnah about the history of Magna Charta—whether there was a Congress which

in its 35th year passed an angry resolution and thereby got the Magna Charta?

SACRIFICE, KEY TO SUCCESS.

But everybody knew this: that unless they were prepared, as the very last resource, to sacrifice everything they possessed for the things they had not got they would not get the things which they wanted. That was the lesson of history, and every man in this country should learn it. Until they were willing to make sacrifices for their country they would not get anything. They would not get anything if they continued to make money by getting fat briefs. The defect of our political system was that there was nothing absolutely behind it. He was, however, glad that Mr. Jinnah could not swallow even Mr. Jamnadas Dwarkadas—he stuck in the throat of Mr. Jinnah. Mr. Jinnah said that if the people had sent their best to the council there would not have been that compromise on Mr. Jamnadas' resolution on the Punjab atrocities. But that was the talk of 400 B. C. for what would have happened? Supposing 20 to 30 people had gone to the councils what would have happened? Mr. Jinnah had told them that they would have fought to the bitter end, and somebody shouted out that the resolution would not have been allowed., Mr. Jinnah's answer was that Government would have been compelled to suspend the assembly in less than a year. But who would have cared? (Laughter) When Cromwell

turned out the Parliament people said in the words of a historian, not a dog barked and not a dog would have barked if these 20 to 30 men had left the councils and the council had been suspended.

THE RIGHT TO VOTE.

But if they could make the Non-Co-operation movement successful and train the villagers and send really representative men to the councils and these representatives walked out of the councils then they would have a revolution,—and they wanted such a revolution, for the masses had learnt not to give their votes. Even in the remotest villages where Mr. Gandhi never had been they knew that they were asked by Mr. Gandhi not to give their votes. He felt certain that Mr. Gandhi came to India because he felt certain, and found by experience, that he could not win the battle in South-Africa because India would not allow him. The battle for Swaraj had to be fought in India and when it was won they would win the battle in South Africa, in Natal, in Canada and many other countries. What was the use of going to the councils and talking there as much as they liked? They could not do anything there, except talk. When they had got the country at their back they could demand anything they liked and they would get it. At the present time they were playing a children's game, but when Mr. Jinnah talked of the real thing—of the burning fire, etc.,—he was mixing up two things which could not be

combined. They could not speak of these two things in the same breath.

Sir W. Vincent stood up in the Council and accepted the resolution moved by Mr. Jamnadas and Indians were supposed to feel grateful about it. They could not forget the past. If the speaker felt certain that there was the least sorrow and regret in the heart of Sir W. Vincent he would go on his knees into the councils and beg humbly of him to let him take part in it in however humble a capacity—he would do that if he felt there was the slightest change of heart and regret. He was not convinced of the change of heart.

THE ROYAL FAMILY.

Continuing, said the speaker, the Government officials were making use of the Royal family for their own purposes. They were prostituting their name so that Indians could remain in the Empire. The speaker then gave an account of what took place in Calcutta and Delhi when the Duke visited those places. When people shouted "Mahatma Gandhi ki Jai" the officials told the Duke that the people were doing it in his honour. Englishmen, when they came to India, said the speaker, lived apart from the people; they did not know what was happening in India—they were really living in England and Scotland although they were in India. When he was a correspondent of "The Times of India" Sir Stanley Reed once asked him what right

the Turks had to remain in Constantinople and in Europe? The speaker said they had a right to be in Constantinople because they had been there for the last 400 years. To that he was told that it did not matter. And the English were in India only 150 years—they were only in the middle of the second century and from the way they were behaving the speaker thought the English would not pass the second century in this country.

REFERENCE TO MR. YAKUB HASSAN.

Continuing said the speaker when Mr. Chotani was asked to attend the Conference he nominated Mr. Yakub Hassan to accompany him to England and on the 16th February Mr. Yakub Hassan was being taken to the jail. Their rulers did not understand politics to-day ; they understood only Mr. Gandhi's politics. If Mr. Gokhale had been alive to-day he would have suffered for his country, and if he had refused to suffer he would have been forgotten. How many people had they forgotten whose names were seen in the headlines of newspapers only recently? The men who were afraid of being shouted down by an audience had no business to deal with politics. He asked the lawyers why they did not come into the public and make speeches. It was because there was still a small voice within them that told them the time has passed for their old tactics

—all those things belonged to 4,000 B. C.—The present was the time of people, who were ready to suffer for their country. They were the real politics in any sense of the word.

Mr. Jinnah and Mr. Jayaker wanted positive things and not inactive things. What was it that this Non-co-operation taught them? First of all, it taught them to be non-violent. But some people said the non-violence of the Ali Brothers was only skin-deep. They must have pretty thick skins! Mr. Jinnah was speaking of crowds because he did not know them—an Indian crowd was the most docile and most quiet crowd. If Mr. Gokhale was afraid of the masses then he would say that Mr. Gokhale did not know those masses. Those men who were really afraid of the masses did not show any anxiety about them—they did not go amongst the masses and preach to them. They were afraid of the violence of the masses, but people who had fat balances had cause to be afraid of the masses.

ANARCHY—NOT COWARDICE

Some people spoke of the Bolshevik agents in India and if the Government knew of these agents in India it was a pity they did not know anything of the people of India. Mr. Gandhi did not care how many students came out of the college, how many lawyers came out of the law Courts, his one anxiety was about the masses. Mr. Gandhi said he had a great duty to the masses and he wanted to drive fear out

of their hearts so that they could face the Artillery ; he wanted to take out the fear of Artillery from their minds. The Mahatma rather preferred to have anarchy than cowardice among the people. Mr. Mahomed Ali said they could get Swaraj if not by peaceful means at least by violent means and for that purpose they would have to train the people.

Mr. Banker in proposing a vote of thanks to the speaker, said the presence of the Ali Brothers had taught them to speak frankly what they had in their innermost heart, and the people of Bombay were thankful to them for it.—*The Bombay Chronicle*.

ON THE EVE OF HIS ARREST.

MOULANA MOHAMED ALI'S MESSAGE.

Mr. H. M Hyat wired from Bombay on the 22nd Sept. 1922.

On the eve of his arrest my loving and beloved chief Maulana Mahamed Ali ordered me to convey the following message from him to his Hindu and Muslim friends and admirers in the country :—
"Whosoever has any love or regard for us must take my arrest in a calm and peaceful-spirit and give expression to that love and regard in two and only two ways, firstly, by contributing all that a Mussalman possibly can towards the Smyrna Relief and Angora Munitions Funds and secondly, to discard all foreign cloths and wear pure Swadeshi. I hope my arrest

will give greater courage and hope to my friends and followers who, I expect, would carry on the programme of non-violent non-co-operation with tenfold zeal, energy and firmness, undeterred by any fear of repression but hopeful of God Almighty's choicest blessings in this righteous cause. "Isha Allah, victory is ours and is in sight."

At Waltair where Maulana Mahomed Ali was arrested and where I and his Begum Sahiba were allowed to see him for a couple of minutes Maulana Mahomed Ali emphatically reaffirmed the above message. He also commanded me to convey his love and devotion to the National Muslim University of Aligarh, its staff and students, his dearly beloved pupils and colleagues whom he wished to convey his assurance that he had made Aligarh his home and in his absence his wife shall regard it as such.

The brave lady in the presence of her brave husband assured me that she would bring her children to Aligarh and live there along with her equally dear children of the National University and wherever she might be called upon to go for work among the womenfolk of the country, Aligarh would be her headquarters whither she would return. The Maulana Sahib's arrest has stiffened the determination of his devoted pupils now working as propagandists in Madras presidency, who are prepared to sacrifice their all in the prosecution of the work to which they were deputed by the Maulana Sahib. It is hoped similar reports will be received from the other propa-

gandists of Aligarh National University now scattered all over the country. The Begam Sahiba, having spent five busy days in Madras amongst Hindu and Muslim ladies in connection with the Angora Munitions Fund and Swadeshi and having performed the inauguration ceremony of a girl's school at Madras, was permitted by Mahatmaji to return to Bombay where she arrived by Madras Mail this morning. She proceeds to Karachi to-morrow night by Gujrat mail to be present there during the trial of her husband and Maulana Shaukat Ali. I shall be in attendance on the Begam Sahiba during the journey to Karachi.

THE KHILAFAT DELEGATION.

The Indian Khilafat Delegation to England which left India in February 1920 was received by Mr. Fisher, the British Minister, acting on behalf of Mr. Montagu, Secretary of State for India, on 2nd March 1920. The Delegation consisted of :—

Mr. Mohammed Ali, Mr. Syed Hossain, Maulana Syed Sulaiman Nedri, and Mr. Hasan Mohamed Hayat, Secretary.

There were also present from the India Office :—

Sir William Duke, G.C.I.E., K.C.S.I., Mr. J.E. Sheekburgh, C.B., and Mr. S.K. Brown.

Mr. Fisher asked Mr. Mohammed Ali to open the case.

Mr. Mohammed Ali: I think, Sir, it is probably understood by the Secretary of State that we held at Amritsar a Session of the All India Khilafat Conference during the early part of this year when a resolution was passed for a second time that a Delegation should proceed to Europe and America, in the first instance, to lay before His Majesty's Government and the Allies, and of course the Peace Conference, the point of view of the Mussulmans generally, explaining their religious obligations and sentiments, and the position of Indian Mussulmans, and also making clear to His Majesty's Government the support that Mussulmans are receiving in this matter from the vast bulk of Indian opinion.

With regard to this matter, we did not at the time know when precisely the Peace Conference was making a settlement with the Turks, and the Viceroy in his reply to our Address even expressed the fear that we might arrive too late to be heard before the final settlement. We trust that is not the case ; and we wired to the Secretary of State for India and to the Prime Minister immediately on landing at Venice on the 22nd February, urging that we should be given a full and fair hearing before any decisions were taken. We are now here and are thankful for being received by you this evening on behalf of Mr. Montagu, about whose illness we are very sorry to hear.

Before we enter into any explanation of our religious obligations and views, I should like to say

that on our arrival here, and even in the course of our journey across Europe, we found that a certain kind of propaganda was being carried on by the Armenians and the Greeks and others hostile to Turkey, who have been accusing the Turks of most horrible and revolting crimes. We, for our part, are, to speak quite frankly, not in a position to work in the same manner here, because, in the first place we can afford neither the money nor the morals for such a propaganda ; and, in the next place, because we are not at all in touch with the Turks, who are after all, the principal people concerned in the matter : consequently we cannot verify any accusations however grave. But we note that in the last Session of the All India Khilafat Conference held at Bombay on the 15th and 16th February, a resolution was passed to the effect that a Delegation of Indian Mussulmans should proceed to Asia Minor as well as to other regions in the Empire of the Khilafat. When this Delegation have visited the parts from which massacres are being reported at this critical moment, we shall be in a position to affirm to deny the truth of these reports.

But our position is, above all, of a religious character. Before I go into details, I should like to mention that this question is to the Indian Mussulmans a vital question of religion.

Sometimes it is being put forward that Indian Mussulmans desire to dictate to His Majesty's Government and to the Allies. I assure you, Sir, that

nothing could be farther from our minds than to use any expression that could be construed into a desire to dictate or to threaten. But the question is whether the settlement with Turkey is an affair of Imperial Policy or merely a question affecting Great Britain. If this is a question affecting Great Britain alone, we have nothing further to say. But if, on the contrary, it is a question affecting the whole of the Empire, as it clearly is, then we have equally clearly a *locus standi*, and the policy of the Empire can no more be dictated by Great Britain alone than by Indian Mussalmans. It must be a common policy of the whole Empire. I think that it has been recognised by the entire community in India, both Musalmans and Hindus, that things have come to such a pass that, as subjects of His Majesty, we should be failing in our duty if we did not say how matters stand with us.

It is not a question of Moslem sentiments, if by that we understand feelings that may be changed at will. There are certain clear religious obligations imposed on us by our faith. The question of the Khilafat is not only part of our faith, but, if I may put it in that way, it is the whole of our faith. The functions of the Khilafat unite both temporal and spiritual work which Islam believes it is charged with doing. At all times since the death of the Prophet there has been a Khilafat, and it must be preserved at all times by the entire body of the Mussulmans. There has been no such thing as a merely spiritual

headship of Islam. Islam, as we regard it, is the last word in ethics, and the last word in guidance in all our affairs. Therefore every act of a Mussulman's life is, and must be, a religious act. Our duty to His Majesty is a religious duty. A man's duty to his family and his friends must be considered a religious duty. Therefore it would not be correct to try to distinguish between temporal leadership and spiritual leadership in this matter. The Khalifa is something more than a Pope. We feel there is likely to be some misunderstanding about this, and we consider it our duty to let it be known how we stand in regard to the Khilafat.

This institution, which is both temporal and spiritual is, as I have said, to be preserved by the entire body of Islam. It is necessary for the Khalifa to have a certain amount of temporal power for the defence of our faith, and although it may vary from time to time according to the strength of his possible enemies, there must always be a minimum which cannot be reduced with safety. We consider, speaking generally, that the Khalifa's power had been reduced after the Balkan war to about the minimum with which a Khalifa can maintain his dignity and act effectively as Defender of the Faith. That is why our irreducible minimum is the restoration of the '*status quo ante bellum*'. With less than that the Mussulmans do not think the Khalifa and the Commander of the Faithful could effectively

defend our faith, if in any part of the world our religious freedom came to be in jeopardy.)

We do not rule out by any means political, as apart from territorial, changes. We have no objection if the Peace Conference is to consider whether autonomy could be given to various non-Turkish communities living within the Turkish Empire, whether they be Christian, Muslim, or Jew. This would coincide entirely with the 12th point of President Wilson's fourteen points, which requires that security of life and opportunities of autonomous development should be assured to these communities. For these guarantees may be taken from the Ottoman Government consistently with the dignity of a Sovereign State. ,

Then, quite apart from the main question of the preservation of the Khilafat with adequate temporal power, there is the question of the Jazirat-ul-Arab or "the Island of Arabia". To European geographers Arabia is only a Peninsula, bounded on the fourth side by land. But to Musalmans it has always been an Island, the fourth boundary being the waters of Tigris and the Euphrates. It thus includes not only Hedjaz, Yemen, Nejd and other provinces commonly included in Arabia, but also Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia. It is a religious obligation, based on the dying injunction of the Prophet, that within these limits there should be no non-Moslem control of any kind whatsoever. There was some likelihood of mandates being given to Christian Powers like

America, France, and Great Britain herself within that territory. We therefore considered it our duty to explain matters to the Indian Government, and then to the English Government and to make it clear that no Mussulman could ever acquiesce in this. No Moslem could reconcile this to his conscience.

Mr. Fisher : I understand you to say that the Moslem conscience could not acquiesce in a mandate over a territory such as Palestine or Syria being given to a Christian Power. How, on that showing, would it be right for the Moslem conscience to acquiesce in the British Sovereignty over India?

Mr. Syed Hossain : There is a great deal of difference. Arabia contains the Holy places. It is in regard to this tract that control by non-Moslem communities is ruled out.

Mr. Mohamed Ali : Although I should be very sorry indeed to be understood to say anything at all that would tend to lessen the value of Constantinople, which has for nearly five centuries been the seat of the Khilafat, to Muslim sentiment, and to suggest that Mussalmans could willingly agree to lose any part of Dar-ul-Islam, I must say that even if Constantinople went out of Moslem hands, it would not have the same effect as if any portion of the sacred territory of the Jazirat-ul-Arab went out, or was placed under a non-Moslem mandatory. This tract, for the most part barren, has been marked out in a special manner in the various Scriptures as being the land of the prophets, and it is probably

on that account that control over every part of it is required by Islam to be entirely Moslem. We, who consider ourselves to be the spiritual heirs of Abraham and Moses and J  sus, consider that this is a land apart and consecrated in a peculiar degree and reserved for us. We are charged with the duty of maintaining its sanctity inviolate, of keeping it peaceful and tranquil, a sanctuary for the Faithful, and safe for Theocracy. In order to preserve that sanctity and peace and tranquility which we desire, it is necessary that it should remain with us. It would be a sad day indeed for us when any part of it goes out of the hands of the Mussalmans, for then we would have betrayed a divine trust. Mussalmans will never acquiesce in any arrangement that permitted any form of control being exercised by a non-Moslem Power over any part of the Jazirat-ul-Arab.

Then there is a series of religious injunction with regard to the Holy places. The three sacred Harems of Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem must always be in the custody and under the wardenship of the Khilafat, and the wardenship of no one else could satisfy the conscience of Mussalmans. Mussalmans also claim that the Shrines of Najaf, of Karbala, Kazimain, Samarra and Baghdad should remain under his wardenship. Non-Moslem control over the territory in which they are situated is not at all permissible.

If I may now reverse the order in which I have outlined the threefold claim of the Mussalmans, I

will say that the three sacred Harems of Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem, and the Holy shrines I have named in Mesopotamia, must continue to remain under the wardenship of the Khalifa precisely as they did before the war. They are all situated within the Jazirat ul-Arab, and there must be exclusive Moslem control over every part of that region. Now, if that control is the Khalifa's control as before the war, not only will this religious requirement be fulfilled, but it will also assist in the fulfilment of the first religious requirements to which I have referred, namely, the preservation of the Khilafat with temporal power adequate for purposes of the defence of our faith. Therefore, if, on the one hand, the pledge of the Prime Minister of the 5th Jan. 1918, the solemnity of which he has now fully proclaimed, is redeemed in its entirety, and the 12th point of President Wilson's fourteen points, on the basis of which armistice was concluded with Turkey, is honoured in the observance, and, on the other hand, the religious requirements imposed on the Mussulmans by their faith with regard to the Jazirat-ul-Arab and the Holy Places are respected, as we claim they should be respected, as the basis of our loyalty, then the main requirement of the preservation of the Khilafat will be fulfilled, and the territorial *status quo ante bellum* would be restored. This delegation will be satisfied if the Khilafat is thus preserved with sufficient territory and temporal power, and, if necessary, guarantees may be taken

for good Government, security of life, religious toleration and opportunities of autonomous development of the subject races consistently with the dignity and independence of the Sovereign.

I would mention here that, while we recognise that it is the bounden duty of their subjects to maintain their allegiance to the Allied and Associated Governments, we desire to say that all Mussulmans are bound at the same time to maintain their allegiance to the Khilafat, and ask you to recognise that we have our religious as well as our political obligations. We do not desire, nor is it possible for us, to move away from the political position in which we stand, just as we do not desire that our position should be made embarrassing by any ill-considered action of these Governments with regard to the Khilafa's Government. If demands were made which we could not satisfy without prejudice to our salvation, we would have to consider the whole position in that case.

As regards the propaganda carried on in this country against the Turks, we feel that, when the Turks are accused of crimes against humanity, these accusations are due in a great measure to religious and racial prejudices ingrained for centuries past in the communities that indulge in these accusations, and in no inconsiderable measure also to the greed and covetousness of Turkey's neighbours that have for long wanted to grab as much as they could of Ottoman territories. To say the very least of it,

these crimes have been much exaggerated. In some parts of the Christian world it is considered that the Turks should be driven out of Constantinople not only because they are Turks and guilty of criminal conduct, but because they are Moslem, and Islam itself is a blight. We have to remove these deeply-rooted prejudices and repudiate the association of criminal conduct with Islam. But at the same time we are also anxious to exert our influence as Mussalmans so that not only such things, but even the suspicion of such things, should not be possible in future. As regards the character of the Turk, we think it very different indeed from what it has so often been described to be. We should not like to say anything at all about the character of the propaganda of the Churches among other sources of mischief and prejudice. We are not here to increase any kind of bitterness. As a matter of fact, we have come on a mission of peace. But this much we will say, that before one can judge the Turks impartially, one has to inquire into the intrigues carried on for two centuries at least by the enemies of Turkey to foment trouble among her Christian subjects, and thereby make out a plausible case for lopping off parts of the Ottoman Empire in Europe and Asia. One will also have to enquire into the character of the dealings of these Christian populations of Turkey with their Moslem neighbours, and ascertain whether these dealings were neighbourly or provocative. In any case, we think that even if

the Turks have been to a certain extent to blame, it must be admitted that they had a very great lesson, and I can assure you, Sir, that Indian Mussalmans do not think that they have nothing more to do if their claims are satisfied ; if a settlement is made such as they hope for, they would endeavour to create a desire in the Turks for reconciliation with the British Government and their Allies. They would also impress upon the Turks that not only must such atrocities, as they are so recklessly accused of, not occur, but they must also be above suspicion of committing such atrocities. As Mussalmans, we have to wipe off the stain of inhumanity from the fair name of Islam, and the British Government and their Allies can rest assured that Indian Mussalmans will not fail in their duty towards Islam in a matter of this kind. Their restraining influence would be utilised to the fullest extent. Our mission is of a double character. It is our duty to represent matters to His Majesty's Government, because we are his subjects ; and it is our duty to represent matters to the Khalifa, who is the Commander of the Faithful. Both these duties we should like to observe. If a settlement such as we desire is made with the Khilafat, our influence for the good would naturally greatly increase, and it would be used in the interest of the Empire and of humanity. But if the settlement goes against our sentiments and religious obligations, without saying one word which may likely to be misconstrued into a threat, we must frankly state

that we shall have to think of our religious duty first.

I should like to say that it is very difficult for His Majesty's Government, removed as it is, both in point of distance and religious and political surroundings, from India, to understand what is actually happening there. I do not like to say anything against the Government of India or the officials there, if I can help it. They have been exceedingly courteous in receiving our deputation and facilitating our departure from India and our coming over here. But I must say that the official world does not fully understand what is passing in the hearts of the people of the country. At any rate, I think we are in a better position to understand how things stand with our people. A considerable portion of my life has been more or less a blank lately, owing to internment and incarceration. I assure you, Sir, it was only when we came out of the prison and saw things with our own eyes that we discovered, and it was a great shock to us—what the real state of the country was at the time of our release. India has changed so enormously that anyone who knew it five years ago would not recognise it to-day. It has changed so rapidly in fact that it is no longer a question of years but of months. Well, the officials in India at any rate do understand better than most people here that if in the settlement with Turkey regard is not had for the religious obligations and the position of the Mussalmans, it will be a very serious matter. Indeed. I am not an Englishman, and cannot pretend

to know the English language as well as Englishmen themselves know it, and I fear that words that I may use may sometimes bear a significance that I may not have intended. It is difficult for me to explain, but I will say this. I heard in the House of Commons, soon after we came over to London and went to hear the debate on Constantinople, Col. Wedgwood say: "You can get a great deal out of Englishmen by persuading them, but you must not use threats." Well, Sir, I suppose that is true of every self-respecting people, and since it is true of Englishmen also, I will beg of any Englishman, I will beg of Col. Wedgwood, and I will beg of you, Sir, to tell me how to frame a warning, that would be the most serious of warnings, but would not be construed into a threat.

Finally, I may add that in some quarters hostile to Turkey, and even to India, efforts are being made to belittle the importance of the mission which has brought us here, and it is said that the Indian Khilafat Delegation is unimpressive. With reference to this, all that I can say is that we could have brought a larger body of men with us, and also people more distinguished than ourselves. But it must be understood that work has to be done in India also, and we cannot spare many men for the work here; and it ought to be understood that we do represent the entire body of Mussalmans of India, and the vast bulk of our Hindu compatriots and others who are in this matter at one with us.

Mr. Syed Hosain—I should like to supplement what has been said by one or two observations. The question has been raised both in the Press, here and in India, that in this matter Muhammadan agitators are trying to make political capital, and that there is no foundation of any religious feeling in it. I should like to say that this is utterly untrue. In this matter, at any rate, it is our duty to inform His Majesty's Government that it is not really a political question so far as we are concerned. It is purely a religious question. I should like to say this in support that Turkey has been at war with the various European nations for the last 300 years. Sometimes she has fought with the active support of England. Sometimes she has won, sometimes lost. We, Muhammadans in India, never raised the question of the Khilafat at all. This is the first time in the history of British rule in India that the question has arisen and it has been raised now because the Khilafat has been put in jeopardy. That is the important feature. It is in jeopardy for this reason. As the result of this last war the territories of the Ottoman Empire, including those regions regarded as sacred, are being brought into the melting pot. The impression in India is that some of these territories are about to be annexed by Great Britain herself, and I can assure you that this possibility has created a very great deal of anxiety and alarm and very genuine feelings which are not pleasant because, as the Mohammedans view it, up to now strict reli-

gious neutrality has been the foundation of British rule in India ; and certainly the loyalty of the Indian Mohammedans, which has been a tradition of English rule, has been largely built up by the fact that so far as their religious life was concerned, they enjoyed a very uncommon degree of freedom and security. But now the situation is that apparently Great Britain herself is going to be a party to the dismemberment not only of the Turkish Empire, but also of the actual realm of the Khilafat. This area according to Islamic law, has got to be under the guardianship of the Khilafat and nobody else. If by any direction of the British Empire this region is given to any non-Islamic power, the Indian Mohammedans has got to choose between his loyalty to the British Crown and his spiritual allegiance to the Khalifa. It is a choice which he would prefer to avoid. I mention this point to make it clear that this is not a political question. It is a religious question.

Then I would say this. The question has also been raised in more than one quarter that the Hindus in India have got nothing on earth to do with the Khilafat question, and that the fact that they are making common cause with the Mohammedans in itself argues that this is a political movement rather than a religious question. As to that, I would say that if you were aware of recent facts in Indian national life, you would at once see that this is not the case. During the last few months, certainly during the last year, there has been a very extra-

ordinary fusion of Hindu and Mohammedan feeling in India, and the reason why the Hindus have come into this movement is because from the Indian point of view they have come to regard the Khilafat issue as a national rather than a sectarian question. They have taken this view chiefly on account of Mr. Gandhi. Mr. Gandhi has laid down the principle that inasmuch as the chief thing we are out to have is Indian national unity, if it is the case that so many crores of Indian Mohammedans feel that is a matter of life and death to them, then the Hindu, consistently with the idea of national unity, cannot stand aside. Mr. Gandhi has said they must make common cause with their Mohammedan compatriots exactly as he would expect us to make common cause with the Hindus were up against similar difficulties. That is why there has been nothing of a hole and corner nature in this matter. They have all come in with a clear recognition of this point that in so far as they desire to have a common Indian nation, and we form a great part of that nation, what affects us so closely must be a matter which concerns the Hindus also. This is an All-India question. They are just as committed to our cause as we are ourselves.

The All-India Khilafat Conference formally adopted a manifesto which is really the mandate of the delegation which we comprise, and in this document, which I would ask your permission to quote, is set forth very briefly the whole of our position.

Mr. Mohammed Ali—I might mention that before drawing this up, in which Mr. Gandhi took a considerable share, he desired to have before him Mohamedan experts. He had them and he cross-examined them at great length and in great detail, and entirely satisfied himself that these were our religious obligations.

Sir William Duke :—I do not quite follow the bearing on the sacred places of Jazirat-ul-Arab. I understand that the principal Holy Places in Mesopotamia are only places of pilgrimage for the Shiahhs who do not recognise the Caliph.

Mr. Mohammed Ali :—The Holy Places are held in very great reverence and by all sects. Many Sunni Mohammedans also visit the shrines.

Sir William Duke :—The bulk of the pilgrims are Shiahhs. It is not in the same way a necessary pilgrimage to the Sunnis.

MR. FISHER'S REPLY.

Mr. Fisher :—You have come over a long journey to put your case before the British Government and you apologised for your English, I may say that there is very little need for an apology. You put your case very fully and very clearly, and, if I may say so, very temperately before us. The British Government is of course well aware that it had the valuable assistance of a million Indian soldiers in the recent war, and that many of those soldiers were Muslims by religion, and it is aware of its obligations not

only to the Muslim soldiers who fought for it in the war, but to all its loyal Muslim subjects in India ; and I think you may feel assured that we are anxious to study the religious susceptibilities and sympathies of your fellow believers, and that whatever conclusions may be reached in respect of the international settlement, the settlement of the world's affairs, attention to the Indian aspect of the case will always be given. Indeed it is no secret that the decision which has recently been taken by the Allied and Associated Powers to retain Turkish sovereignty in Constantinople has been to a large extent influenced by the desire of the British Government to meet the religious feelings of its Muslim subjects in India. Still of course you will realise that, while that is an important factor, and a factor which the British Government will never lose sight of, it is not the sole factor which the Ministers responsible to the British Parliament have to take into account in these far reaching and complex transactions. There are other factors as well. Of course, as you, I think, are perfectly well aware, consideration for the position of the subject peoples of the Turkish Empire is one of the elements which has to be taken into account, and I feel that I ought to remind you of the fact that a very painful impression has been created in this country by the news of the recent massacres in Cilicia. I wish to point out to you that the issue is a complex one ; but one to the solution of which the British Government has very steadfast good will to

the Muslim population of India, and you may be assured that what you have said will be duly considered by the Government.

Mr. Mohammed Ali, you have been very careful to avoid anything in the nature of the language of threats, and you have been wise in doing so. Of course, as you realise perfectly well from your large experience of public affairs, the British Government is bound to frame its views on wide considerations of policy, and cannot be deflected one inch from its course by anything in the nature of threats. But at the same time the British Government is bound to give due consideration to any views which may be sincerely felt and honestly expressed by loyal subjects of the Empire.

I very much regret that the Secretary of State has not been able to receive this Deputation. He desired to do so. He is disappointed that he is unable to meet you, but as you are aware, he is unwell at the present moment, and consequently I am taking his place. I hope, that before you return to India you may have an opportunity of meeting the Prime Minister and of laying your views before him. As you know, a conference is taking place at the present time. The Prime Minister is meeting the statesmen of the allied countries in Downing Street, and many important issues are being discussed. Mr. Lloyd George's time is very much occupied, and I cannot promise you that he will be able to see you, but I hope that he may be able to do so.

Gentlemen, I have only one other thing to say, and it is this. As a philosopher once said, history is always a *pis aller*, a choice of second best. It is founded on compromise. We cannot all get everything that we want, but you may be quite certain that the British Government will never fail in giving due consideration to feelings loyally and sincerely expressed by subjects of the Empire.

MR. MOHAMMED ALI'S FINAL REMARKS.

Mr. Mohammed Ali :—May I express the thanks of the Delegation for the reception that you have so cordially given to us. I quite understand,—I think all of us understand even the most illiterate in India,—that our desires and sentiments cannot be the sole factor in a settlement of this kind. But there is one point that has not been entirely appreciated and that we particularly desire to lay stress upon, namely, that there are certain religious obligations that are of such a binding character that they must be our first consideration ; and since our loyalty is based on respect for our religious obligations, regard for them must be the first consideration of His Majesty's Government also. It is true that life is one long second best, and that compromise is of the very essence of politics. It is precisely because we recognise this that we have not asked for anything more than the restoration of the '*status quo ante bellum*.' But if a new earth and a new heaven were to be created, as we were at one time led to hope from

the utterance of the statesmen of Allied and Associated Nations, and if therefore, all the territories taken and retained by force were to be restored to their rightful owners, then we would have asked for the return of Egypt, of Tripoli, of Bosnia and Herzegovina, of Crète and of the large slices of Turkish territory carved out by the Balkan Allies. It is therefore quite clear that we have already applied the maxim of '*pis aller*' in the region in which it can be applied. But in the domain of faith and religious obligations here can be no compromise. That is a matter to which '*pis aller*' does not apply. There we can only have the best, and the best is just good enough. There the second best is just as bad as the very worst.

With regard to our desire for interviews with the Prime Minister, we recognise his position, and understand how difficult it must be for him to find time, but if I may say so, without disrespect, if M. Venizelos (the Turkophobe Greek Minister) can come so often and have the ear of His Majesty's Government, it will only seem right that representatives of Indian Mussalmans and Indians generally who, as you have acknowledged, Sir, have come from a long distance, should be given a fair hearing and enabled to put their case before His Majesty's Ministers before decisions are taken.

As regards the "Cilician massacres," we believe that the news that has come over here is from very tainted sources. So far as we are concerned we

should like a thorough and impartial inquiry into the whole question of these so-called massacres, and we should court the utmost publicity for the investigation into the offences alleged against the Turks and its results. Let there be a commission sent out to examine the facts and the causes that have brought about a state of affairs that all alike must deplore. So far Greeks Jews and Armenians all have been sending all sorts of roving commissions, and it is the Indian Mussalmans alone that have kept out. They could therefore well ask for a commission of their own being permitted to inquire into these massacres. But, to permit no possibility of a suspicion of partiality, we say that English people as well as Indians should be represented on this commission. Not the highest among us would consider such a task beneath him, and even His Exalted Highness the Nizam, and other Indian Rulers, Ulemas like Maulana Abdul Bari and Maulana Mahmud-ul-Hasan, and leaders of Indian public opinion, both Hindu and Moslem, would gladly welcome such an opportunity to sift the truth. Let there be a thorough investigation, if the Turk be as he is said to be, we will wash our hands off him. We do not wish Islam to be regarded as the supporter of murderers.

There is one thing more that I must ask your permission to refer to. There have been certain statements in the speeches both of the Prime Minister and of the Leader of the House of Commons with reference to the Khalifa, the seat of the Khilafat, and

the Allies garrisoning of the Straits. We think we can understand that the exigencies of Parliamentary debates, and politics generally, some times drive politicians to attempt to reconcile opposite points of view and satisfy all parties, and to express opinions in a language which they would have preferred not to use, and would not have used in the intimacy of private discussions. But if it really be the case that the Khalifa is to be kept under the guns of the Allied Powers, and is to exist in constant fear even of his own life, his position would be worse than that of the Pope at the Vatican. He would be the Pope at Avignon and even worse than that, for he would be a prisoner of people of alien faith and race. If that is to be the case, we would far rather see him in exile at Bronssa, or even Koniah than in such a plight. The consequences of such an affront to Islam cannot be exaggerated and cannot be endured.

Maulana Syed Sulaiman Nedri:—I should just like to add that I am perhaps the first Indian "Maulvi" that has come over to this country. I am not a politician nor is Maulana Abdul Bari Sahib of the famous family of the Ulema of Feringi Mahal, Lucknow, who has particularly asked me to represent him. This ought to convince His Majesty's Government that this is not a political matter to us but a religious matter.

THE DEPUTATION TO THE PREMIER

London, March, 17, 1920.

Mr. Mohammed Ali in opening stated that the deputation had come on a religious question. Islam drew no distinction between spiritual and temporal affairs. It has always had two centres, one personal and the other local. The personal centre is the Khalif as successor to the Prophet and repository of traditions. This local centre is Jazirat-Ul-Arab or Islamic Arabia. Islam regards it not as a peninsula, but as an Island, the fourth boundary being the water of Euphrates and Tigris. For the defence of the Faithful the Khilafat must retain adequate Territorial resources, etc., which may be summed up in the result of recent wars that Muslims consider the irreducible minimum of temporal power adequate for the defence of the Faithful to be the restoration of territories on the *status quo ante bellum*. They do not rule out such political changes within the scheme of Turkish sovereignty as would guarantee and secure the autonomy of various Muslim territories consistently with the dignity and secure independence of the State.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Llyod George) asked if this signified opposition after all to the declaration by the British of Emir Feisul as King of Arabia. Mr. Mohammad 'Ali expressed a hope of reconciling Turco-Arab difference, and of persuading the Emir Feisul that his own ambitions and those of the Arabs

could be entirely satisfied within the scheme of Turkish sovereignty.

Pressed by the Prime Minister to say if he were opposed to the independence of Arabia, he replied in the affirmative. This would not, however, rule out special arrangement for autonomy. Referring to India Mr. Ali explained that consistently with their own desire for autonomous development, they could not think of denying it to Arabs, Jews or Christians within the Turkish Empire. Apart from the question of temporal power, Muhammadans claim that Jazirat-Ul-Arab including as well as the Arabian Peninsula should remain inviolate, and entirely in Moslem control. This is the minimum demanded by the religious obligations absolutely binding to Muhammadans. "It does not specify that it should be under the Khilafa's own control. Religious requirement will be satisfied even if Emir Feisul exercised independent control there." Both this requirement and that of temporal power may easily be satisfied if Jazirat-Ul-Arab remains as before the war, under the direct sovereignty of the Khalifa.

Thirdly, a series of injunctions required the Khalifa to be warden of the three holy places of Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem, while overwhelming Moslem sentiment required that he should be warden of the holy shrines of Najaf, Kerbela, Kazimain, Samara and Bagdad. Apart from the above religious obligations, Moslems trust that the pledge regarding Constantinople, Thrace, and Asia

Minor, the populations of which are overwhelmingly Moslem, should be redeemed in its entirety. Moslems cannot tolerate any affront to Islam in keeping the Khilafat as a sort of hostage in Constantinople. As regards Thrace, Turkish claims require no further argument than the principle of self-determination. The same principle would entirely rule out the Greek claim to Smyrna.

Turning to the question of massacres, Mr. Ali said that the Indian Khilafat delegation must put on record their utter detestation of such conduct and their full sympathy for the sufferers whether Christians or Muslims, but if the Turks are to be punished, the whole question requires impartial investigation by an international Commission on which the All-India Khilafat Conference should be adequately represented. The Commission should go into the question of the organization of revolutionary societies by Christian subjects of the Sultan, and of provocation offered to the Moslem majority in the region affected.

Pressed by the Prime Minister, Mr. Mohammed Ali said that he neither denied the existence of these massacres, nor justified them in the least. He was not in a position to affirm or deny anything. The Prime Minister cited the answer given by the Turkish delegation in Paris admitting the massacres. Mr. Mohammad Ali went on to ask for a thorough enquiry, and added that if it "establishes to the satisfaction of the world that the Turks have really been guilty of those atrocities and horrible crimes,

then we will wash our hands off the Turks. To us it is much more important that not a single stain should remain on the fair name of Islam. We want to convert the world to our way of thinking but with what face can we go before the world and say we are the brethern of murderers and assassins?" He urged that the massacres began only in the last quarter of the last century, after the success of Russian intrigues in the Balkans, etc. In any case, if the Turk is to be punished on the assumption that his rule is a blasting tyranny, the evidence should be absolutely above suspicion. No such evidence at present exists. "Even in to-day's papers," he said, "you read of the horrors perpetrated by these so-called innocent lambs i.e. Armenian Christians." He urged the importance of removing a wrong impression from the minds of millions of Moslems. There should not be the least suspicion that the Turkish question is being dealt with in spirit of the crusaders of Europe. On other points Mr. Ali reiterated what he said in his interview with Mr. Fisher.

THE PRIME MINISTER'S REPLY.

The Prime Minister, after commending the lucidity and moderation of the speakers, said that in Paris great care was taken to consider the case put forward by the official representatives who came from India. The Maharajah of Bikanir and Lord Sinha who themselves formed part of the peace delegation repeatedly brought forward the Muham-

madan case, also delegations were arranged from Muhammadans, some residents of Great Britain, some from India, and at the Prime Minister's request the Supreme Council of the Allies heard the case. He would therefore like Indian Muhammadans to feel that their case had been presented with great care and force, and had been listened to with conscientious care not only by the delegates of the British Empire but also at the request of British delegates by the Supreme Council of the Allies. Secondly, he would like to get out of the mind of every Moslem throughout the Empire that they were treating Turkey on different principles from those applied to the Christian countries. They were at war with three Christian countries and one Muhammadan country. They did not seek war with any of them, nothing was further from their minds at the beginning of the conflict with Germany than that they should have to make war with Turkey. He did not believe that they had ever before made war against Turkey, though they had fought for her many times. He referred to the Crimea and the events of 1878, yet Turkey, when Britain was engaged in the most terrible struggle in her history, suddenly declared war on them. It was vital to them in that struggle to have free access to the Black Sea. Lack of such access prolonged the war at least two years. Turkey suddenly slammed the gates in the face of an old ally who had always stood by her and who had no quarrel with her of any sort or kind at that time. He

did not believe that France had ever before made war with Turkey. She had been on England's side in the Crimea supporting Turkey, yet the same thing happened to France. Therefore no Muhammadan in India should imagine England entered this war against Turkey as a crusade against Islam, nothing was further from their minds. He did not believe that the majority of the Turkish population wanted war with Great Britain. He deeply regretted that the rulers misled their country into fighting against their old Allies and friends. The result was to prolong the war for two years. Now Turkey, like Germany and Austria, had been beaten. Germany and Austria had paid the penalty for defeat. Austria had fallen to pieces. Alsace-Lorraine and Poland had been taken from Germany upon whom very stern and severe terms had been imposed. Both Germany and Austria are Christian countries ; therefore it is no use talking about crusades. "We are" said the Premier, "applying the principle of self-determination to those countries which oppress subject peoples and provoke war to destroy liberty throughout the world." He did not want any Muhammadan in India to imagine that they were applying one principle to Christians and another to Muhammadans, neither did he want any Muhammadan in India to imagine that they were abandoning in the case of the Turks principles which had been ruthlessly applied to Christian countries like Germany and Austria. Continuing, he said :—

"I do not understand Mr. Muhammad Ali to claim indulgence for Turkey. He claims justice, and justice she well get. Austria has had justice, Germany has had justice—pretty terrible justice. Why should Turkey escape? There was no reason why we should be applying any different measures to Turkey from that which we had meted out to the Christian communities of Germany and Austria. We are not treating Turkey severely because she is Muhammadan, we are applying exactly the same principles to her as we have applied to Austria, which is a great Christian community. The principle is that of self-determination applied to Empires that have forfeited their right to rule. The Arabs have claimed independence and severance from Turkish dominion. Is it suggested that the Arabs should remain under Turkish dominion merely because they are Muhammadans? Is not the same measure of independence and freedom to be given to Muhammadans as to Christians?"

Turning to Thrace, the Prime Minister said, it was very difficult to get the facts but he had before him statements of both Turkish and Grecians of Thrace between which there was very little difference. According to both the Muhammadan population is in considerable minority. If that is true and the principles of self-determination is to be applied, the whole of Thrace would certainly be taken from Turkish rule. The same thing applied to Smyrna. After very careful investigation by an

impartial committee it has been found that a considerable majority of the population was non-Turkish and the great majority undoubtedly preferred Greek rule to Turkish rule.

Turning to the question of temporal power, the Prime Minister said that the question of temporal power of a spiritual head was not confined to Islam. It was one of the great controversies of Christendom as well, concerning which there were wide differences of opinion among Roman Catholics and themselves. But after the Pope was deprived of his temporal power, his spiritual power was greater and very likely greater than ever. He knew, he declared, of sincere and zealous Mohammadans who took a very different view of temporal power from that of Mr. Mohammad Ali. He would enter into no controversy. All he would say was the Turk will exercise temporal power in Turkish lands. We do not propose, said the Premier, that he should retain power over lands which are not Turkish. This is the principle we are applying to the Christian communities of Europe and the same principle must be applied to the Turk.

As to the Armenian massacres, there was no doubt about them. It is true that an impartial investigation has not taken place, but that is because the worst massacres of all occurred during the war, and there was no one there to investigate. He had cited the reply of the Turkish delegation in Paris. Their sole answer was that those who were in power

at that time and ordered the massacre of Armenians had also committed crimes against Moslems and condemned to death by every means by three million Mohammadans. That is the answer. It is not a question of punishment but a question of good Government, and whether it is 80,000 Christians or three Millions Moslems, a Government which cannot protect its own subjects, whether Christian or Moslem, against wholesale massacres of that kind, is not fit to govern. We are therefore bound in the interests of civilization to exercise some kind of control and supervision. It was quite clear that the Turkish Government, as at present constituted, is incapable of protecting its own subjects.

The Prime Minister then referred to the devastation and desolation under Turkish rule of Asia Minor,—once the granary of the Mediterranean. He proceeded: "If the Turk were a capable and efficient administrator who looked after his land well, there is not a Christian community in Europe that would not say, 'God bless you and prosper you,' and we would not dream of interfering, we should be glad to see him work out his own faith in his own land. But I do not think that he has governed in a way which makes Islam proud of him. I will ask you to look at the way in which he has done it. Is Islam really proud of Turkish dominion?"

In conclusion the Prime Minister wished to give comfort to the Mohammadans of India who with very few exception had stood loyal by the Throne and

Empire. There were exceptions even among Christians and he would therefore draw no distinction to the detriment of Indian Mohammadans because there were some among them who were disloyal. He gratefully acknowledged that Mussalmans of India had stood by the Throne and Empire. They helped us in the struggle. We willingly and gladly recognise that. We recognise that they have a right to be heard in a matter which effects especially Islam. We have heard them. Not merely have we heard them but we have very largely deferred to their wishes in this matter. The settlement was very largely affected by the opinion of India and specially the Mussalmans of India. But we cannot apply different principles in the settlement of a Mohammadan country from those which we sternly applied to our settlement with Christians with whom we were also at war.

Mr. Mohammed Ali in reply said that the action of Turkey in entering the war might have been due to alarm caused by the fact that the Czar of Russia, their ancient enemy, was one of the Allies of Great Britain and to the existence of the secret treaty which promised Constantinople to Russia.

To this the Prime Minister replied that he wished to make it absolutely clear that when they entered into war they had no understanding whatever with Russia to the detriment of Turkey so that the Turk had no reason to fear anything from their having engaged in a war on the side of Russia. Our

war, he said, was against Germany and we had not Turkey in our minds in the least.

MESSAGE TO THE SULTAN.

Then early in May 1920 just before the final draft of the Allies' Terms of Peace which they wanted to thrust upon Turkey was drawn up and handed over to the Turkish Govt. the delegation sent the following message to His Imperial Majesty the Sultan of Turkey :—

"The Indian Khilafat Delegation representing over 70 million Mussalmans and 250 million of their compatriots of other creeds who stand shoulder to shoulder with them, have been delegated to explain to the Allied Powers and the Peace Conference the religious obligations imposed on every Muslim by his faith and express the overwhelming national sentiment of India with regard to the preservation of the Khilafat and the inviolability of the Sanctuaries of Islam. The Delegation beg to offer in the name of their co-religionists, at this grave crisis in the history of Islam and of the Khilafat, their whole-hearted allegiance to your Majesty as the successor of their Prophet and the Commander of the Faithful. Although deeply ashamed that the Mussulmans permitted the Khilafat, however unwillingly it be, to be

reduced to its present distressing condition, we nevertheless venture, with all the profound esteem that we entertain for your Majesty and the great veneration inseparable from your high office, to submit that to-day the eyes of Mussulmans throughout the world are turned towards Stamboul and they confidently trust that in all conceivable circumstances and at all costs your Majesty will uphold the dignity of Islam and will remain steadfast in the defence of the Khilafat and of the sanctity of the Jazi-rat-ul-Arab in its entirety.

THE THREE FOLD CLAIM.

"We are charged to claim for the Khilafat the complete restoration of the territorial *status quo ante bellum* without prejudice to such political changes as guaranteed to non-Turkish nationalities, if they so desired, autonomous Government within the Ottoman Empire consistently with the dignity of a Sovereign State, and we are to explain that this was the irreducible minimum of temporal power inalienable from the sacred institution of Khilafat that could be considered adequate for the defence of our faith. We were also charged to declare that the Khalif alone could be the servant of three sacred Harems of Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem and the warden of the holy shrines and, further that, no Mussulman would, or could, tolerate any form of non-Muslem control whether in the shape of mandate or otherwise over Syria, Palestine or Mesopotamia

included as they are in the sacred soil of the Jazirat-ul-Arab that had been entrusted on his death bed by our Holy Prophet to our sole care. We have tried to explain our three-fold claim to the Allies to the best of our limited powers and, in spite of the appalling ignorance and tragic indifference, even of some of those who are making themselves responsible for a new settlement of the world's affairs, we have made it sufficiently clear that the reduction of the Muslem claim by a hair's breadth will not only be a violation of the deepest religious feelings of the Muslems but will also be a flagrant violation of the solemn pledge given by responsible statesmen, representing the Allied and associated Powers and given at a time when they were desirous of enlisting the support of the Muslem people and soldiery. Further we have not hesitated to warn the British Government that if these pledges were not redeemed and effect was not given to the declaration that brought about the Armistice, it would be futile to expect peace in India and that an affront put upon the entire Indian nation will be incompatible with an expectation of blind loyalty. Having done everything that was demanded of us by our duty as Mussulmans, as loyal subjects of the King Emperor, and as men deeply anxious to secure a just and lasting peace, and charged with a mission of reconciliation and concord, we now await the response of the Allied Powers to our appeals and warning.

But of far greater importance to the Muslem

world will be your Majesty's response to the demands of the Allies and before that response is made we deem it our humble duty to bring to your Majesty's notice that Islam to-day stands solidly by your side as it has never stood since the last of the Khilafat Bashideed passed away. Every Muslim is now determined without flinching and without fear, to do all that Allah demands from him even to the extent of offering his life as the price of his faith. May the great God grant to your Majesty and to your noble and brave, but distracted and divided, nation the strength and resolution to do your duty not only by Turkey but by Islam, and may the unity of Turkey soon become a true reflex of the unity of Islam.

The Indian Khilafat Delegation finally beg leave to recall what our glorious Prophet said in the cave of Thaur to your Majesty's first predecessor Abu Baker, when they were only two and their enemies were many:—"Fear not ; verily Allah is with us." God grant we shall yet succeed if only we retain our faith in Allah's omnipotence and serve none but Him.

MR. MOHAMMAD ALI IN PARIS.

By far the most important and successful of Mr. Mohammod Ali's overseas campaign, however, was in France where late in June 1920 the Committee of *La France et Islam* organised in Salle Wagram, the

biggest hall in Paris, an overcrowded meeting in honour of the Indian Khilafat Delegation, presided over by M. De Monzie formerly Minister, Mercantile Marine, of the French Govt. In the course of his speech which was received with remarkable cordiality and applause, Mr. Mohammad Ali said:—

“Before I make a statement with regard to our case I should like to address just a few words to any Armenian gentlemen that may be in this assembly. I ask them to take it from me that nobody in the hall could have greater sympathy with the Armenians than the Indian has. The reason is very simple. My compatriots here have tasted the bitter cup of subjection. Having tasted that bitter cup and having found it worm wood and gall, they do not want the Armenians to taste that cup any longer than myself. But let us face the situation as it is to-day. For centuries the Armenians lived at peace with the Turks. Then the sinister figure of *Tsarist* Russia came on the scene and poor Armenians were made to fight the battles not of Armenia but of the *Tsarist* Russia. Now that *Tsarist* Russia has gone, those who have inherited the traditions of that tyrannical empire are once more making tools of the Armenians. Immediately after the armistice a tremendous propaganda was started in favour of Armenia. This has been going on for more than a year, but the hands that were held up in horror at the Armenian massacres were dripping with the blood of the Turks shed in Smyrna.

"To-day in this wretched treaty of peace that I have in my hand for every place they have found a mandatory. The Greeks can go to Smyrna and Thrace, England to Mesopotamia and Palestine but poor Armenians, you have no oil, you have no cotton, you have only massacres. (Cheers) Therefore what happens to you this : You are left once more to God who had apparently entrusted you to the care of these Christian mandatories. (Cheers, laughter.) I tell the Armenians you can purchase your peace with the Turks on far better terms than you can purchase it from those friends of yours. (Cheers.) You would certainly not be treated as a foundling found every morning at a fresh door. If you do not want to live with the Turks any more let the Turks and you have the adjustment of territories between the new Republic of Erivan and Turkish Armenia and let such Christians of Turkish Armenia as like to go over to Eriven go over to that side." Then referring to the Greek move against Turkey, he said :—

ISLAM MEANS PEACE.

"I am a man of peace ; the world wants peace (cheers). Islam means peace. But if the Greeks will have war, then they will have war. (Loud cheers.) But it is no good merely to cheer here or in England. Yes, if the Greeks are victorious it is all very well, but when they are beaten to their knees (cheers),

as I hope they will be before long, not because they are Greeks, but because they are unjust (cheers), then they will appeal to you, to France, and to England in the name of Christianity which they themselves have trampled under foot. I am not a Turk. I belong to a people who fought for you and England and I think we did a little to save both you and England. Now it is not the Turk who is speaking to you. I have come here because my religion compelled me to come here and my compatriots of other faiths have carefully examined and found that it is the part of my faith and that I cannot compromise on this and they have pledged their word to me that they will not compromise either (assent from Mr. Bomanji and other Parsees and Hindoos.) But if there is any shameless Turk in this assembly or at Versailles or in Constantinople or even in the camp of Mustapha Kemal, who is prepared to sign this treaty, then I tell him as we have told Mr. Lloyd George and the Viceroy of India, we at least will not accept this treaty. (Cheers.) In that treaty there is Article 139, which does not mention our religion. Secret diplomatists never do that kind of thing. (Laughter.) It merely demands from Turkey the renunciation of all title and jurisdiction over the Mussulmans who are subject to the sovereignty or protectorate of any other power, i.e., us, also our friends, the Egyptians.

“If they will accept protection (the Egyptians

present shouted "never, never")—You say never, we also say never. (Cheers.)

NEW KING FOR OLD LAND.

"Then there is Article 132. There are Articles : 96, 97, 98. These demand that the Turks should renounce in favour of principal Allied Powers—they might as well have said one principal Allied Power (laughter), which would be far more truthful—all rights and titles in Syria, Palestine, Mesopotamia on whatever ground, religious otherwise, and in the Hedjaz in favour of that new king of an old land where the Mussulmans recognise only one God to be the King. The great King of the Hedjaz is to exercise all rights of the Khalifat but how is he to live? 54,000 pounds per month are being paid by these friends of England in order presumably to retain their friendship for England. (Cheers). I blame the Turks for many things and particularly for not having succeeded in retaining the friendship of the Arabs, but I can say this much for the Turks that they have given and rightly given more money to this desert Kingdom of the Hedjaz than they ever got out of it (Cheers). And how long does our friend the King of the Hedjaz hope to get this money from the British treasury? There is no chance of Mr. Lloyd George going to the Hedjaz on pilgrimage. (Laughter.) He will still have to depend for his income on poor Indian pilgrims who come from other

parts of the world, but will they undertake to maintain in that holiest of holy lands such a King of the Hejdaz (Cheers). At any rate I have told the envoy of Emir Feisul, if the Arabs agreed to any such mandate in the holy places, we would not agree to it. (Cheers). And be it said to their credit the Arab Delegation told us: "It is not our property to give or to remain. It is a common heritage of Islam."

After further explanations on the position of Indian Moslems in the Turkish question, he concluded:—

"Now ladies and gentlemen, I will not detain you much longer. I will only say this to you: If you look at this question from our religious point of view, this treaty is unacceptable to us and remember there are more than 300 millions Mussulmans in the world, in India, Turkey, Algeria, Morocco, Asia Minor, Egypt, Central Asia whose religious obligations are being disregarded in this treaty. Again, there are distinct pledges which had been given to us which have got to be respected by you and by England. If they are disregarded to-day, remember you who are a banking nation—and the bourgeoisie is very well represented here to-night (laughter)—that a dishonoured cheque is not accepted twice (Cheers). We ask for no gratitude for anything that we may have done for France or England but I say this to you that if the Indian soldiers knew that after their defence of France and of England and after victories in Mesopotamia, Palestine, not British

victories but Indian victories (cheers), if they and known that this would be the kind of the treaty that would result from their victories, they would not have come to your aid in those dark hours of October 1914"!!

"SAVE US FROM OUR FRIENDS"

(BY MOHOMMAD ALI).

I am afraid from our repeated experiences in the past it appears to me that England is preparing a case for fighting against the Turks, now that its pet, Greece, has had sufficient hammering from the Turks in Anatolia and has no hope left of crushing the Turks unaided and it is this fear that makes me regret all the more the intervention of Mr. Hasan Imam. He appeared to me to be unduly reticent so far as the public was concerned when he landed at Bombay last April. His excuse at the time was that he regarded the matter still as a subject of negotiations, and since he was not a delegate of people but a nominee of the Government chosen to explain the Muslem attitude on the subject of the Turkish Treaty, the people were not entitled to demand from him an account of his work in England or even a review of the situation from his personal point of view. But he is no longer reticent and, if he is consistent, we can only conclude that no further

negotiation is possible, and that his own interview given to the Associated Press as well as the despatches of those stormy petrels, the correspondents of English newspapers in Turkey, are but a prelude to the fresh outbreak of hostilities between England and Turkey. No news, as the Muslems have learnt from the experience of the last few years, is always good news; which means that the Greek winnings which commenced with such *eclat* is now over, and the Turks are now about to begin their's, which makes their British backers far from comfortable.

THE PRISONER OF THE BOSPHORUS.

At first the Nationalists together with their brilliant and brave leader, Ghazi Mustafa Kemal Pasha were "rebels" and as is customary with England, she did not wish to "parley with the rebels." The puppet government at the head of which was the Prisoner of the Bosphorus, the Sultan of Turkey, and the Khalifat of Islam had been made to sign through a few graceless myrmidons of 10, Downing Street, a treaty at Sevres on 10th August last. What more was there to be done but for Mr. Lloyd George to ask the Indian Khilafat Delegation to announce an equally abject surrender? And this was the only reply given more than a month later to a detailed and clear representation of the 10th July that we had addressed to him and to the other Allied representatives at Spa. To this we gave the only reply that those who stood up for Mussalmans

and for Islam could give, viz, the dictum of our Prophet that "no obedience is due to a creature of God which involves disobedience towards the Creator" with which our Spa representation had closed.

As for the Turks their reply was given in characteristic fashion. The Prime Minister acknowledged, in his interview with the Indian Muslims for whom Mr. Hasan Imam was the spokesman on the 12th March "the Turks can fight well if he cannot talk". Glorious as has been Turkish tradition with regard to fighting, I do not think that they ever fought so well as they have done in Anatolia with greatly attenuated resources and literally with their backs to the wall.

In a long despatch that I sent to the "Bombay Chronicle" from Paris a year ago almost to a day, I prophesied—and really it did not require much perspicacity to venture to play the role of a prophet that if within a few weeks the Greeks did not take Eskishahr and Afium-Hissar in order to make further resistance impossible, they would give up the job in despair and would even wreck their revenge on those who had deceived them with the vision of a grand and withal a cheap success. I had then indicated that in his own country Venizelos was seated none too firmly on the saddle, and was enabled to carry on only with the help of Great Britain by filling prisons with the political adversaries. He had