

most sacred duty of the Government to respond to that claim. Towards the Hindus our attitude should be of good will and brotherly feelings. Co-operation in the cause of our Motherland should be our guiding principle. India's real progress can only be achieved by a true understanding and harmonious relation between the two great sister communities. With regard to our own affairs we can depend upon nobody but ourselves. We should infuse a greater spirit of solidarity into our society ; we should remove the root causes and the evil effects of the process of disintegration, we should maintain a sustained loyalty to, and co-operation with, each other. We should sink personal differences and subordinate personal ambitions to the well-being of the community. We must recognise that no useful purpose is served in petty disputes and in forming party combination. We could not lose the sympathy of our well-wishers in India and in England by creating a wrong impression that we, as a community, are out only for self-interest and self-gain. We must show by our words and deeds that we sincerely and earnestly desire a healthy National unity. For the rest, the 70 millions of Mussalmans need not fear religious differences. A few days ago I came across a paragraph in the *Bombay Chronicle* the well-known daily paper of Bombay, with its editor, Mr. B. G. Horniman, a friend of the Mussalmans, who has rendered great services to us. It is as follows: The following incident reported by the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, may well be read with profit by those whose

perverse imaginations, in spite of proofs to the contrary, always see in the difference of religions, in India an irremovable bar against placing Indians in high offices of trust and responsibility. This is how H. H. the Nizam just disposed of Hindu-Mussalman dispute in his territory. Well, for about a year or so there sprang up a quarrel between the Hindus and the Mussalms of Warrangal about the building of a mosque in a prominent Hindu locality. In spite of many protests from the Hindu population the other party persisted in constructing one. The Hindus then appealed to His Highness with the result that he was pleased to appoint a Committee of enquiry, consisting of two Mussalms and one Hindu to report on the matter. The report was in favour of the Hindus, and His Highness has been pleased to pass his orders accordingly. The action taken by H. H. the Nizam, it need hardly be added, was in accordance with the traditional policy adopted by the Rulers of Hyderabad

CONCLUSION

The Renaissance of India really lies in our own hands. Let us work and trust to God so that we may leave a richer heritage to our children than all the gold of the world—FREEDOM—for which no sacrifice is too great.

THE HON. Mr. ABDUL RASUL

Speaking on the resolution on Self-Government in the All-India Muslim League, Lucknow, in 1916. The Hon. Mr. Abdul Rasul said:—

It is known that England is the most freedom loving country in the world. It was pointed out in another place how all political refugees of Europe, found shelter in England. When England along with other powers advocated the cause of freedom, did England think that India was not as educated as some of the other countries following? Most of you know that England along with other powers advocated Self-Government for the Balkan States. The people of India are better educated than the people of the Balkan States. Are we less educated and advanced than what Japan was fifty years ago when Self-Government was granted to the people of Japan? We find that even the Negroes in Siberia have Self-Government. The wording of our resolution is most moderate, and reforms, that we now ask for are only steps to a further measure of Self-Government. That is our goal. I hope the Government will not consider our demands extravagant. It has been stated in some papers that after the War the Colonies would have a large share in the administration of India. I do not know if that is correct or not. We have been ruled by the English people, but certainly we shall object to be ruled by the

Civilians who come from the Colonies which do not treat our people in a way that they ought to, having regard to the fact that that the Indians, South Africans, Australians, etc., are all subjects of the same Sovereign. We know what our people want better than the Civilians who come from South Africa, Australia, New Zealand and England. I do not mean any disparagement to the members of the Indian Civil Service when I say that in 95 cases out of 100 they do not understand our languages. There is a great deal of misunderstanding about this question of Home Rule or Self-Government. Our rulers and Anglo Indian editors of papers say that our object is to drive the English out of India. It is not the intention either of the Hindus or the Mussalmans to drive the English out of India. If it is to be a settled fact that the Colonies are to have control over our affairs, we must insist on having our share in the control of the affairs of the Empire. Do not think that anybody can say that ours is an unreasonable demand. Understand that Mr. L. Curtis, who is here on the dais has written a book called *The Problem of the Commonwealth* and that it is also his object that we, Indians, should have a place in the Empire not as a Dependency, but as a dominant partner. If so, we welcome the suggestion in his book, but if it is not so, we must strongly object to the Colonies having any share in controlling the affairs of India. The Governor-General said the other day in Calcutta that he would be dishonest if he held out any hopes that our progress would be rapid. I say equally

determinedly and equally respectfully that, if our rulers do not grant us reforms, which are so reasonable, yet if we go on appealing and appealing to the British people in spite of what he, Lord Chelmsford said, our progress will be rapid. The English people have been very cautious, but at the same time if we can show to them the justice of our cause, I have no doubt the British public would come forward to grant what we want within a few years. After the Boer War the British statesman granted Self-Government to South Africa. When we are shedding blood in the cause of the British Empire, are we to be debarred from having that measure of Self-Government which, Boers, who were enemies of Britain, obtained within a few years of the annexation of South Africa? (Loud and continued applause).

SIR RABINDRANATH TAGORE

The following is a running summary of a lecture recently delivered by Dr. Tagore at Calcutta on "Things being shaped as the Master desires."

I have grown grey as I have watched, year after year how, at the least shower of rain, Chitpore Road, in front of our lane, becomes flooded, and how the discomfort of its being under water is emphasised for us and the wheels of our luckless carriages by the underlying tram tracks, which on this road, are in a chronic state of being under repairs.

I have latterly begun to think that it is possible not to allow this kind of thing to go on that, in fact, one gets on ever so much better for not allowing it to go on—and that the contrast between Chitpore Road and Chowringhee is driven home to every one who goes about with his eyes open. They both belong to and are part and parcel of the same city, the same municipality, but what we are willing to suffer in the northern part, they are not willing to stand in the south. We await our Master's voice; they insist on being their own masters.

The right of being one's own master is the greatest of man's rights. So this country, in which all teachings and injunctions, all rules and observances, have been directed towards keeping this greatest of rights suppressed, where paths are destroyed lest footsteps

should stray, where in the name of religion man is humiliated and abused,—has naturally become the greatest of slave factories.

Our modern bureaucratic rulers have taken to gravely offering us the same counsel: "You are unfit, you will make mistakes, self-government is not for you." These teachings of Manu and Parashar sound strangely out of tune when repeated in English and rouse us to give the reply which the spirit of European civilisation itself has taught us:—"To make mistakes is not so serious a matter as not to be one's own master. Truth can only be arrived at, if one is free to err."

We may go further and remind our bureaucratic masters that the automobile of self-government, which they now so proudly drive in their own country, was not always there; and that the creating of the old parliamentary cart, which first began its journey in the night jolting its way from the rut of one precedent to another, did not sound exactly like the music of a triumphal progress. How it used to sway from interest to interest,—of the king, of the church, of the land lord, of the brewer! Was there not a time when its members could only be made to attend under threat of penalty? And talking of blunders what a tale could be unfolded of its old relations with Ireland and America and its blazing indiscretions in the Dardanelles and Mesopotamia, to say nothing of the not inconsiderable list which might be made out for India alone.

And we have finally a still more important point to

urge. Self-Government not only leads to efficiency and a greater sense of responsibility, but it makes for the uplifting of the national spirit, when those whose minds are now confined within the parochial limits of community of village are given the opportunity of thinking and acting imperially, then alone can they realise the vision of mankind in its larger sense.

Therefore in spite of all risks of muddies or blunders we must have Self-Government—this and this alone is the sovereign cure of all our national distempers.

The same helm serves to steer to the left as to the right. And we must not forget that there is a fundamental principle which must be grasped before man can become true either socially or politically. Each individual has no particular law to guide him. He must have a command of the universal law if he would be successful. The mental cowardice which compels us to await the master's voice before we can act has shaped the very fount of all our national aspirations and endeavours. What master? Any master, be he the elder at home, the police "daroga," the priest or pundit or anyone of the numerous evil spirits in whose altar we have sacrificed all our individuality and independent thinking.

And yet there was a day in India when the Upanishads taught of the Eternal and Universal law, the knowledge of which is science. It is this same science which has given Europe the courage to say:—"Malaria shall be driven off the Earth. Lack of food and lack of knowledge shall not be allowed in the homes of men."

Harmony shall reign in the political world between the commonweal and the rights of the individual."

To-day, all the world is praying to be relieved from sub-servience to the dictates of masters and super-men. Awakened by the modern spirit, we are yearning to join in the universal chorus of democracy. It would have been our eternal shame had we failed to do so, had we proved our undying yearning for some master's voice. It is of happy augury that we have caught a glimpse of the truth and are still able to respond to it.

I know that we are open to the same retort, which the Brahmin gave to the Sudra of old that this fundamental principle of British policy does not apply to us. But, for all that, let us not refuse to believe in humanity and human justice. Let us continue to behave as though power is not the only thing great in the British regime, but that the principles on which it is based are even greater. When the Sudra joined his palms in submission to the Brahminical decree of inferiority, on that very day was dug the pit for the Brahmins' downfall. The weak can be no less enemies of the strong than the strong of the weak. We shall not do the British the dis-service of weakly assisting them to belie their own greatness.

That the people are most concerned in their own Government is a truth greater than the Government itself. This is the truth which gives strength to the British people. This is the truth which is also our strength. If we fail to hold on to this truth, the Government will lose sight of it likewise. If we do not believe and

trust in the British ideal of Self-Government, then the police must needs tyrannise over us and the efforts of the Magistrate to protect us will be unavailing; then will the god of Prestige continue to demand its human victims and British rule in India give the lie to historic British ideals.

After a hundred and fifty years of British rule we hear to-day that Bengal is not even to be allowed to sigh over the troubles of her sister province of Madras. Up till now we had been led to believe that the fact that under the same British sovereignty the provinces of Bengal, Punjab, Madras and Bombay were all being welded into a uniformity of ideal and aspiration was one of the brightest jewels of the British crown. We are told in the West that Britain entered this war and faced death accounting the sorrows of Belgium and France as her own; and are we to be told in the same breath in the East that Bengal must not bother her head about the troubles of Madras? Is this a command to which we are prepared to bow the head? Do we not know for certain, in spite of the vehemence of its utterance of the load of shame which lurks behind?

England came to India as representing European civilisation. The ideal of that civilisation is the word she has pledged to us. We must hold her to that word. It is our duty not to allow her to forget it. Unless both parties do their duty forgetfulness and fall will be the inevitable consequence. Science, comradeship and self-respect of the people, this is the wealth

Europe has acquired. This is the consideration on which ~~must~~ be based England's title to the Empire.

The Englishman may point to his own history and say "This great ideal of the government of the people by the people was evolved by us through many a struggle and at the cost of much striving and sacrifice." I admit it. All pioneer peoples of the world, in the pursuit of their several quests, have had to pass through much error and sorrow and strife. But when they have gained the truth they sought, it has become available to others without their having to tread the same long road of error and sacrifice.

In America I have seen Bengal youths becoming experts in the manufacture of machines without their having had to retrace the whole history of the steam engine beginning from the boiling kettle. What it took centuries for Europe to evolve it took but little time for Japan to transplant, roots and all, to her own soil. So, far from being convinced of any reason for delay, we may on the contrary urge that it is just because we are deficient in the qualities which are necessary for self-government that practice in governing ourselves is all the sooner necessary. What of the democracies which are the boast of the West? Can we not rake up enough of sin and crime and every kind of enormity from amidst the European peoples? Had there been any Over Lord to say that till all these continue to exist Europe shall not have self-government, then not only would all these have remained as they

are, but all possibility of their cure would have departed.

I do not deny that we have our weaknesses in our individual characters and in our social system. Still we want self-government. In the great democratic festival of the world no one people have all their lights burning—yet the festival goes on. If for sometime our light has gone out, may we not ask for it to be lit at the wick of England's lamp without thereby raising a howl of indignation? It will not detract from England's light but surely add to the brightness of the world's illumination.

H. H. THE MAHARAJAH OF ALWAR

At a banquet given in honour of H. H. the Maharajah of Bikaner at the Taj Mahal Hotel, Bombay, the Maharajah of Alwar in the course of a long speech said:—

Your Highness, if at this War Conference there should be any question regarding the future of our country, it will not be necessary for you to speak of our great past. Our ancient civilisation is still a source of admiration to the people of other lands, and cannot but be the cause of legitimate pride to the sons and daughters who have been born of the soil. But no nation can live on its past alone. We are determined that the superstructure shall be built to completion on the same religious foundation, and that the future of our mother country shall be as equally great, if not greater than what it was in the ancient days. We are all naturally anxious to raise India's position in accordance with her ancient glory. India has nothing to beg. But at the present time, it has not even the opportunity to claim or ask that our Aryavarta may at least be put in such a position that she may be able to hold her head alongside of other sister nations of the Empire. We are not going to embarrass the Government who guide the destinies of this country with such questions at the present moment, as it is necessary for us to concert all our energies towards our common aim of ultimate success. We feel confident that, when the

moment arrives, we shall not be forgotten or left behind. Is it possible that a nation which has drawn the sword for protecting the liberties of weaker nations, such as Belgium, will overlook our rights and claims to raise our heads on a footing of equality with the other Dominions? When the War is successfully over and the British people extend to India their hand of comradeship, entrust us to wield the destinies of our own country, Your Highness can assure them we shall be as ready to grasp their hand with feelings of warm gratitude and emotion, as we have been to discharge our duties in the present crisis. When such constitutional changes take place, it is not possible to think that the destinies of our one-third India are likely to be ignored. We rest in confidence at the present moment.

H. H. THE MAHARAJAH OF BIKANER

At a banquet given in honour of H. H. the Maharajah of Bikaner at the Taj Mahal Hotel, Bombay, His Highness, in the course of his reply, said :—

We have every reason to feel confident as to the future of India, and I think that, if we reflect on the ready response and gratitude which stir the hearts of millions of loyal Indians at each new sympathetic step or generous measure taken by the British Government for the amelioration of the condition and status of the people or the political advancement or the moral or material development of our mother country, we can feel proud of our countrymen. And most of all we may be proud when we regard the sacrifices in blood or treasure that have been cheerfully made by prince and peasant alike in this colossal struggle, when our countrymen have fought shoulder to shoulder with our English and Colonial brethren for God, King and Country, and in the cause of freedom and humanity without any idea of reward or recompense, but glad firmly to grasp the hand of comradeship and friendship extended to them by their brethren of Great and Greater Britain, for whether we come from the territories of British India or those of the Indian States we are all Indians who are entirely united in loyalty and attachment to our King-Emperor, in our affection for our mother country and in our deep and genuine solicitude for our brethren of all creeds and communities

throughout India. And I know I am voicing the feelings and sentiments of Your Highnesses when I further state that we of the Indian States, who yielded to no one in the whole of the British Empire in steadfast loyalty and deep devotion to the Person and Throne of our King-Emperor, happily find it quite consistent to be at one and the same time in the best and truest sense of the term staunch loyalists and Imperialists as well as true patriots of our mother country, deeply sympathising with all the legitimate aspirations of our brother Indians in British India, just as much as we feel sure our brethren in British India sympathise with the legitimate aspirations of the Princes and people of the Indian States, and our desire to see maintained unimpeded our dignity, privileges and high position. The beginning now made in according India her proper place in the Empire is wise and sagacious measure that will knit England and India still closer together, and that it will further strengthen the ties connecting India with Great Britain which all well-wishers of the Great British Empire earnestly desire. I would like to be permitted to say that I am not speaking any idle words in an irresponsible or light hearted manner, but that I am expressing, my honest and firm conviction when I say that this and many other signs are good omens, full of bright promise for the future of India. The daughter State has proved that it would, as of old, always faithfully stand by England through thick and thin for the honour and glory of the mighty British Empire, of which she considers herself an integral part. After the

end of this terrible world-wide War, who can doubt that the angle of vision as regards India will be still further altered in favour of every reasonable and right political reform? Close personal comradeship on the battle-fields and the common bond of loyalty for the Sovereign and love for the Empire have further more led to a similar favourable change in the angle of vision of the Self-Governing Colonies and the other parts of the British Dominions which for the first time are beginning to realise and understand India at her true worth. Big changes are in the air, including the reconstruction and reconstitution of our Empire, and though at present the immediate energies of all of us must be devoted to winning the War, yet when by God's infinite grace the arms of His Imperial Majesty the King Emperor and those of our brave Allies are crowned with victory, an event which happily is already in sight, I sincerely believe that British statesmanship and British sense of justice and fairness will rise equal to the occasion, and accord to our country that place to which her position in the Empire and her loyal services to the Crown entitle her. We may, therefore, confidently assume that Great Britain and the British nation who have so bravely made, and are still making, such tremendous sacrifices to uphold the cause of justice and humanity, will not forget the just claims and aspirations of India to enable her to work out her destiny under Britain's guiding hand and protection.

LORD BISHOP OF CALCUTTA

The Lord Bishop of Calcutta in the course of his sermon at the St. Paul's Cathedral on the War Anniversary day, 1917, said :—

Our cause remains to-day what it has always been, the cause of justice, mercy and good faith, the cause of truth and of liberty. We are still fighting to prevent one Power from destroying the liberties of some states and dismembering others, and from imposing upon the whole world the theory that 'might is right.'

But there are signs that under the strain and exasperation of protected warfare we are tempted to be unfaithful at heart to the object for which we are fighting. We have all realized that if Germany won this war, the world would have to accept all the atrocities which the Germans have committed in it as parts of the recognized custom of war. Yet in this last year both in Parliament and in the newspapers men have urged that we ought to commit atrocities upon the Germans under the name of reprisals. If we did this we should be giving the sanction of our example to the commission of atrocities in war. If we do not uphold the customs of civilized warfare, who will be left to do it? We must be very straight and plain with ourselves. If we commit, or approve of our soldiers committing unjust or merciless or dishonourable acts, we have but little right to say that we are fighting for

justice, mercy and good faith. It is then hypocrisy for us to bring our cause before God to-day.

But it is not only against the German method of conducting war that we are fighting. We are fighting against the German principle that the strongest nation ought to subdue and enslave weaker ones. If this principle were accepted, there would be no end to wars, and the strongest nation might always plead the excuse of Germany that it was making these conquests with the object of spreading its own superior civilization. We stand for the right of nations to live and grow according to their own God-given nature, whether they be great or small. Here again we must keep our own conscience clear. We have become the paramount power in India by a series of conquests in which we have used Indian soldiers and had Indian allies. We have remained the paramount power in India because the Indian people needed our protection against foreign foes and against internal disorder. We must now look at our paramount position in the light of our own war-ideals. The British rule in India must aim at giving India opportunities of self-development according to the natural bent of its peoples. With this in view, the first object of its rulers must be to train Indians in self-government. If we turn away from any such application of our principles to this country, it is but hypocrisy to come before God with the plea that our cause is the cause of liberty.

But while our cause has remained the same as we have professed it since the war began, recent events

have given it a new meaning. The adhesion, of the United States to our side and the revolution in Russia have added a new element to the idea that we are fighting for liberty. We have hitherto been fighting for the liberty of nations from enslavement by other nations. Now we realise that we are also fighting for the masses of the people within each nation. We are fighting for the democratic idea. With eyes enlightened and with hearts uplifted, understanding our great cause more clearly than in the beginning of the War, let us pray that we may be more worth of our cause.

Mr. SYED WAZIR HASAN

At a meeting of the London Indian Association held at the Caxton Hall, Westminster, (1913 October 11), Mr. Syed Wazir Hasan, Secretary of the All-India Moslem League, delivered an address on "The Hindu-Mahomedan Problem in India." Dr. J. N. MEHTA presided, and there was a considerable attendance of members and friends, including Sir Mancherjee Bhownagree, Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, Mr. Mohammed Ali (Editor of the Delhi "Comrade") Mr. M. A. Jinnah, Mr. J. M. Parikh, and Mr. H. P. Lal (Secretary).

Mr. SYED WAZIR HASAN, who was cordially greeted, then addressed the meeting. The subject (he said), with which he was to occupy their time was of very great significance and importance to the inhabitants of a country which contained, as it did, about one-fifth of the whole human race, and it was of no less importance to *Great Britain, of which India*, in the words of Lord Morley, was practically the only Empire. Upon the right solution of it depended the future of their mother land, and also to a great extent the future of the great Empire to which they belonged. Of course, India was neither wholly Moslem nor wholly Hindu, nor, indeed, was India synonymous

with a combination of Hindus and Mussulmans. But he meant no disrespect to other communities in India when he said that the Hindus and the Mussulmans formed the two main communities of India, and her future depended far more on the establishment of proper relations between them and the adjustment of those relations to the position of India in the British Empire than on the relations and position of other communities inhabiting India. It would be obvious to any but the wholly insane that it was possible neither for the seventy millions of Mussulmans to exterminate in any manner or way the two hundred and twenty millions of Hindus, nor for the two hundred and twenty millions of Hindus to get rid of the seventy millions of Mussulmans. They should not go back too far into the remote past, and rake up old rivalries, nor were they likely to get at the truth in histories most often read by the educated Indians of to-day, for it was only too often that the honest and laborious chronicler's hand was invisible therein while the shadow of the politician loomed only too large. But about six years ago, when a new educational policy came to be pursued in India the position of the two communities were not exactly the same. The Mohammedans had practically lost their Indian Empire, but like all proud but fallen people, they disdained at the time to learn anything from their new teachers. However natural this spirit of defiance and this habit of sulking might have been, no Mussulman could look back upon it except to lament the criminal neglect of

opportunities which were provided for Mussulmans as well as the Hindus in India by a generation of English men whose name was blessed in all educated and cultured Indian households, and would continue to be so blessed by coming generations educated on the lines marked out by those illustrious and benevolent English men. He was inclined to find the causes of present-day antagonism to the extent that it existed in the difference of temper of the two communities when education on modern lines was first introduced into India. Wisely enough, and quite naturally, the Hindu community began from the very first to take full advantage of the new education, and its present evolution was due to the foresight and adaptability of its leaders sixty years ago. Unfortunately for the Mussulmans, they remained for a long time in the stupor that followed upon their decline, and the disappearance of their dominion, and it seemed very unlikely that they could be roused from that condition by any individuals or forces working at the time. But happily for them, just at the time that the Hindus began to attend in increasing numbers, every day the schools and colleges established, by Government and missionary societies in India, there lived amongst the Mahomedans one who, although the product of ancient Eastern education, and surrounded by the environments of a period of decline had a sufficiently clear vision, and a far-sightedness that made him realise the importance of a change in the form and the content of education. He meant, of course, Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, the greatest Mussulman of the last

century, and one of the greatest Indians of that period. No one in India had worked harder or on sounder lines for the unity of India than did Sir Syed Ahmed, because it was due to him that Indian Mussulmans took to English education, and when once the two communities shared the same temper as regards Western education, and the educational disparity between them was removed, national unity would be assured. The Calcutta University was founded in 1857, and thirty years after that memorable event India witnessed the establishment of the Indian National Congress.

THE EXAMPLE OF THE CONGRESS

In this interval a new generation of men had come into prominence, and was beginning to guide the destinies of their fellow-countrymen. The teachings of Western poets and political philosophers had now begun to bear fruit, and the first manifestations of the effect of the training which India received at the hands of its rulers now became visible in an organised form in the Indian National Congress. The Congress was, therefore, the result of the ordinary process of evolution working during the preceding thirty years, and was, as such, an embodiment of Indian political consciousness. These thirty years were unfortunately not utilised by Indian Mussulmans in the same manner. But the cogitation of Sir Syed Ahmed, for whom the downfall of Mussulman and the cataclysm of the Mutiny of 1857 were a rude awakening, resulted in the foundation of the Mahomedan Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh in

1877, and it was no mere coincidence that it took the Mussulmans also exactly the same period of thirty years after this epoch-making event to establish their first political organisation. In the space of these thirty years intervening between the foundation of the Aligarh College and the establishment of the Moslem League in 1906 a new generation of Mussulmans had come into prominence, and had begun to shape the destinies of their co-religionists. The foundation of the League was, therefore, the first manifestation of the dawn of political consciousness on the Moslem horizon in India. The study of the poets and philosophers of the West which had brought about a new political consciousness to the Hindus twenty years ago, brought about the same consciousness to the Mussulmans twenty years later. In 1886 the Mussulmans could have taken no useful part in Indian politics, and, in fact, he felt certain that with their ignorance at that time, and in the temper in which they then happened to be, their participation in Indian politics would have reacted unfavourably on their Hindu fellow-countrymen also. "He who plucks an unripe fruit must expect to find it sour."

THE MAHOMEDANS AND THE MOVEMENT

It might be asked that if the Mahomedans became conscious of their political entity twenty years later than the Hindus, why did they not join an already existing political organisation instead of forming, as they had done, a separate organisation of their own. His reply to this question would be two-fold. In

the first place, the growth and evolution of the two communities, although similar in character, was not the same in point of time. Those who started on their journey late in the day could not hope to catch up those who began theirs with the dawn. But it was possible for Mussulmans to learn a great deal from the lessons which experience has taught to the Hindus, and either by discovering short-cuts or making forced marches to catch up their fellow wayfarers on the road of progress. And here he would make an appeal to his Hindu fellow-countrymen to lend every assistance they could to the Moslem laggards, for if they were to work together with the Hindus the two must march shoulder to shoulder. Even in politics magnanimity was often the best policy, and in thus appealing to Hindu fellow-countrymen to be magnanimous, he was not appealing only to their magnanimity but also to their political sagacity. The continuance of educational disparity between Hindus and Mussulmans would retard the growth of a common nationality, as the existence of such a disparity retarded common action in the past. Political unity could only be established between those who were equally well educated, and if Moslem co-operation appeared at all necessary, it was the duty of his fellow-countrymen to assist in removing the existing disparity, and any help offered to the Mussulmans in education was one more stone put on top of the others in the construction of the national edifice. Considering that so many things and institutions which

were common to-day in India were the results of study of English people and their institutions, and of a conscious or unconscious imitation of them, it was not to be wondered as if in gazing into the future of our country they were liable to think a little too often that it would be similar to that of the country which brought to them their newly-found political consciousness. But it was only too true that India was in a hundred and one things unlike England, and they would once more be quarrelling with the laws of Nature if they anticipated a political future for India exactly the same as the present condition of England. The history of India for many, many centuries, and the temperament of our people in the East had to be taken into account, and it appeared to him that they would be failing in their duty as nation-builders if in deciding upon the method of attaining salvation, they attached the same value and significance to differences of religion in India as was done in England. In the East religion was something more than a matter of ritual, something more than a set of spiritual conceptions. It often provided a social polity, and gave a distinct colour and shape to culture. When he scanned the skies he saw the vision of the future to be one of a united India, but the union appeared to be one not of individuals but of communities—a political entity on federal lines as unique in constitution as their circumstances—a federation of faiths no less strong than a federation of States in America or of kingdoms in Germany—a union of

people "not like to like but like in difference, self-reverent each and reverencing each." The main thing to consider was not whether two people enter the same house from two different doors or from one door, but whether they entered the same house or not, and whether they came to it animated with the same desires and cherishing the same ideals. If he might be permitted to say so, too much time had been spent in discussing the question of different doors, and it had been forgotten that they had to live in the same house, and that if they wished to live together, it was better to live in concord and harmony than in conflict and hostility.

THE GROWTH OF GOOD FEELING

Often and often enough the political organisations of the two communities had worked on the same lines in recent years, and the representatives of the two communities in the various legislative bodies of India had fought shoulder to shoulder against despotic measures and policies. The most recent manifestation of the desire to work together had been the series of meetings which had been held in Allahabad, Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay. The last of which had taken place at Cawnpore, and an account of this had come to hand by the mail. They would find that Mr. Mazar-ul-Haque, the distinguished champion of Indian unity, had made a remarkable speech. In this meeting, he might add, more than two thousand Mussulmans participated. It would not do to mistake these signs for an ebullition of Moslem temper which

would subside as quickly as it had arisen. These were symptoms of the effect that education on similiar lines had produced on two communities living side by side and recognising a common destiny above the existence of separate entities and the din of communal claims. The new ideals which were being cherished by the present generation of the Mussulmans could not but open new vistas before their vision. They saw—and saw with a steady gaze—that the progress of their common mother-land must depend on a hearty co-operation among all her sons. Side by side with the recognition of their peculiar conditions the Mussulmans, too, had begun to form conceptions of broader obligations and wider responsibilities to their country as a whole, and while not quarrelling with the existence of separate communities as separate political entities, it was possible to progress towards the formation of a nation in India evolved out of a gradual process of eliminating and minimising the points of difference and developing and increasing the points of concord between the two great communities. Even if he differed from some of his fellow-countrymen in his solution of the problem of nationhood, he was not any the less sincere and ardent in his desire to achieve the goal which they all had in view. The glaring monotony of Indian public life was the result of forcing the awakening mind of the people into a cast-iron mould that might break, but would not bend. It was a shallow philosophy that sought to find unity of effort through a uniformity of opinion. It was idle to expect

public men to respond to fresh inspiration, and to initiate fresh forms of public endeavour so long as freedom of thought was suppressed by those who controlled the only efficient instrument that democracy had evolved for the organisation of public will and intelligence.

THE MOSLEM LEAGUE AND ITS OBJECTS

He would now place before them certain recent developments in the organisation of which he was the chief executive officer—the All-Indian Moslem League. It was felt that there must be a political ideal for a political organisation. In April, 1912, there issued a circular letter from the office of the All-India Moslem League to all its members and other leading Mussalmans inviting their opinion on the subject. It was a matter of extreme satisfaction that the views of a large majority pointed to one and only one end, and it was that Moslems must place on their programme as their ideal a system of self-government suitable to India under the ægis of the British Crown. This ideal was placed before a meeting of the council of the All-India Moslem League held on December 31, 1912, under the presidency of his Highness the Aga Khan, and eventually the League gave its confirmation. That ideal runs in the following resolution:—

“The objects of the League shall be *inter alia* attainment under the ægis of the British Crown of a system of self-government suitable to India through constitutional means by bringing about amongst others a steady reform of the existing system of

administration, by promoting national unity, by fostering a public spirit among the people of India, and by co-operation with other communities for the said purposes."

This clause indicated not only the ideal towards which a steady march was being made, but it also attempted, to a limited extent, of course, to point out the steps by which they might approach nearer to the goal in view. Let them now analyse the clause—"By a steady reform of the existing system of administration." This indicated that although no revolutionary reforms were contemplated, nevertheless, the Mussulman mind was not unconscious of the defects in the administration of the country at present. It was obvious that the machinery with the help of which India is governed was more or less a century old. It was preposterous to contend that the India of to-day could be well governed with the help of the same machinery.

THE IDEAL OF SELF-GOVERNMENT

The second portion of the clause stood thus—"By promoting national unity." Howsoever they might wish for a speedy formation of an Indian nationality, it must evolve out of the circumstances which arose under political activities in different directions. It could not be "let there be a nation, and there is a nation." The Indian nationality must be founded upon the bed-rock of a unity of ideals. The methods of working for the attainment of those ideals might differ. He maintained, therefore, that the ideal of self-government which the

All-India Moslem League had placed on its programme was an important step towards the formation of that great nationality for the building of which all Indians were aspiring. The last portion of the clause ran as follows:—"By co-operating with other communities for the said purposes." Their Hindu brethren had been invited to meet the Mussulmans in conference in which they could discuss the preliminaries to concerted action, and if he was spared the strength to take up this pleasant task, the conference should be convened. He would now quote a short passage from a message which his friend, Mr. Mahomed Ali, and himself, left behind for his fellow-countrymen when leaving the shores of India:—

"But the object of our journey is by no means sectarian or exclusively communal. We firmly believe that the progress and well-being of the Mussulmans are bound up with the progress and well-being of the country in which they live. The present carries in its womb the hopes and fears common to every community in India, and we shall be failing in our duties not only as Indians, but as Mussulmans also, if we do not strive during our sojourn in England to convert our fears into hopes, and to materialise the hopes which we share with all our fellow-countrymen."

He hoped they would accept this as a true index of the Moslem heart, and he appealed to his fellow-countrymen for patience, toleration, and good-will

THE CRITICS OF THE NEW MOSLEM

He could not conclude without passing reference to chimerical dangers pointed out and needless warnings indulged in by a certain section of the Anglo-Indian press, which had found an echo in the correspondence columns of an important English journal, but it was not only to these people that he addressed himself when he said that the unity of Hindus and Mussulmans was not to be a unity in opposition to the British Government. Often and often in the history of political organisations a unity in opposition had proved to be both ephemeral and weak. It was true that they wished to unite in attacking from two different sides the citadel of bureaucratic, and, in fact, despotic rule, and all the abuses which it inevitably brought in its train, but he was astonished to find that the unity between Hindus and Mahomedans which every British administrator in India had so long preached was giving rise in the official mind to considerable embarrassment and uneasiness, now that it was at last going to be practised. He would not insult these illustrious administrators by accusing them of hypocrisy, but they must realise that the education which Indians had received, made them somewhat critical, and unless they dissociated themselves from all ideas of being hostile to Hindu and Mussulman unity, Indians would not be equally disposed to give them credit for perfect sincerity. They were not so foolish as to believe that self-government could be

achieved in a day. It would only follow the growth and development of a common nationality. If they were to believe the journals to which he had referred, the Mahomedans seemed to be very much like the child in the nursery rhyme—"When he is good, he is very, very good, but when he is bad he is horrid." Was it sane to imagine for a moment that Indian Mussulmans meant to exterminate the British and oust the British Government from India simply because, following slowly in the wake of the Government of India, they had now come to cherish the ideal of self-government, to which such a clear reference was made in the now memorable despatch of that Government, August 25, 1911? Was it natural to expect that in spite of years of Western education which had guided other communities of India on the path of progress, Indian Mussulmans would be content to live like the women of ancient Rome in a state of perpetual tutelage? Was it wise, was it even in the interests of the continuance of the British connexion with India to distort for the ultimate rulers of India the legitimate hopes and aspirations of educated Mussulmans into a moment of anarchical character? If it was believed that a wise Providence could not neglect the growth and progress of a fifth of the whole human race, they must believe that British rule in India to-day was providential. The sheet-anchor of the Oriental mind was a faith in Providence. Let them all hold fast to that faith, but let them not forget those beautiful lines which may be addressed to unity.

“Thou wilt come, join men, knit nation unto nation.
But not for us who watch to-day and burn.
Thou wilt come, but after what long years of trial,
Weary, watching, patient longing, dull denial.”

LALA LAJPAT RAI

A remarkable article by Lala Lajpat Rai has been published in a Boston (U.S.A.) newspaper. The following is the extract :—

I have often been asked how India feels about the war, and what is her position. India's interest is neither purely altruistic nor absolutely disinterested. She is interested in the results of the war as she hopes for a radical readjustment of her political relations with England, or, for the matter of that, with the whole world. She aspires to a position worthy of her past. Her people desire to be in their own country what other people are in theirs, as it is only then that she can make her proper contribution to the world ethics and the world culture.

READJUSTMENT AND REVALUATION

Then, again, this war must result not only in the revaluation of political standards, but also in a revision of ethical and moral ideals. India has a valuable contribution to make towards this revaluation. This readjustment and revaluation must spring from a spirit of co-operation and goodwill, not only between the different nations of the world, but also between the different religions of the world. That is only possible if India is treated justly and generously and given her

legitimate place in the comity of nations, and if her political disqualifications and disabilities are removed.

THE POLITICAL AWAKENING

At present the world sees India with other than Indian eyes, and generally with the eyes of prejudice—the eyes of Empire builders and Empire rulers. She suffers a great deal from misrepresentation and misapprehension.

However, we need not unearth the past; what we are just now concerned with is the present. There can be no denying the fact that ever since the Russo-Japanese war India has been astir. A keen desire for political liberties has been shown by all classes of her people. The general awakening of India has attracted world-wide notice. A national party has come into existence who do not accept the present political arrangement as satisfactory or honourable. Some of them desire complete independence, others would be contented to remain within the British Empire on the same footing as Canada or Australia or South Africa. They have proved their fitness by every test recognised under the sun.

INDIANS AS FIGHTERS

It is now an established fact that even as fighters Indians are inferior to none. Many a position lost by the purely white troops in this war has been regained by the Indians. Their valour, their resourcefulness, their stamina, their indifference to death, their skill, have all been put to test. The unanimous opinion

of all competent observers is in their favour. The British press and the French press, and even the German press, are full of praises for them. Yet they are fighting in strange environments, in a climate of which they have had no experience before, among people (both friends and foes) whose language they do not know.

THE GRIEVANCE OF THE ARMS ACT

The fighting capacity of India is simply inexhaustible. India can throw into the war millions of fighting men, if they are properly armed. At present a General Arms Act prohibits the use of arms by Indians in general except under a license from the magistrate, which is granted very sparingly, and for very strong reasons. Even the constitutional party among the Indian Nationalists feels the humiliation of being a disarmed nation and strongly objects to a continuance of this policy. It demands the repeal of this act or such modification of its provisions as will enable the bulk of men of property and education to carry arms. When the war ends this demand is sure to gain in volume and intensity, and it will be impossible for the authorities to resist without creating a serious disaffection in the country.

THE INDIAN "INTELLECTUAL"

As for intellectual equipment, their intellectual capacity has never been denied. But education is neither compulsory nor free. The populations of 300,000,000 in an area of over a million square miles

has only five universities to satisfy their craving for intellectual food. In the matter of scientific, technical, and vocational education, India is decades behind Europe and America. There is hardly a high-class technological institute in the whole country. To get up-to-date education Indians have to go to Europe or seek the hospitality of American universities.

It is obvious that this can be done by few only, and sometimes the best of the Indian students cannot get proper education to enable them to show the best in them. Yet the few that have gone to Europe or have come to America have held their own against local students. In the British universities, Indians have on many occasions beaten Britishers on their own ground; occupied the highest positions in all departments of knowledge, mathematics, classics, history, political economy, science, medicine, surgery, law, and philosophy. In India itself the opportunities for original and research work are almost nil. Post-graduate work is very little provided for. Yet in less than fifty years the country has produced a Tagore and a Bose—one on the literary side and the other on the scientific.

AS LAWYERS AND STATESMEN

As for capacity for legal and political work, it is admitted by the British administrators that the world knows no more keen and acute lawyers and clever debaters than the Indians. With the Indian Press Act laying down limitations on the liberty of the press and with "sedition" laws always hanging over their heads

like the sword of Damocles, the Indian politicians have held their own. There is no lack of statesmanship and public spirit in India if there were only fields for its display.

There is another part of national life in which India lags decades behind the other big countries of the world, namely, on the industrial side. For sometime it was said that Indians were lacking in enterprise and in commercial genius. The difficulty is that India is not free to determine and follow its fiscal policy. That policy is laid down for it from London, and the interests of Great Britain loom very large. Even if the Government of India, as at present constituted, were to determine a policy in the interests of India, primarily, they would not be allowed to do so if it is in any way militated against the commercial interests of Great Britain.

WHAT SELF-GOVERNMENT WILL DO

With Self-Government the industrial regeneration of India will come as a matter of course. It will remove the present embargo on Indian immigration to other countries outside of Asia. Self-governed India will loom large in world politics, not as aggressor or exploiter, but as a contributor to the general happiness of mankind, and to the moral and ethical uplift of the race. Hindus are the most tolerant people on earth. With self-government gained India will be a great moral force. It will add to the glory of Great Britain if she gets it without bloodshed. She has deserved it

by her conduct in the past. She is earning it now on the battlefields of Europe. She can be a never-ending source of strength to the British Empire, if dealt with justly and liberally.

WHAT INDIA WANTS

The "Christian Science Monitor" contains the following report of an interview which its representative at San Francisco has had with Lala Lajpat Rai.

The well-known Indian Nationalist leader, who has recently arrived in the United States from Japan, said that while a majority of the educated and half-educated Indians, as well as the lower classes, were in favour of Indian self-government, and while there had been outbreaks and acts of sedition, there was no possibility of an uprising of the people against the British Government.

In regard to the concessions that the British Government is likely to make at the close of the war in favour of Indian autonomy, he observed that the talk of a more liberal Indian policy among British publicists, and even by the Tory Press, led by the London "Times," at the beginning of the war, had recently ceased or changed its tone, indicating, in his opinion, that the prospects of substantial concessions in self-government were not now so bright as they seemed to be at the beginning of the war.

Indian politicians might be divided into three classes. First, there were the extreme Nationalists; second, the moderate Nationalists; and third, those

who were frankly in favour of the rule of the British Government. The Extremists based their propaganda on fundamental grounds. They did not believe that the British would ever voluntarily grant them freedom. They were, therefore, opposed to making petitions and sending memorials. Some of them wanted absolute "swaraj," and some of them qualified "swaraj" on Colonial lines; but everyone of them believed that neither was possible except by active revolt or successful passive resistance. They felt that they were not now in a position to organise, but that, in the meantime, it was their duty to do as much as they could to embarrass the Government by following the tactics of guerrilla warfare and by conducting a terrorist campaign. They said that they must keep the flag flying, no matter how heavy their losses. In their opinion it was the only way to carry on their propaganda and make it effective for impressing the country and gaining fresh recruits to their cause.

The Moderates, on the other hand, those of the Indian National Congress, who wanted to conduct their agitation on constitutional lines within the limits of law, were not in favour of embarrassing the British Government. They were opposed to all agitation, leaving everything to the good sense of the Government. Many of them believed that after the war the Government would make large political concessions, and that the country would make a material advance on the road to self-government on Colonial lines. Many of the members of this body, however, could scarcely be

distinguished from those of the third class, who were out-and-out loyalists.

The programme of the Moderate party, that is, the demands that they were likely to make on the British Government at the close of the war, had not been completely formulated, but the substance of the demands might be classified as follows: Repeal and modification of the Arms Act, making it possible, at least for men of education and property, to keep arms without license; some provision for the military training of Indian youths; army commissions to Indians; improvements in the position and prospects of the Indian soldier; a change in the constitution of the Imperial Executive Council so as to admit of more than one Indian being appointed to it; changes in the legislative councils; a non-official, elected majority in the Viceroy's Council; direct election; removal or restrictions in the choice of candidates; freedom of debate; freedom from the embargo of the Secretary of the State for India in fiscal legislation. Similar changes in the provincial councils with provincial fiscal autonomy and greater freedom in provincial legislation; executive councils for the provinces that were without them; a provision that each council should have at least two Indian members, and that the latter should be elected. Compulsory primary education, with ample provision for technical, commercial and scientific education; complete separation of judicial from executive functions with high courts in place of chief courts in each of the provinces, and an extension of jury trials; governors in place of

lieutenant-governors and chief commissioners in all the provinces; exclusive or at least larger employment of Indian agency in the public services; inauguration of industries under Government patronage with a protective tariff and ample provision for technical and industrial education in the country. The holding of simultaneous competitive examinations in India for all branches of the Indian services for which examinations are held in England; the repeal of the Indian Press Act and other coercive and repressive laws put on the statute book within the last ten years; better treatment in the Colonies with freedom of travel and emigration or freedom to bar the Colonials from holding any position in India; freedom of education; local self-government, freed of official control from village unions upwards.

HOME RULE FOR INDIA

The "Christian Commonwealth" for July 29, 1914 contains a lengthy interview with Lala Lajpat Rai.

It is observed at the outset that since the rejection of the India Council Bill by the House of Lords the question of British rule in India has ceased almost as suddenly as it began to interest the British people. But at the best of times interest in India is confined to a small section of the people.

Sometimes, but very rarely, we have a dim apprehension of the fact that the blessings of British rule are not altogether appreciated by the Indian people. We hear of a Nationalist movement. Travellers tell rather disturbing stories of the unrest that prevails. A few

Anglo-Indians who have spent years among that people warn us in grave tones that this unrest will one day come to a head. But on the whole, the British public and the British Parliament never think about India in any sense as a country with a soul of its own, which sees visions and dreams. And we are shocked and startled by the suggestion that in her dreams India sees herself as a self-governing country.

Yet to this conclusion events in India are certainly tending. The rejection of the India Council Bill is another step on the road that leads to the formulation of a claim for Home Rule.

THE REJECTION OF THE INDIA COUNCIL BILL

We regret the rejection of the Bill, not because we regarded that measure as a considerable step in the direction of associating educated Indian opinion with the Government of India, but because the refusal of even that small concession of representation in the Bill will make the progress of our constitutional agitation very difficult.

It gives the extreme section a handle against us. The constitutional movement in India is viewed with suspicion on both sides: by the younger generation of the Indian Nationalists as well as by the Government. This result will make it harder for us to confine the Nationalist movement within constitutional limits. We are strongly opposed to violent methods of propaganda. But we shall find ourselves powerless to stem the tide flowing in that direction if we are to have our proposals rejected in this

way. It can only foment unrest and lead to conspiracy and violence if the mass of the people of India become convinced that our constitutional propaganda is shown to be powerless to secure the reforms we have set out to win.

While leaving the next step to be decided by the Congress at its meeting in December next, Lala Lajpat Rai is personally in favour of abolishing the Secretary of State's Council altogether, as serving no useful purpose.

It is a citadel of bureaucracy. It stands in the way of the government of India being reconstituted on proper lines and of Indian claims being considered. It can only be justified in its continued existence by making it an organ for the expression of Indian opinion. If it is not to be that, it is worthless. Either it should be abolished or Indian opinion should have adequate and effective representation upon it. And we hoped that might be achieved by allowing some form of election, at least as far as the Indian members are concerned.

THE DIFFICULTY OF THE INDIAN REFORMER

The difficulty of the situation is this. The present constitution of the Legislative Councils leaves much to be desired, in spite of the "reforms." The value of the municipal boards as popular assemblies is largely discounted by the preponderance of official members and Government nominees. Any sort of vigorous outside propaganda is hindered by the Press Act and the Public Meetings Act.

We are muzzled. We cannot bring any strong pressure

to bear upon the Government. It proves the ineffectiveness of ordinary political propaganda, and drives all agitation underground. Educated people can only take part in public life by speaking and writing, and our activities in this way are restricted to a degree that the English people cannot realise. The only other channel of service open to us is social service, and that is limited by the fact that there is little we can accomplish by means of reform from within.

THE DEMAND FOR SELF-GOVERNMENT

Self-government for India on the same lines as it has been granted to other parts of the British Empire is one of the ideals of the National Congress. Anglo-Indians say that it is impracticable. The extremists among the Indian Nationalists say that it is impossible: they do not believe that the British rulers of India will ever consent to it. The direction their propaganda takes is therefore obvious. They do not believe in the ideal of self-government within the Empire. They want absolute autonomy and independence. The moderate section among the Indian Nationalists are prepared to accept the continuation of British rule. They desire self-government within the Empire. We have already some sort of municipal franchise. It is limited, as I have shown. But it can be extended to the Councils and gradually developed. This is our answer to those who say that it is impracticable. We have no answer to those who say that it is impossible, and who point to the refusal of our very moderate claims for representation by the British rulers as evidence that constitutional methods of agitation are futile.

It is admitted that the mass of uneducated Indian

opinion is not vocal, and that the only vocal section of the people is the educated class. But it is that class that leads the others. It is drawn from all classes, and represents all grades. From them the unrest spreads to the masses, as definite ideals and claims are more and more clearly and firmly formulated. And Lala Lajpat Rai's last word to the interviewer is that unless something substantial is done quickly to associate the Indian people more closely with the government of their own affairs, "the situation, already sufficiently serious, is likely to become more grave."

Mr. SYED HASAN IMAM

In the course of his Presidential address at The Bihar Special-Provincial Congress held at Patna, on August 26, 1917, Mr. Hasan Imam, spoke as follows:—

Gentlemen:—I have always been of opinion that the education imparted to us in this country is calculated to impress upon us too much of our duties to the State but very little of our rights. Perpetual insistence on our duties to the State and its visible embodiment—the officials—is the one keynote of a foreign educational policy, and one sees it at the very first glance. For example in a book recently brought out by a member of the Indian Educational Service in this province—called *Select Passages on Duty to the State* for the purpose of ‘reading, analysis and translation in schools and colleges’ the learned compiler declares in the preface to it that the extracts collected ‘have been chosen with a view to emphasising the duty we owe to the state and to one another.’ Now I have nothing to say against and in fact much in favour of teaching our boys the duties they owe to one another, but I venture to think that infusing young minds with the notion that they but owe duties to the State, without teaching them in the same breath that the State also owes, in a corresponding measure, duties to its subjects is not to fit our young men to become self-respecting and useful citizens of the Empire. It is hardly fair to our young men

to ransack classical writers on politics, from Plato and Aristotle to Mill and Spencer—as the compiler of the book in question has done—with a view to stuff their brains with passages on their duties to the State, without simultaneously enjoining on them the one great lesson our people stand badly in need of learning, that the State is for the benefit of the people and not the people for the benefit of the State, whether in India or in any other country. Viewed in this light it is not so much the people who owe duties to the State as the latter to the former. But unfortunately this very necessary teaching is not imparted to our young men either in schools or colleges or even when they have entered the world. The political atmosphere in this country, in which we live and move and have our being, is so redolent of 'Duty to the State' and laden with official vapour to such an extent that even meetings expressly called to record our loyalty to our Sovereign are not supposed to be able to do so unless presided over by a high executive official. It is therefore that in the absence of any insistence on the State's duties to the people, it devolves upon us to carry on as vigorous, active and earnest a constitutional agitation as we can with a view to teach the people the great lesson that the State exists for them and not they for the State. It was this lesson which our revered and patriarchal leader, Dadabai Naoroji, who has just gone to his rest, emphasised from the presidential chair of the Indian National Congress when he presided over it for the third and last time, at Calcutta, in 1906. His

memorable words—so full of deep significance and earnest patriotism—may well be recalled by us at this time and laid to heart. Our great leader exhorted us in words of burning eloquence as follows :—

Agitate, agitate over the whole length and breadth of India in every nook and corner. All India must learn the lesson of sacrifice of money and of earnest personal work. By doing that I am sure the British conscience will triumph and the British people will support the present statesmen in their work of giving India responsible self-government in the shortest possible period. We must have a great agitation in England as well as here. Agitate ; agitate means inform. Inform, inform the Indian people what their rights are and why and how they should obtain them and inform the British people of the rights of the Indian people and why they should grant them. The organization, which I suggest, and which I may call a band of political missionaries in all the provinces will serve many purposes at once—to inform the people of their rights as British citizens, to prepare them to claim those rights by petitions and when the rights are obtained, to exercise and enjoy them.”

In meeting to-day we are to some extent carrying out the mandate of our revered leader, who has been rightly designated the father of constitutional agitation in this country. The two points which the Provincial Congress Committee have thus kept in view in convening this session of the Congress are firstly, the declaration of Richard Cobden that ‘repetition is the

essence of agitation and secondly, the lesson embodied in Herbert Spencer's famous dictum that alien truths can be forced on minds reluctant to receive them only by means of repeated iterations.

PERSISTENT AGITATION AND THE BUREAUCRACY

These two dicta, the first of the most persistent and the most successful of British constitutional agitators and the second of one of the greatest political thinkers of the 19th century, should constitute the watch-words of our public activities. I have not had the same advantage which some others in this province have had of coming in contact with the members of the great bureaucracy who have been the arbitors of our destinies for now over a century and a half, ever since that memorable date, 12th of August, 1765, on which the grant of the Dewany of Bengal and Behar was made by the Emperor Shah Alam to the East India Company. But in this official-ridden country where, as I have already pointed out, even demonstrations of loyalty are organized and presided over by officials no one can live without feeling sooner or later the impact of the Indian bureaucracy. Now as I fully believe that there is a soul of goodness in things evil. I shall be the last person to deny the virtues of the bureaucrats who have wielded and still wield the destinies of our country. These virtues are being so constantly dinned into our ears by themselves that it is not likely that we can forget them. The latest glorifier

of bureaucratic self-complacency, a member of the Indian Civil Service, in his recently-published book called *The Economic Life of Bengal District*, sketches with a rare modesty the unparalleled achievements in this country of the great service of which he is a member, in the following passage:—'The Indian bureaucracy has supplied India with cheaper railway communications than any possessed by European countries, has provided for her the greatest irrigation works in the world, has created a judicial system which will bear comparison for fairness and expedition with any system elsewhere, has maintained order and security of life and property in the most unlikely conditions, has grappled successfully with widespread failure of crops and has attempted of late years the stupendous labour of providing an ignorant and densely populated country with a modern system of education and a modern system of sanitation. It has done all this at a cost which is an infinitely lighter burden upon the resources of a poor country than any of the Governments in Europe has placed upon the resources of a rich country.' Here are the alleged achievements of the Indian bureaucracy put by a member of that body presumably at the highest and certainly not at the lowest. I have no desire—since it is not germane to the subject before me—to find myself in controversy with the writer of the passage I have quoted for your special behoof, but what I desire to point out is that in this very flattering and almost idyllic picture of the achievements of the

Indian Civil Service—painted by the sympathetic hands of one interested in showing his own class in the most favourable light and in which the super-excellences of that body are brought into most prominent relief—there is no reference at all to any sense of responsiveness on the part of the civilian to the just aspirations of the Indians for what the Greeks called the 'higher things of life. That writer does not allege that, and it but goes to conclusively confirm us in our impression of the character of the Civilian administration as mechanical, unresponsive, and doctrinaire, in fact, as absolutely impervious to popular aspirations and to public opinion. Nor is it surprising since the very essence of the bureaucratic government is a belief in its own infallibility and its right to do for the people not what they want but what they ought to or are supposed to want. It is one of the well-established maxims in the science of character-study that the exercise of unchecked and irresponsible power inevitably corrupts some of the finer qualities of humanity and is calculated to tarnish, in the end, even the pure metal of which the Nietzschean superman is made. When you have to deal with such a class of men, the only way, it seems to me, which is likely to be effective is to iterate and reiterate your demands with a force and intensity which cannot be overlooked or ignored. I do not subscribe to the view that such demands can be more properly made in our Legislative Councils. True I am at some disadvantage in speaking on the subject

since I have never aspired so far to a seat in either the Provincial or the Imperial Legislative Council. But I have had the benefit of the experience of several of my friends who have been members of the Councils and their 'confessions' have confirmed my view that our Legislative Councils—as at present constituted—can and do afford very little scope for the expression of the public opinion of the educated and advanced sections in the country. Regard being had to these two obvious facts, the limitations of our Legislative Councils and the absolute imperviousness of the bureaucracy to public criticism and popular demands, it behoves us to earnestly and seriously take to heart the exhortation of Dadabhai Naoroji to agitate, agitate and agitate on constitutional lines till our people from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin become permeated with one uniform idea that they have not only duties to discharge to the State but rights against it—the rights to think their thoughts aloud, the rights of free association and expression and above all the right to rule themselves on such lines as they believe will be conducive to good government, without let or hindrance from any foreign bureaucracy. It is in this view of the matter, that this Special Congress is calculated to serve a very useful purpose.

OUR ONE GOAL: HOME RULE FOR INDIA

It is because we are satisfied that there can be no political and economic progress in our land till the bureaucracy is replaced by popular legislatures with full control over the executive and the judiciary, that

we have placed before us as the goal of our aspirations, the establishment of self-governing institutions in this country. It is idle to tell us that the bureaucracy have done for us this, that and the other, that they have given us good government with its concomitants of peace and contentment. Good government which the bureaucracy profess to have given us is no doubt better than no government but in the first place good government need to be necessarily synonymous with bureaucratic government. Even a fair-minded member of the Indian Civil Service.—Mr. Bernard Houghton—has had the candour to admit in his well-known work called *Bureaucratic Government* that 'the menace, the real peril, lies not in the grant of more popular government to India ; it lies in the continuance of the present bureaucratic system—a system which has served its purpose and which India has now outgrown. We are grateful for this unequivocal admission in our favour by a retired Civilian but as a matter of fact we scarcely need any such outside support. Our knowledge of the deficiencies and limitations of the Indian bureaucracy is too subjective to make us require any objective proof. The wearer, whom his shoe pinches feels it but too keenly to need any confirmations on the point from the on-looker. We who have lived these many years under the administration of the Indian bureaucracy do but too well realize its inevitable shortcomings—the unelasticity of its system, the rigidity of its method, the soullessness of its administration, the super-sensitiveness to and

impatience of even the most moderate criticism, the intense anxiety to retain, at all cost, the power and influence it has so long enjoyed and last but not least the passion for docile obedience subservience to its authority. These are realized in a more or less large measure in all parts of India, but in a somewhat backward province like ours they stand out in bold relief—especially the last. However it be, it is quite clear to us that now that we are demanding self-government, we shall not be placated by the good government offered to us by the Indian bureaucracy—be it howsoever best intentioned, conscientious or benevolent.

THE BUREAUCRACY AND OUR ASPIRATIONS

Such then is the situation facing us at present—on the one side a growing phalanx of educated and cultured Indians daily getting more and more qualified to manage their own affairs and desirous of coming into their own deeply dissatisfied with the present system of administration and the political constitution which affords hardly any scope for their talents, capabilities, and legitimate aspirations for administering their own affairs; on the other a close foreign bureaucracy actuated by strong *esprit de corps*, an unbending determination to preserve in their own hands all power in the State, and an inflexible resolve to cherish and maintain these great vested advantages which they have so long enjoyed. But there is nothing new in this. It is after all the repetition of what has transpired in every country in its onward march from bureaucracy to

democracy. It is just what was occurred before our own eyes in China and Russia and we in India must, profiting by the examples before us, be fully prepared to pass through the necessary struggle—a settled political phenomenon—which precedes the birth of a new nation, for as no sentient being can be born without the pains of labour on the part of the mother so each people must undergo the process of travail incidental to its being born as a nation, with a political consciousness. Now there is no doubt in our mind that the Indian bureaucracy has outlived its day and outgrown our requirements and it must now be at once replaced by popular Government. But whenever we urge this plea we are met with the official reply:—‘True, you are entitled to self-government in the fulness of time.’ We concede it is—as Mr. Percy Lyon put it to a Calcutta audience shortly before he retired from the Executive Council of Bengal—‘the inherent right of a nation to govern itself and Englishmen learn and understand that from their birth and it has been their policy from time immemorial.’ But—and now comes the very important ‘but’—‘You are not yet fully qualified. You need still a long period of growth and culture. The growing child cannot be treated as we treat the adult. You require to be trained and disciplined before you can be entrusted with a full measure of liberty and the full responsibility belonging to man’s estate.’ I daresay you have all noticed these sentiments finding a place even in the otherwise statesmanlike declaration made in the House

of Commons by the Right Hon. Mr. Montagu about the Indian reforms. The Secretary of State told us that the British Government and the Government of India—mark 'the Government of India' also which itself is the great bureaucratic citadel—'must be the judges of the time and measure of each advance in conferring self-government on India.' Contrast this pronouncement of the Secretary of State with that of the Prime Minister, recently made with reference to the German colonies, at present in British occupation. Said the Right Hon. Mr. Lloyd George:—'The dominant factor in settling the fate of the German colonies must be the people's own desires and wishes and the leading principle is that the wishes of the inhabitants must be the supreme consideration in the re-settlement—in other words the formula adopted by the Allies with regard to the disputed territories in Europe is to be applied equally in the tropical countries.' Any extended comment upon these two declarations—of the King-Emperor's Indian minister and his Prime Minister—would be but an act of supererogation. Obviously India, which in the recent memorable words of the Lord Bishop of Calcutta came under British Rule, 'by a series of conquests in which we (the British) have used Indian soldiers and had Indian allies is to be shown not even that consideration which is to be extended to the German colonies conquered during the present war. It is then at all surprising that holding the views he does as to 'training Indians in self-government,' the Metropolitan

exclaimed 'that if we turn away from any such application of our principles to India, it is but hypocrisy to come before God with the plea that our cause is the cause of liberty.' No gentlemen, we cannot and should not accept the view propounded by Mr. Montagu—while giving him full credit for the very best of motives and intentions—that the Government of India should be 'the judges of the time and measure' of our each advance towards self-government. True, he refers in this connection to the British Government also but we know from our past experience that that means on effect and substance nothing more than the acceptance of the views of the Government of India and the retired officials who occupy comfortable berths in that Cave of Adullam—the India office. We desire to remodel and reconstitute the Government of India and the provincial Governments by making them subject in all matters of administration and legislation to popular control, that is to subordinate the Executive to the views and wishes of popular legislatures—and yet it is the very instruments of our proposed reconstitution that are to be the judges of our capacity to do so! Verily Indian problems seem calculated to pervert the sense of logic even in great statesmen. Mr. Montagu's statement—if really acted up to—will but serve to confer on the Indian bureaucracy the additional power to hinder our progress, perhaps even more effectively than they can do at present. But the proposal has its humorous side which has not escaped the vigilant editor of the *Aurita Bazar Ratrika*, who shrewdly

remarks that 'if the custodian of a minor whose property he enjoys be given the privilege of determining his ward's age of majority, the latter will ever be in a state of minority.' There is great force and wisdom in these sagacious comments, and just as the declaration of the age of the ward's majority does not depend upon the wishes of the guardian but is fixed by law independent of the latter's self-interested opinion, so should the question of our capacity for each advance be determined by the British Parliament upon due enquiries made from time to time by means of Parliamentary committees, in consultation with the representatives of the National Congress and the Muslim League. Of one thing we are all sure, that if the Government of India and the British Government —which latter practically means the India Office —are to be the judges of our progress in self-government, the time will not have arrived till the crack of doom, when we may hope to attain even a fair—let alone a full—measure of self-government. This matter is in my opinion one of most vital importance and I can but hope that these observations of mine will assist you, to some extent, in formulating your views in your resolution on the subject.

'Apply any test that may be considered reasonable and you will find that the results of the Anglo-Indian administration are like the fabled apples on the shores of the dead-sea rich and tempting to the view but "ashes to the taste."

THE REPLY TO REPRESSION

Now all this cannot conduce to peace and contentment and above all there can be no peace till Mrs. Besant and her two associates are released and restored to full liberty. Reforms may or may not be introduced in our constitution, commissions in the army may or may not be granted to Indians, Mr. Montagu may or may not come to confer with his Excellency Lord Chelmsford's Government—in fact whatever may not happen—but if I am certain of one thing it is this, that there shall be no peace in the land so long as Mrs. Besant and her associates remain interned. We want the Government to distinctly understand that we are *not prepared to be content with any measure of self-government until Mrs. Besant, who is to us symbolical of all that is good, great, ennobling and vivifying in the Home Rule movement, is restored to our ranks to be able to preside over the next session of the Indian National Congress.* If the Government are not aware of the true feeling of the country on the subject and the temper of the people the more is the pity, the more it is to their discredit. Already a wave for passive resistance is surging through the land and will—unless the Government realize even at this late hour their responsibilities in the matter—very probably carry everything before it. Now passive resistance is the last weapon of the constitutional agitator. It includes what is popularly known as boycott and comprises amongst other things the withholding of all co-operation till the wrong to be righted is duly redressed.

That it is a perfectly constitutional method of bringing moral pressure to bear upon the Government does not admit of any doubt. Sir Charles Russell—afterwards Lord Russell of Kallowen, Lord Chief Justice of England—in his address to the Parnell Commission dealt at length with the subject and in the course of it he observed that 'individual boycotting or boycotting in combination is neither actionable nor criminal.' At the same time, though a perfectly legal and constitutional weapon, resort to passive resistance requires careful consideration, and on this subject I cannot do better than read out to you what Mrs. Besant herself wrote in her paper *New India* in the issue of the 4th January, 1915—'The conditions of successful passive resistance are a clearly defined grievance deeply felt by the great majority of people, a public whose sympathy can be obtained, a small area in which practically all the people concerned exercise such resistance. Vague discontent, general dissatisfaction, these are not suitable for passive resistance. Moreover, there must be a reasonable hope of success within a comparatively brief time. In India none of the conditions are present. Indian conditions resemble those against which the suffragists contend in England—a mass of inert indifference which cannot be roused into sympathy. Therefore while respecting the handful of patriots who adopt this policy, we say quite definitely that passive resistance cannot be wisely and usefully employed in working for self-government. A handful of passive resisters in 300 millions of passive

acquiescers is futile and their abstinence helps the bureaucracy.' There is a deal of truth in these observations, though the Government would do well to take note that the acerbity of feeling in the country is now ever so much greater thanks to the policy of persistent repression, culminating in the internment of Mrs. Besant herself and her two associates—and that they should therefore so modify their policy as to give some assurance to the people that hereafter they will not be thwarted in their efforts at securing constitutional reforms. And I feel sure that the most signal proof the Government could give—one that will afford us the utmost satisfaction and gratification—is the immediate release of Mrs. Besant and Messrs. Arundale and Wadia.

THE PROMISED REFORMS AND OUR LINE OF ACTION

And now, gentlemen, I have done. I fear I have trespassed on your valuable time too long, but the vital importance to us of the problem of the reform of the Indian constitution and my desire to be of some little assistance to you in the discussion of the subjects which will be placed before you, is my apology for my having detained you. You are aware of the announcement made by Mr. Montagu in the House of Commons on the subject of Indian reforms including the grant of commissions to Indians in his Majesty's Indian Army. For this definite and distinct declaration of policy promising the establishment of self-government in this country, we are grateful to his Majesty's Government

and not the less to Mr. Montagu himself—the reflex of whose true liberalism and genuine sympathy with our aspirations is visible in the terms of the announcement. I have already taken exception to that part of the statement which refers to the question of the fitness for which further advance to be judged practically by the Government of India. But though we have a right to complain of this part of the statement nevertheless you may be sure that no Government of India will be able to resist our demand if it will be backed up by the weight of our educational and moral progress in a larger and larger measure. The Government of India may be and is all powerful and very influential but the great principles of righteousness that govern this Universe are after all ever so much and immeasurably stronger than the strongest bureaucracy. It is but a few years back that Lord Morley declared his conviction that his object in introducing the Indian reforms was not to establish the germs of parliamentary government in India and it is that what we have now been practically promised by Mr. Montagu. However, all that is for time to come. It is sufficient for our present purposes that as the result of this conference with the Government of India, the heads of provincial Governments and administrations and the leaders of public opinion, Mr. Montagu had promised to introduce substantial reforms. For myself I have great hopes from Mr. Montagu, since he has always given evidence of a critical faculty keenly alive to the inherent limitations and inevitable deficiencies of the Indian

bureaucracy. But a few days before he assumed his present office, he delivered a remarkable speech in the House of Commons, during the debate on the Report of the Mesopotamian Commission, and I will commend a careful perusal of it to your earnest attention. Never before in the history of Anglo-Indian administration the bureaucracy were subjected to such a searching, withering criticism by one who had held the high office of Parliamentary Under Secretary for India. Just think of his delicious description of the working of that *Sanctum Sanctorum*, that holy of holies of retired Anglo-Indians—the India Office—as ‘an apotheosis of circumlocution and red tape beyond the dreams of any ordinary citizen.’ Similarly he declared the Government of India as ‘too wooden, too iron, too inelastic, too antediluvian’ and added that he did not believe ‘that any body could ever support the Government of India from the point of view of modern requirements,’ since it ‘was an indefensible system of Government.’ It is this refreshing candour—the Indian bureaucrat will perhaps characterise it as brutal—which leads me to hope that the scheme which Mr. Montagu will evolve may satisfy our aspirations for the present. He knows that that feeler thrown out by his assistant—Lord Islington—in his address at Oxford has already been condemned, as the proposals, outlined in it are singularly inept, inane and jejune. Nor can we in the light of the revelations made by the Hon. Mr. Srinivasa Shastry as to the circumstances under which our late lamented leader Mr. Gokhale prepared his

scheme which has been recently published accept as suited to our present requirements the proposals outlined therein. But shortly Mr. Gokhale's suggestions constitute a pre-war document and the last three years have brought about such a tremendous moral and intellectual revolution that what might have suited us then cannot do so now. Thus we are driven to fall back upon our own scheme—that jointly evolved by the National Congress and the Muslim League. That scheme, therefore, represents for us, at present, our irreducible minimum of claims and while we shall be grateful to Mr. Montagu were he to give us more it is quite certain that we cannot be and shall not be content with anything less than what is set out in our scheme. That is our plain and emphatic demand.

OUR FUTURE DESTINY

Whether we shall get at present all what we want is not known to us, since the future is on the knees of the gods. But about one thing we should be under no delusion and that is that whether we get it now or later, to-day or to-morrow, we *shall* come into our birth right and nothing—nay, no power on earth—can keep us out of our inheritance, if only we ourselves are not slack in pressing our demands earnestly, forcefully and constitutionally on the attention of the great British democracy who are the real sovereign power in the State. For though the King-in-Parliament is the supreme power in the British State from the legal point of view, it is the democracy of Great Britain that

is for all political purposes the master of even the Parliament. What is therefore, essential to our success is an agitation on a gigantic scale to convince the British democracy of the justice of our claims to self-government and the moment their leaders are satisfied of it they will unhesitatingly bring to bear upon the House of Commons the force at their disposal. Already our hands have been materially strengthened in pressing our claims by the recommendation made in the Minority Report of the Mesopotamian Commission by Commander J. C. Wedgwood M. P., who concludes it as follows:—"My last recommendation is that we should no longer deny to Indians the full privilege of citizenship but should allow them a large share in the government of their own country and in the control of that bureaucracy which in this war uncontrolled by public opinion, has failed to rise to British standards." It now remains for us to follow up this advantage by a sustained, persistent and vigorous constitutional agitation both in Britain and in this country and we should not be satisfied till we have eventually succeeded in storming the bureaucratic citadels at Whitehall, Simla and Delhi and installing in their places free, popular government in the memorable words of President Lincoln as 'Government of the people, for the people, by the people.' Then and then only shall the genius of our Motherland which did so much for human culture and civilization in the days of yore, shall again find full play for the true service of humanity. You might have read the testi-

mony recently borne by the well-known writer, Mr. H. C. Wells, to the Indian mind, which he described as possessed 'of singular richness and singular delicacy with a wonderful gentleness—a mind that in spite of all, that it has done in the past is still destined to make its chief contribution to the human synthesis in the years that lie ahead.' We Indians fully share this view and hope but we are equally satisfied that if the approach of that day is to be hastened it will be by the early establishment of Home Rule in this land—since of the many evils of a foreign bureaucracy perhaps the greatest is its pernicious effect in stunting the development of the mind of the people it rules over, and in perverting their moral nature. But we fully believe that we are the heirs of a better and larger hope and shall yet rise in the scale of nations. It rests with us to hasten its realisation by our earnestness, patriotism, sincerity and above all by possessing an illimitable faith in the great destiny that awaits us in being constituted a self-governing member of the commonwealths composing the greatest federal Empire the world has yet known.—*Bande Mataram.*

SIR KRISHNA GUPTA

They were passing through very stirring times—very moving and distressing times. A small people, but proud and independent, had been wantonly attacked, trampled under foot, pillaged and ravaged by a remorseless enemy, and England, true to her traditions as the champion of liberty, and upholder of righteousness and justice, had rushed to her rescue, and with the help of noble Allies, was fighting for all that made for humanity. In that great world-wide conflict, England had been well supported by all parts of her Empire. Men from the distant marches—from the uttermost regions of the Seven Seas—had come forward to prove that Empire was a reality stronger than the ties of blood and kin, of race, of creed, and of colour. It had proved to be stronger than mere self-interest, stronger even than death itself. Truly, in the hour of trial the Empire had found itself. (Cheers). India, his own country, had not lagged behind. Side by side with their British comrades, Indian soldiers were fighting in every theatre of war. In Flanders they were by the side of the Canadians, in the Near East they were at the side of the Australians and the New Zealanders; in the Persian Gulf, in Mesopotamia, in East Africa, it was the Indian Army, both Indian and British, who were carrying on operations. Truly,

it might be said that India was bearing her part—her fair share in the fray. This was as it should be. India was the corner-stone of the Empire.

THE REAL EMPIRE

It was the possession of India that gave the British Crown the title and justification of calling the British Dominions an Empire. It was a curious fact that there was a disposition to draw a distinction between Empire and Empire. In the Press and in public and private conversations the talk was of the British Empire—Imperial, united. But the British people and the self-governing colonies did not recognise their ruler and sovereign as their Emperor; he was only their King, and it was solely in reference to India that they found the title employed. King George was Emperor of India, but only King of the United Kingdom and the Dominions. He did not profess to understand what was behind that. It might be that, although Empire was good enough, there was something uncanny about the word Emperor, and, judging from what was happening in other Empires, there might be some truth in that. (Laughter.)

THE SETTLEMENT AFTER THE WAR

The Colonies, as they knew, were very vigorous and pushful, and rather more vocal than themselves. They had already started the idea that, when the war was over, and a final settlement took place, they were to be directly consulted. They were quite right. But India

also ought to have direct representation. (Cheers.) The Colonial request had met with a favourable response in the highest quarters. But when the turn of India came, they were told that they were represented by the Secretary of State for India. If that were the case, were not the Dominions also represented by the Colonial Secretary, by their Agents-General, their High Commissioners? If India was not to be content with the Secretary of State, why should not the Colonies be equally content with their representation? But India very properly also claimed to be directly represented. The Secretary of State was a Cabinet Minister with the collective responsibilities attaching to that office. He was like a butterfly fluttering from flower to flower; he passed from office to office and he had no permanent connexion with India. Hence if the Colonies were to be directly represented on Imperial questions, India had a right to the same treatment. At the recent meeting at the Guildhall. Mr. Bonar Law had said:—

The dominions of the British Empire have not been created by the war but the conditions have been changed by the war. It is my hope, and if it is taken up in earnest while the metal is glowing red hot in the furnace of the war I believe it may be done, that as result we may see a Parliament of the British Empire in which every part of the Empire in proportion to its resources and numbers will share in the duty and honour of ruling the British Empire.

India wished for nothing more; if that were done, they would be satisfied.

A FUTURE OF SELF-GOVERNMENT

He would not be doing his duty did he not say a few words upon the great benefits which the British connexion had brought to India. But for that connexion, their condition would have been very much worse, and they therefore wished for the continuance of British rule. If India was at any time to be democratically governed, it must be under the guidance of Great Britain. To educated Indians, to all classes of thinking men, the British connexion was an absolute necessity for India. They were proud of the connexion. It was English education which had given them ideas of liberty. It was the English language in which the various peoples of India communicated with each other. Much of late had been said in deprecation of education, much suspicion had been attached to the educated Indian classes; they had been accused of disloyalty. But this great war had shown that the educated classes were loyal to the backbone—(cheers)—and to their credit must be placed the present peaceful state of the country. (Loud cheers.) He hoped that under the British connexion, under the guidance of England, the land of liberty, his country and their country would be raised from its present state of degradation, and become one of the great units of the Empire. When England had trained the people of India in the art of self-government, when she received complete autonomy, when they had the various Provinces as separate States, controlled by a Central or Federal Government, presided over by a representative of the

British Crown, preferably one of the reigning family, then, and then only, would England have discharged the great task imposed on her by Providence. She would reap her reward in the consolidation of the Empire, the stability of which would never be shaken, and in the everlasting affection and contentment of a people amongst whose faults certainly ingratitude is not one. That day, let us hope, would soon come. (Cheers).

SIR SATYENDRA PRASAD SINHA

The following are the extracts of an interview with the representative of the Christian Monitor, Calcutta :—

Asked whether it was probable that the Home Government had come to any decision as to the future of India after the war, Sir Satyendra expressed himself as doubtful. "I could wish that they had made up their minds about it," he remarked, "for I cannot help thinking that the longer they hesitate to declare themselves, the less likelihood is there that they will come to a bold and statesmanlike decision.

"India, of course, has got a great deal that she wanted. She is making steady progress socially and industrially, and she has the prospect, in the dim and distant future, of obtaining self-government. But that is not enough. India is painfully conscious of rigid limitations which come into play the moment she aspires to develop beyond a certain point. Indians have their own ideas of self-expression. Repress those ideas, and you dwarf us, even granting that you offer us more perfect ideas of your own. In the matter of government, for example, it is, from our point of view, less important now that we should have a perfect government than that we should govern ourselves."

HOW TO PROCEED

When we speak of self-government, not one of us ever contemplates any separation between Great Britain and India. We gladly recognise that the ties between the two countries are too strong to break, and, if they were not, we would not have them broken. Let the British Government retain the amplest powers of veto over all our affairs. But, subject to that veto, let us have now an instalment of self-government on colonial lines, and let the basis of these concessions be broadened as rapidly as we fit ourselves for their extension. Of course, we shall make mistakes—there will be many and big mistakes. Atrocities even may occur—never mind, even they will not prove that you have been wrong to trust us. Only be bold, and the outcome will be not merely a contented and prosperous India, but an India which will be ten times as strong a British asset as she is to-day.

“I am no sentimentalist. I do not rest these proposals merely on grounds of abstract justice to India, but also upon considerations of the highest expediency to Great Britain. It is to Britain's interest that India should be happy, prosperous, and self-governed. Such an India will be a source of strength to the Empire in every way. India only asks to be trusted. Surely she has earned a right to that.”

“We are sometimes told that, because it took you centuries of struggle and development to work out your political freedom, therefore we must be content to progress at the same deliberate pace. Are we, then, to

derive no benefit from your experience? Surely you were working out the problem of free institutions for all mankind. Railways were started in England less than a century ago, but you have not insisted on making us wait for them as long as you had to wait. I know Englishmen are cautious by nature and temperament, but extreme caution is sometimes no less harmful than its opposite. And for this purpose—that is, cautioning, as it were, against extreme caution—I would like to read to you a passage from Ruskin." Here Sir Satyendra took up a little book which lay on the table and read as follows: "All measures of reformation are effective in exact proportion to their timeliness. Partial decay may be cut away and cleansed, incipient error corrected; but there is a point at which corruption can no more be stayed, nor wandering recalled."

"GIVE REAL SELF-GOVERNMENT"

"What I am contending for," "is not merely a matter of better treatment for individuals. It is not enough to offer So-and-so a high position in your Government. You should give us real self-governing powers."

"Is it your opinion," he was asked, "that the Indians have made the best possible use of the limited powers of self-government which have already been conceded?"

"It is my opinion," he replied, "that, considering the very limited opportunities afforded to them of schooling themselves in the art and practice of self-

government, they have done extraordinarily well. If we are to wait for true self-government until we are perfect, we shall wait for ever. In the words of Dr. Johnson, 'Nothing will ever be attempted if all possible objections must be first overcome.' "

"What," next enquired the "Christian Science Monitor" representative, "would be the effect of a self-governing India upon the position of non-official European residents?"

"Please remember," answered Sir Satyendra, "that we always postulate the continuance of British rule. That is a guarantee that we shall always welcome the British merchant and rejoice in his prosperity. For a long time to come we must look up to the British as our guides and mentors. As I said in my presidential address to the National Congress at Bombay, no other race could or would have done the work of the English in India. Let England trust us, and she will never regret it."

THE HON. RAJAH OF MAHMUDABAD

The Hon'ble the Rajah of Mahmudabad, who was interviewed at Simla, by a press correspondent on the present political situation in India, said:—

We thank the Prime Minister for appointing Mr. Montagu as Secretary of State for India. We know that he is a friend of the people of India and he knows India from the inside. We welcome his pronouncement in the House of Commons, as this is the first time in the History of British India that it has been definitely laid down that the British policy is to raise India to the status of a self-governing partner of the Empire at an early date. I appreciate fully the importance of Mr. Montagu's decision to come to India and examine Indian problems on the spot. But we must prepare ourselves to do all we can to enable him to understand what exactly the real situation is, and I might as well say here as emphatically as I can that we intend to support, and support as firmly and unflinchingly as possible, the Congress League reform scheme. While on the visit of Mr. Montagu, I wish to take this opportunity to declare my rooted conviction that the projected visit might be more likely to produce the desired result if a general amnesty were declared, and political prisoners were released. One of the chief difficulties no doubt which any Indian reformer would

have to face and successfully overcome is the adjustment in as happy a manner as possible of the relations between the Ruling Chiefs and the British Indian Government. While not desirous of entering into the question fully, I would lay it down as a guiding principle that unless we of British India are allowed to have a voice in the affairs of the Native States, the Princes should not be given any hand in shaping our destinies at this critical juncture. I have great hopes in the statesmanship and liberal instincts of our present Viceroy.

Mr. MOHAMED ALI

SPEECH DELIVERED WHILE IN ENGLAND

Mr. Mohamed Ali, who was greeted with cheers, said that he and his colleague were very grateful for the kindness which had been extended to them during their visit. On a previous occasion when in England he learnt how much untruth was embodied in Kipling's lines, "East is East, and West is West and never the twain shall meet," and the impressions he then gained had been fully confirmed by his experience of the last few weeks. Speaking of his mission, he said that, though they had met with many disappointments, they did not despair. They had found a great deal of ignorance prevalent regarding India, but they had also realised that much of it had in recent years been dispelled, and he would suggest to those of his hearers who might be authors that, if they found they could not always get sufficient inspiration out of the threadbare themes of the West, there were vast worlds in the East from which they could gather fresh inspiration. There was a good deal of virgin soil which novelists could till but which journalists who were always in a hurry could only scratch. It was to the author he looked for the dissemination of information with regard to Eastern problems. It had always been a matter of wonder to him how

the forty-five millions of people who inhabited Great Britain could be so oblivious of the fact that they had a big moral trust in connexion with the hundreds of millions who inhabited their Eastern Empire. Western people had lately been telling them that practically a ban had been put on the larger part of creation a sinister ban of colour—a ban which was to make the Asiatic an inferior being—they seemed to forget that Jesus Christ was an Asiatic, and that they had got almost all their civilisation from the East. The people of India had had Western education and Western ideas forced upon them; as a result they had learned self-respect, they had come to realise the dignity of their race, and they had come to know, too, that they must live their own life and work out their own destiny. They did not believe that Providence would be so unjust as to place a ban upon the larger half of humanity. If they felt dissatisfied with the present condition of things, was it to be said that they were consequently disloyal? Had they wanted to light the fiery cross, they could have done it much better in their own country than by coming to England. Had they wanted to embarrass the Government, they would not have made their speeches on public platforms; they would have worked underground. He wished to utter one word of warning, and that was, if they did not take care of their large Empire in India, if they were not true to the great trust which Providence had placed in their hands, they would run serious risk of losing India. In his opinion, the British connexion was in.

dispensable for India's growth and progress. He was loyal to his Majesty, not because he was a British-born subject, but because he believed the British connexion meant the uplifting of his country, of his race, and of his religion. For these objects it was necessary that the British should be in India. He and his colleague came to this country to lay their case before the British public. In the first instance, it was their desire to see Ministers and to whisper into their ears the matters which it was sought to impress upon the Government. But they had not been able to see the Ministers they desired to meet. They would return and try again. When he was in Edinburgh the other day he was shown seven gates at Edinburgh Castle in close proximity to one another, which an enemy seeking entrance had to pass in turn. He could only say that if there were seventy gates preventing their access to British Ministers they intended to knock and knock again at each until they were opened. And although on this occasion they had not been able to reach the ear of Lord Crewe, they had, at any rate, succeeded in reaching the ears of those who ruled Lord Crewe, of those who were his masters, of those who had a vote to give. When they got back to their own country they would not wish to excite their fellow-countrymen by telling them how they had been compelled to return without seeing Ministers, but they would, at any rate, feel confident that, if Ministers would not see them, they would at any rate, have to hear them, both in this country and in India

KHAN BAHADUR SARFARAZ HUSSAIN KHAN

In the course of his speech as President of the Behar Provincial Conference, Khan Bahadur Sarfaraz Hussain Khan said:—

I have followed with advantage the excellent precedent of my predecessors in seeking the co-operation of men of light and leading in the province by requesting them to favour me with their views and sentiments, and I am extremely grateful to such of my friends as have thus assisted me with useful suggestions. I shall utilize them as well as I can and—without the least desire to minimise my own responsibility—I feel all the better fortified that I am supported by the views of united Behar in what I am going to say on some of the current questions agitating the public mind in the province.

“It is a grievance of a very long standing—this of the practical emasculation of the higher classes of our people. It is morally indefensible, politically inexpedient and is at the root of much legitimate discontent which a wise Government would do well to remove.”

The Secretary of State for India has announced in the House of Commons the decision of His Majesty's Government to remove the bar which has hitherto precluded the admission of Indians to the commissioned rank in his Majesty's Army and steps are accordingly

being taken respecting the grant of commissions to nine Indian Officers belonging to native Indian land forces who have served in the field in the present war and whom the Government of India recommended for this honour in recognition of their services. Their name will be notified in the London Gazette and in the same Gazette they will be posted to the Indian army. The Secretary of State and the Government of India are discussing the general conditions under which Indians should in future be eligible for commissions. In due course the Army Council will be consulted with a view to the introduction of a carefully considered scheme to provide for the selection of candidates and for training them in important duties which will devolve upon them.

For years I gave the best of what God has given me to loyal co-operation with those in whose hands Providence has placed our destinies, but I feel bound to confess that of late the conviction has been growing upon me more and more that while co-operation with the officials is good, self-dependence and self-reliance are even better and that while good Government, such as has been established in this country by our British fellow-subjects, is to be appreciated and supported, yet Self-Government for India within the Empire would be even immeasurably better and should, therefore, be sought after by every constitutional means at our disposal. It is in the fulness of this conviction that I stand before you to-day as an avowed Home Ruler so that the few years that may yet be vouchsafed to me