

set of children is born into a certain caste, who can have nothing to do with, and can never rise into another caste ; those things in your educational system have got to be considered and thought out. Each child must be taught by a co-religionist of its own caste in the language which it knows. The problem, therefore, before the Indian Government as regards education, which is, as every speaker has admitted, closely mixed up with this question of employment—the problem before them is, I say, a very great one.

“Now, sir, the very idea to day of education in India is hardly understood. You may travel for days—nay, for weeks—in India and never see a white man, and may never see a railway. To those people modern ideas have not permeated at all, and those who to-day hold the advanced views of educated men like my friend the last speaker can be counted in thousands among the millions of that great country. Consequently, Mr. President, education, modern ideas, modern developments, are only surface deep in India, and the Indian Government, however advanced it may be, has the immense problem before it of trying to create public opinion among those masses before it can advance. If you were to go to them to-day with a scheme of education of the very best kind, you could not get them to accept it because their intellectual outlook is entirely incapable of understanding what you are aiming at, and it would only be thought that you were making some attack on their religion, their caste, their tradition.

“Take, for instance, the question of mines, Mr. President. The coal mines of Bengal are, a large number of them, shallow. They are worked by families of workers who come from the country around—fathers, mothers, and children. They all come in a family party. You would think they would work underground by day. Not a bit of it. They all go down at night, because then it is cool to carry on their work ; and they go down—mother and father, women and children, daughters and babies in arms. Now, you cannot apply regulations about underground work offhand to a condition of mining such as that.

“Under those circumstances. Mr. President, the majority of the commission came to the conclusion that the best thing to do was to give the Indian Government an opportunity of putting forward their own ideas and their own scheme with regard to this question of lowering the age at which children may be employed. To lay down offhand a rule about 12 years of age would not be worth the paper it was written on.

“I suggest that the practical, the sensible way, to deal with

the matter is to ask the Indian Government to let a future Conference of this body have its views and have its plans and ideas. Therefore, Sir, we appended our names to the report which has been made to you, and, therefore, I suggest to this Conference that we cannot unravel the great problem. We cannot even indicate to Indian Government how to do it, but they, of their own accord, are engaged in investigation with regard to these questions. They know themselves how far they can go in the matter of obtaining, for instance, even fairly accurate statistics with regard to their own factories, the extent of which are still unknown to-day.

"In all those things the Indian Government is far better able to tell what they can do and what they cannot do, what they can try to do immediately and what they can try to do by degrees.

"Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I suggest to this Conference that the recommendation of the commission might be accepted in regard to India, believing as I do, in their desire to see that the children are not worked in factories and that the age is raised gradually in all countries, believing that that will be the best course to obtain the co-operation of the Indian Government and to obtain some real degree of advance and success,

The President Mr. Joshi of the Indian Delegation.

Mr Narayan Malhar Joshi (India): On behalf of the workers in India I rise to support the amendment put before this Conference by Miss Bondfield. I can assure the Conference that it is not a very pleasant task that I have undertaken, namely, that of criticising the attitude of the Government delegates in this Conference, especially of such an international character like this. But I have to do my duty toward those people for whom I stand in this Conference. Sir, Mr. Warrington Smyth, from Africa, has placed before you a picture of India from which you are likely to imagine that India is an uncivilised or, at the most a half-civilised country. But let me request this Conference to remember that India is being governed by the British Parliament and has been for over 100 years, and in some provinces for over 150 years. The British Parliament than which there is no more democratic institution in the world, is responsible for the Government of India. And can you believe, if you are told that under the Government, for over 100 years India could not have made any progress than that which has been pictured to you by Mr. Warrington Smyth.

"I am quite sure the representative of my Government, as well as the representatives of the British Government here, will not

accept the statement given to you here by Mr. Warrington Smyth in defence of the Government of India. Then, I wish also to bring to your notice another fact, namely, that factory legislation in India is not quite unknown. It does not stand on the same footing as China, Siam, or Persia. We had for many years factory legislation which is being improved from period to period. Therefore, when you consider the case of India, lay aside from your mind the impression that India, first, is a country which is depicted to you by Mr. Warrington Smyth and secondly, that factory legislation is new to that country. We have factory legislation and in short, I wish to describe to you what protection is afforded to children by that factory legislation. According to our factory act, children under 9 are not allowed to be employed, but children between 9 and 14 can be employed for six hours. My friend, Mr. Chatterjee, calls it a light work. Let me remind this Conference that it is going to pass a convention of eight hours a day for adults, and you are going to perhaps accept the statement that in India the climatic conditions are so different that children of 9 can work for six hours, and seven hours in some factories, and that can be considered light work.

"Now, to describe to you the present factory legislation, the protection afforded by the present factory legislation, I shall request you to consider what the amendment is. The amendment that the age should be raised from 9 to 12. We do not ask for the present to apply the whole convention to India. We suggest a very moderate application. We ask you to allow the workers of India to reach the final goal stage by stage, and we propose to you the first suggestion, namely, let us go from 9 years to 12 years

"Then we do not ask you, as you ask in the general convention, to apply this age limit to almost all industries. We ask you to fix this age limit only for those industries which are worked with factories and in which not less than 10 persons are employed. Then we also ask you to apply this age limit to certain well organised industries, such as railways, mines, and docks, where supervision by Government Inspectors is very easy.

"Now let us see what are the arguments offered before this Conference in opposition to the amendment of Miss Bondfield.

"The first and perhaps the most important is, that in India there is no education and the children will go on the streets if you do not allow them to be employed. I admit there is great force in this argument, but let me tell you again that the picture laid before you by Mr. Warrington Smyth is not true

in the least. Let me ask you, of this Conference, if there was education any wher in the world before it was first in India? Do not believe, therefore, for a moment that the people in India are against education. Therefore, the idea of education is not new to India. Indians were educated, Indians wrote books on most difficult subjects many thousand years, at least two or three thousand years, before perhaps any other people began to write books and think on these subjects.

"Therefore, the idea of education is not certainly so new to Indians as depicted to you by my friend, Mr. Warrington Smyth. Then he said it will take time to educate public opinion in India; otherwise the Government cannot introduce education. Let me again tell you that the Government of India is not very much influenced by public opinion in the country. It is to this present day an autocratic Government. If the Government means to-morrow to introduce certain legislation in the country, they can do it even if the whole public opinion of the country oppose it. Therefore the argument that the Government waits to educate public opinion holds no water at all. Let me again tell you that Indian public opinion as expressed by the educated Indians is not certainly against education. Let me tell you a fact: That a Bill for compulsory education in India was introduced in the Legislative Council of the country some 10 years ago, and the opposition did not come from the educated people of the country, but the opposition came from the Government itself. I therefore think that the argument that people must be educated before education is made compulsory need not carry any weight with you at all.

"Then Mr. Chatterjee also said that it is difficult to persuade people to accept education. Let me tell this Conference that in the same India of which this Conference has spoken there are some parts where compulsory education has been given for several years, and people in those Provinces have not rebelled against their Government—I give you that assurance. Therefore, we need not consider very much the objection that people in India will object to compulsory education being introduced.

"Sir, there is no doubt that you cannot educate a vast country like India within one year. I admit that. And therefore I ask you, what will happen within one year if we wait? What is the use of waiting for one year when we know full well that you cannot introduce a general system of compulsory education in a vast country like India? It will be of no use. If the Government of India could not educate the people during the past century or more, I am quite sure they will not be able to

introduce a general system of education within one year. Therefore, I think we shall not gain anything by giving them one year's time. If we think that children of 9 and 10 and 11 should not go to factories and work there for seven hours and six hours, let us raise the age limit.

"I can give you an additional reason. If we are anxious that Indian children should be educated, then I may tell you that if you once raise the age limit the opposition from at least one section of the opponents of education will melt away at once, and that is the opposition of the capitalists. If the age limit is raised, I am quite sure the opposition to compulsory education in India will melt away in a moment.

"I now leave the argument about education. I have one other argument. The second argument is that India has got different climatic conditions. I admit we have got more of the sun and some other climatic conditions. But are you willing to believe that in India children of 9 years of age are as well developed as children of 14 years of age in western countries? Do you think that climate can make that great difference, that children of 14 in Europe? I need not say anything about this argument. Only I put it to you whether that is possible. Mr. Chatterjee said that it is a question of procedure. The Government's argument is that they have no notice. All of you must have received a copy of this supplement report in which the views of the Government of India are given. That one fact will prove to you that the question was before the Government of India. They considered the question. They sent their reviews to this Conference, but when the question of raising the age is to be discussed here we are told that that report must be forgotten. We must close our eyes to that report. I hope this Conference will not accept that statement.

"I admit there was not a very long notice, but there was notice to the Government that the question of the employment of children was to be discussed by this Conference. This was known to the Government long ago, and if they were really serious about this question I am quite sure they would have come to certain conclusion. Decisions, even in India, even in a vast country like India, are taken by Governments on very vital matters at shorter notice than was given by this Conference.

"Then there is the argument that the draft convention was not before them, but let this conference remember that we are in considering the draft convention. The India Government knows that the draft convention which was to be sent to them or, which was sent after wards, was not to be applied to India. The Govern-

ment of India knew perfectly well that India's case will be considered specially.

"Perhaps some of you will know that the clause for the special countries was put in the treaty at the suggestion of the Indian representatives at the Peace Conference, and therefore the Government of India knew that the general convention will not be applied to India and India's case will be considered specially.

"Therefore, they certainly need not have waited for the general convention at all. Their duty was to consider what was best for India and to make those proposals before the Conference. I, therefore, hope that all of you will agree with me when I say that the argument that there was no notice really carries nothing in it. There was notice to the Government of India. They had considered the question. They had sent their views to you. They clearly said there that they are not prepared to do anything in the matter, and then you are asked again to wait. I do not know for that reason. My only guess is, if you will allow me to be a prophet for a while, that they wanted to get a postponement for one year, and if possible, to get further postponements.

Let me again repeat that the question of education is not going to be solved within one year. The Government of India knows that, but they wanted time. They still want time. Then there is another thing.

"We are asked to believe that the Government has not considered this question, because they had no notice. But the Government delegates are likely to accept certain definite proposals as regards the hours of work. Government had time to consider such an intricate question as the hours of work, but they had no notice to consider the simple question of the raise in the age of children's employment. And on top of this, we are assured—and I must accept the assurance—that no economic considerations weigh with Government, and may we hope even with the employers in considering the age limit of children in India.

"I therefore request this Conference not to wait for one year more. In the first place, we will not gain anything by waiting one year more, because the education question will not be solved in one year and, secondly, the question is not such a light one as many of you are likely to believe. If you can save the children of 9 and 10 and 11 in India from work for one year, it would be a great benefit to them; and I therefore strongly believe that you will give your serious consideration to this question and will not postpone this important matter for a year, because there will be no benefit by postponing it.

"I shall only speak one word more. We are told that if this

Conference makes a definite suggestion for raising the age limit for children to a definite period, the Government of India may not accept the proposal; but I submit to this Conference that Great Britain has played a very important part in bringing this international labour organisation into existence, and I am quite sure the Government of India, which is responsible to Great Britain, will not treat a convention passed by the Conference with lightheartedness. I am quite sure—and you will agree with me—that a convention of this Conference will carry great weight with the Indian Government; and as long as we are quite sure in our minds that our proposal is a very reasonable and a modest proposal we can also be sure that the Government of India will accept it.

Report of the Indian Home Rule League of America

(November 1919)

The average American has very queer notions about India. Those who know her geographical location (and there are a good number who do not) have visions of jungles, cobras, and half-naked aborigines about whom one Mr Kipling has written so many "delightful" tales. The average intelligent and progressive American has also, most likely, heard some missionaries talk of the Heathens, their idol-worship and their curious customs and manners. To these sources of knowledge about India may be added the American Cinema, with its presentations of weird and fantastic religious ceremonies, of native Princes who with villainous intent lure sweet American girls, and who are finally defeated by the heroic American youth. This vilification of the Indian character is constantly going on. Counteracting influence is of but recent date.

From what is heard in India about the Vedanta and the Theosophical Societies of America we are apt to exaggerate the magnitude of the interest taken in Indian problems by Americans. The Theosophists at the most number 10,000 ; and as for Vedantists, it may be an exaggeration to say that there are one thousand in the whole of the United States. Outside of these two groups, are some who take interest in the literature and religion of India, but their number would not run even to the million mark.

This interest, scanty as it is, we owe to three of our great men who visited the shores of America in the last twenty years—Vivekananda, the philosopher, Jagadish Chandra, the scientist, and Rabindranath, the poet. Of these, without question, Ta-

REPORT OF THE INDIAN

gore has made the greatest popular appeal. But the interest awakened by him and the other two scholars has not been of active help to India. People have learned of the wonderful philosophy and poetry of India, of the beautiful side of Indian life, but they are still ignorant of the dark side. In an editorial in "Young India," Lajpat Rai recounting the lack of real political publicity for matters Indian in the United States, observes.

"Except within the last five years, no Hindu has ever attempted to lay the true conditions of life in India before the outside world. Shortly before the war a group of Young Hindus started a kind of political propaganda among their countrymen on the Pacific coast of the United States. Their chief aim was to educate and organise their own people. They had neither time nor money to undertake general propaganda and they did not attempt it on any scale. Still they did now and then lift the screen and let the American world have a peep into real India."

The writer refers to the work of Lala Hardayal and his revolutionary co-workers who later on formed the *Gadr* Party. This was before Hardayal's transformation to moderation. (See his letter confessing conversion of faith in this volume.)

In 1916, by a fortunate accident—an act of Providence and the foreign authorities—Lala Lajpat Rai who was in Japan and planning to return to India thought it safer to return to the United States. His arrival marked the beginning of a systematic propaganda for India in the United States. The Lala, in spite of strict war regulations, immediately began to lecture, to write for the press, and to awaken public interest in India among his friends and acquaintances. A year after he had landed in the United States for the third time he organised the India Home Rule League of America.

History of the Indian Home Rule League of America.

On October 22, 1917, three Indians—Lala Lajpat Rai, Keshava Deva Shastri, and Narayan S. Hadiker, a young Hindu student, met in Chicago, formulated the scheme for establishing the Indian Home Rule League, and drew the first constitution which reads

"Whereas, the Indian Home Rule Movement is being pushed on vigorously in India and England with the help and co-operation of eminent Englishmen and English women, and

"Whereas a large number of Hindus in this country (U.S.A.) deeply sympathize with the movement and are anxious to further it as much as lies in their power, and

"Whereas the war utterances of President Wilson in favour of

HOME RULE LEAGUE OF AMERICA

the rights of nationalities to determine their own form of Government have made it clear that the people of this country sympathize with the efforts of subject and small nationalities to achieve autonomy—

"Therefore, it is desirable that an Indian Home Rule League be formed and established in this country to include all such Hindus and Americans as sympathize with the cause, and are prepared to give their moral and material support to it"

Its objects outlined

- (1) To support the Home Rule Movement in India.
- (2) To co-operate with Indian political organizations in India and in England.
- (3) To further friendly intercourse between India and America.

These objects were later revised and while the substance is the same a few explanatory words have been added which make the meaning and purpose clearer. The present objects, as given in the Constitution of the League, are .

1. To support the Home Rule movement in India by co-operating with such political organizations as the Home Rule League, the All-India Moslem League and the Indian National Congress, both of India and England.
2. To secure the power of self-determination for India through constitutional methods
3. To strengthen and support all democratic institutions that aim at making the world "safe for democracy"
4. To further all kinds of friendly intercourse, social, cultural, educational and commercial, between India and America,
5. To supply authentic information on the vital problems of modern India to the American people by the publication of a monthly magazine or by such other methods as are deemed proper by the Council of the League.

Ten weeks after the framing of the Constitution a report was presented by its officers of its progress. Though the workers refrained from active propaganda due to war conditions the results that they achieved might be said to be truly remarkable. Within this short period .

1. Headquarters for work were established
2. Sympathy and co-operation of many influential Americans was enlisted.
3. Two hundred members were enrolled, of which 34 were active, paying \$10 each, 32 were associates, paying \$3 each, and the rest were ordinary members paying one dollar each.

REPORT OF THE INDIAN

4. Two numbers of "Young India," the official monthly organ, were published and distributed.

5. A book-shop was formed which would be a source of income to the League.

6. Branches were established in Detroit, Chicago, Minneapolis and Berkeley, and

7. The League had a total income of about Rs 2,500 in memberships, subscriptions and donations. The total expenditure was Rs. 1,785.

Work done.

Lala Lajpat Rai was elected President and Treasurer of the League and Editor of "Young India", Dr. J. I. Sunderland, an American missionary, was elected Vice-President, Dr. K. D. Shastri, organizing Secretary and Dr. N. S. Hardiker, executive Secretary. All these officers, with the exception of Dr. Shastri, who recently returned to India, still remain in office. A council of seven was formed to advise in matters of important policies and principles.

Since this work had been launched in a war-year no active propaganda was undertaken. All that the League could do was to hold occasional lectures, continue publication of "Young India" and distribute circulars. Among other things, two resolutions were passed by the Council of the League which are worthy of note. The first resolution, sent to President Wilson and Mr. Lloyd George, declared that :

"The Council of the India Home Rule League of America places on record its entire and unqualified repudiation of any sympathy for Germany and her war aims, and its hearty endorsement of the war aims of the United States and the Allies, as expounded by President Wilson. It pledges its loyal support to the war efforts of the United States and the Allies. The Council hopes that in fulfilment of the war aims of the Allies, Great Britain will, after the war, concede Home Rule to India and confer to her the status of a self-governing Dominion similar to Canada, Australia and South Africa."

The other, which was read before the Theosophical Convention held at Krotana, California, in the last week of July 1918, by a representative of the League, read:

"The Council of the India Home Rule League sends its fraternal greetings, to the annual convention of the Theosophical Societies

HOME RULE LEAGUE OF AMERICA

of the United States of America, now being held at Krotoski, Los Angeles. It places on record its deep appreciation of the sympathy shown by the members of the said societies with the Home Rule for India movement, and expresses its grateful acknowledgment of the interest taken by them in making its objects known to the American public."

As soon as the war ceased and the armistice was signed, the India Home Rule League began active work. On the very day of the signing of the armistice the following telegram was sent to President Wilson:

"Members of the India Home Rule League of America beg to offer respectful congratulations to the Government of the United States on the magnificent victory which the United States and the Allies have won over the Teutonic Powers. They hope that this victory of democracy over autocracy will be followed by an immediate grant of autonomy to India and other countries under the rule of the Allies."

To the Secretary of States for India, at London, another was sent which read:

"India Home Rulers (of) America respectfully offer (their) sincere congratulations (to) Great Britain (and) hope that India's claim (to a) substantial step towards Home Rule (will) be favourably considered."

During the year ending October, 1919, the League accomplished the following work:

1. It has enlisted the sympathy of a large number of strong American organisations and of prominent American citizens. The League can claim the friendship of many senators, editors, and men active in public work. Among these may be mentioned: Senators William E. Borah, William M. Calder, A. B. Cummins, A. B. Fall, Joseph I. France, A. J. Gronna, W. S. Kenyon, P. S. Knox, R. M. La Follette, W. McCormick, G. H. Moses, G. W. Norris, J. A. Reed, L. V. Sherman, S. P. Spencer, and others; Oswald G. Villard, Editor of the New York "Nation," Norman Thomas, Editor "The World To-morrow," Robert M. Buck, Editor, "The new Majority," Charles W. Ervin, Editor, "The New York Call", among editors; Frank P. Walsh of the Irish Commission, Julia Lathrop, of the Children's Bureau, Department of Labour, Louis F. Post, Assistant Secretary of Labour, Owen R. Lovejoy, General Secretary, Child Welfare Association, Frederick Howe, former Port Commissioner of New York, Jacob H. Schiff, multi-millionaire, and a host of other prominent men in the United States. Their names add strength to any organisation and the

REPORT OF THE INDIAN

League is to be congratulated for securing the interest of so many of America's finest men and women.

In addition to its numerous sympathizers, the India Home Rule League succeeded in increasing its membership to over 1,000. Of these a great majority—about 80 per cent.—are Americans and the rest Indian students, and business and workmen resident in the United States.

II. It has extended its activities all over the United States through its branches in :

(1) Berkeley, California (2) Chicago, Illinois. (3) Cleveland, Ohio. (4) Columbus, Ohio. (5) Dearborn, Mich. (6) Detroit, Mich. (7) Indianapolis, Indiana (8) Kansas City Missouri. (9) Louisville, Kentucky. (10) Milwaukee, Wisconsin. (11) Minneapolis, Minnesota (12) Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. (13) Rochester, New York (14) Urbana, Illinois.

III. It has increased the sales of its book-shops, and has improved its publication 'Young India'. Nearly all the book-publishers in New York have given their co-operation in the execution of orders for books. Many sales are being made to leading American Universities and libraries of books recommended by the League. In the publication of "Young India," both the size and quality have been greatly improved upon. The value of the magazine as a truth disseminator has been enthusiastically attested to by many prominent Americans. Oswald Garrison Villard, editor of the New York "Nation," says :—

"I find 'Young India' indispensable in my work. We file it regularly and frequently refer to it. It seems to us a model of a magazine that is frankly propagandist."

Senator A. J. Gronna, writes to the League.—

"The world war has left us in a bewildering condition and we must face the situation calmly and with deliberation. but to one whose sympathy is extended to people in the ordinary walks of life, the question of "Young India is one which merits the consideration of all liberty-loving people. If the condition of your people could be generally known throughout the world undoubtedly there would be a sentiment in favour of liberal policies with reference to your people "

Senator Norris says:—

"The magazine throws great light into the dark places of civilization. You are doing a great work and I most earnestly hope that success may crown your efforts."

Many kind words have been said about "Young India," but the

HOME RULE LEAGUE OF AMERICA

British Government in India has thought it best to prohibit the entry of the magazine into India.

IV. The League has given national publicity to conditions in India through articles in hundreds of newspapers and magazines. Some of the periodicals in which they appeared are :

La Follette's Melting Pot, Justice, Gales's (Mexico), Milwaukee Leader, New Majority, The Nation, The New Republic, the World To-morrow, the Dial, the Literary Digest, the Messenger, the Forward, the Butte Bulletin, The New York Evening Post, the New York Call, the International Labor News Service, the Gaelic American, the Irish Press, the Irish World, the Irish Standard, etc

Many articles have also appeared in foreign-language papers—Spanish, German, Swedish, Jewish, Russian and Japanese.

Then the League has published many handbills for distribution in different public meetings that are held from time to time in New York, Chicago and the various cities in which it has branches. It has printed and circulated 30,000 circulars entitled "Getting Together of India," 5,000 copies of "India's Right to Home Rule," 5,000 copies of "India's Message to the working men of America," 3,000 copies of "India's demand for Justice," 5,000 copies of "A letter to the Theosophists from Mr. A. P. Warrington," 1,000 copies of "A letter to Unitarians from Dr. J. T. Sunderland," and a thousand copies each of the circulars entitled, "India's View of Democracy," "Coercion in India" and "Rebellion in India," "British Raj in India," by Mr. H. M. Hyndman ; 5,000 copies of "Self-determination for India" by Mr. Tilak and "Fight for Crumbs" by Lajpat Rai.

Information Bureau.

V. It has established an India information bureau and has co-operated, with the recently formed organization of Hindu laborers in America, the "India Labour Union of America."

The information bureau has for its objects :

1. To furnish reliable information of all kinds about India—political, educational, commercial, etc.

2. To serve as a publicity and advertising medium between India and the United States.

3. To supply teachers of Hindu language and topics in general

4. To supply lecturers on subjects relating to India and arrange lectures

5. To provide a reading room furnishing all Hindu newspapers and magazines, and a library of books on India.

REPORT OF THE INDIAN

To undertake Translation from and into Hindu languages.

7. To teach English to working-men of Hindu origin in America with a view to increase their efficiency and to make them better American citizens

During its year of existence the bureau has translated many letters for American business houses; has opened a class in English for Indian working-men, and a reading room for the public. It has on its shelves about 25 Indian newspapers and magazines of India, and has started a news bulletin service to American papers, as well as one to Indian papers. It has served as a centre for all information about trade, education and industry in India

In New York and vicinity there are over a hundred Indian laborers. Many of these have been organized, through the efforts of representatives of the League, into a Labour Union. The Union holds regular weekly meetings, distributes its literature at all public gatherings, and helps to distribute circulars and pamphlets for the India Home Rule League. Recently 50,000 circulars entitled "India—a Graveyard," and giving facts and figures about Indian economics and politics, were printed, and most of them have been distributed. Several weeks ago the Union sent a Hindu Lady, Mrs. Parvatibai Athavale to Washington to represent Indian working women at the "International Congress of Working Women." Mrs. Athavale originally came to this country to collect funds for Professor Kaive's Hindu Women's University near Poona. Her attendance at the international Congress gave her an opportunity of putting before the Assembly the following proposals.

1. That this International Congress of Working Women call upon the Government of India,

(a) To make extended provision for the general and industrial education of Indian women

(b) To take steps for better housing of Indian women and provide them relief at public expense, in their period of confinement.

2. That it institute a number of scholarships by which women pioneers may be enabled to come to this country (U.S.A.) for training, education and organization

3. That it protest against the shameful treatment which the Indian women are subjected to in the British colonies where they are sent under the slave system of Indentured labor.

Dinner Meetings.

VI. The League organized four successful dinner-meetings

HOME RULE LEAGUE OF AMERICA

in New York, in which prominent men and women interested in India discussed the present situation in India to appreciative audiences.

The first dinner was held on October 15, 1918 in the Civic Club, and was presided over by Dr. J. T. Sunderland. The attendance was about 125. There were speeches by Mr. H. R. Mussey, Managing Editor of "The Nation," Mr. B. W. Huebsch, the publisher, Dr. K. D. Shastri and Lala Lajpat Rai.

The second dinner was held at the Grand Hotel on November 20, 1918 to celebrate the first anniversary of the India Home Rule League. A few extracts from the glowing account by a reporter will give an idea of what the occasion was like.

".....It was a Hindu Vegetarian dinner, in every respect a success and which testified to the growing popularity of the Cause of India among the advanced and liberal thinkers of the Metropolitan.

".....Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard of the New York *Nation*, who, Mr. Lajpat Rai declared, represented the very best of what was democratic in America, acted as toastmaster, and struck the keynote of the occasion when, in introducing the first speaker, he said that 'this was a loyal gathering held to uphold one of the principles laid down by the President of the United States, viz, the principle of self-determination. And if a principle is a principle, it remained a principle for all occasions. If self-determination is applied and would include Philippines or Ireland or any other country claiming it justly, it should also be made to apply to India.'"

The other speakers of the evening were Rev. John Haynes Holmes, Miss Henrietta Rodman, a pioneer in many civic movements, the Rev. Dr. J. T. Sunderland and lastly Mr. Lajpat Rai, who was introduced as a "prophet who will one day be honored all over the world." The reporter writes of this last speech as being "Sometimes sweet in its sympathetic simplicity, pulsating as it was with passionate love for his people, and then again it was a scathing indictment, accentuated by a keen ironical wit, such as few orators of the present time possess."

The third Home Rule Dinner was held at the Central Opera House, New York, on January 31, 1919. Honorable Miss Jeannette Rankin of the House of Representatives came over from Washington to preside at the function and made an excellent speech. The other speakers were Rev. Richard Roberts, an English minister in charge of a church in Brooklyn; Mr. A. P.

REPORT OF THE INDIAN

Warrington of the Theosophical Society, Miss Henrietta Roban, and Mr. Lajput Rai

Rev. Roberts expressed full sympathy with the objects of the Home Rule League and Mr Warrington made a fine speech in which he gave the story of Mrs. Annie Besant's life-work in India, why she has taken the cause of Home Rule for India and what she is doing for it. Mr. Warrington made a forceful appeal to the Americans to support the cause of Home Rule for India, for India was the spiritual teacher of the world and without political freedom she could not make her full contribution to the progress of humanity

The fourth dinner was held at Hotel Aberdeen on October 12, 1919, under the chairmanship of Mr. B W. Huebsch. The dining hall, which accommodates about 300, was packed with people. Lajpat Rai told in detail of the recent Punjab tragedy and read some of Pandit Malaviya's yet unanswered questions to the Government. He gave a summary of the political progress of India during 1919, the Satyagraha movement, the efforts of the Indian leaders in England and the awakening of a feeling of bitter resentment against the recent acts of the Government. The other speakers of the evening were Mr. Gregory Zilboorg, Secretary of Labour in the Kerensky Government, Russia, Mr. Francis Hackett, Literary Editor of the New Republic, Sen Katayama, the well-known Japanese Socialist, and Mr. Charles N. Wheeler of the Irish National Bureau. Then there was Spanish music and Japanese dancing—all making it a truly international affair. Contributions amounting to Rs. 750 were made to help in the work of the League.

Lecturers.

VII It has held numerous lectures in various cities and has sent its speakers to present the case of India before various audiences. Early in 1919 a lecture tour was begun by a speaker of the India Home Rule League, who in the course of his trip, addressed thousands of people all over the East and the Middle West. Ten States were visited. Many organizations pledged their support to the work of the League and passed resolutions demanding self-determination for India. India's case was presented before Delegates of the Illinois State-labour Party Convention by Dr. N. S. Hardiker and a resolution demanding self-determination for Ireland and India was adopted. Much work was done at Washington, D. C. and many senators were addressed at private gatherings and in meetings.

HOME RULE LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Writing on the results of the India Home Rule League's work, a friend in Washington said :

"Of course there is just as much misinformation about India down here as there is anywhere else, but, so far as my observation goes, Dr. Hardiker got everywhere a courteous reception, a chance to tell his story, and usually some comment at the end which showed that he had at least made an impression. When the India Home Rule League decides to open a real campaign down here on the Indian question, there are a number of men in both House who can, and will, talk intelligently on the subject."

India was also given a prominent place in the Programme of the Irish Societies in the United States. Regular speakers are furnished by the League, and many calls have come from all over the country for speakers who will tell the tragic story of India and its relation to Irish History

VIII. Last, but not least, it has awakened interest in India among the Senators and Congressmen of the United States Government. Frequent mention has been made of the case of India by Senators McCormick, Gronna and France, in their speeches in the recent debate on the League of Nations in the Congress.

Through the kind efforts of several of our sympathizers in the United States Senate, a hearing was recently granted the India Home Rule League before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Mr. Dudley Field Malone, a well-known barrister, was secured to represent India's case, and made a very excellent speech. (See p. 14). The most impressive reference to British rule in India was made by Senator Joseph I. France on October 8th and 9th, 1919. Much of the material embodied in his speech was supplied to the Senator by the India Home Rule League.

The plans, principles, policies, propaganda—all the various phases of the life of the India Home Rule League of America centred around the personality of Lala Lajpat Rai. He edits "Young India," presides over the Council meetings and guides and instructs his loyal followers in the carrying out of the numerous activities of the League. He is the responsible person who must shoulder all blame and must meet all difficulties connected with the work for India.

During the two years of its existence the League has had to face many unusual, delicate and difficult situations. While a great majority of its members are naturally the most interested, the most active and the most helpful, the sympathy of most Americans is spasmodic and momentary and to keep it alive and

REPORT OF THE INDIAN

active, it has to be constantly goaded, whereas the Indian feel it in their cause and if they do not exert themselves for their own sake, who will? But the main difficulty with the Indian members is that they are very individualistic and very often rebel against the leadership even of men like the Lalaji. With the enthusiasm and impatience of youth and influenced to a certain extent by the atmosphere of freedom of the United States, they want India to progress politically by leaps and bounds. They begin to complain bitterly when Lalaji counsels progressive steps in the realization of our political goal, when he urges them to undertake only what is practicable in order to be of most effective use to their motherland and not to be led by mere theories. He wants them to live for India and not act rashly and die a martyr's death in the Andamans. Of what avail are bombs and revolution by armed force when the prime necessities for the masses in India are education, internal social reform and food and clothing. Education and reform are not brought by revolutions. They are everywhere always matters of more or less slow progress. Many of our young men in America have found the fiery enticing catchwords of the revolutionists pleasing, and to teach young India that patience, perseverance, industry and self-sacrifice only can bring us nearer the goal, has often proved to be a difficult task for Lalaji.

Financial Position.

During the first year the League was entirely supported by donations, membership dues and subscriptions to 'Young India' from Indians and Americans. The total amount thus realized was not very large, but it was sufficient to carry on a limited amount of activity, as much as was possible under war-time restrictions. The bulk of the receipts were from Indians who gave all they could from their earnings by hard work. One of these donors deserves special mention as an example of the unique sacrifice of an Indian student. Mr. D. C. V. Rao, who is at present one of the most active workers in the League, donated his entire earnings for the summer months of 1918, which amounted to 175 dols. There have been many donations bigger in amount but none equal to it in sacrifice.

Efforts to make the work of this organization known in India and to appeal for funds were futile, due to the strict censorship of mails, but somehow Mr. Tilak heard of the financial condition of the League and he sent 5,000 dols, through an American lady, who personally carried the draft when she returned to the United States from India. This amount and many voluntary

HOME RULE LEAGUE OF AMERICA

contributions, subscriptions and donations made the existence of the League possible up to the present.

At the present moment the League has limited funds at its disposal. Its editorial staff works for nothing. Most of the other help is voluntary. The only paid officer is at present the Secretary, who is devoting all his time to the work of the League, and who receives a bare living wage—just enough to let him exist.

The forces against India's freedom are mighty and untiring. To combat them successfully, active educational propaganda should be carried on all over the world. The objects of the India Home Rule League are very definite. As Lala Lajpat Rai has explained them:—

"Our work is that of education and consolidation. We are more than ever convinced that our success will ultimately depend upon our consolidated and united action backed by the public opinion of Great Britain and the United States. The main field of our operations lies at home. It is there that we have to build, educate and consolidate. But that does not relieve us of the duty of doing the same kind of work abroad wherever our countrymen are to be found in numbers. We have the moral backing of the world opinion for our cause. We must work to secure that moral backing. The only possible way is to educate and enlighten the people of the world by disseminating knowledge of India and Indian conditions."

Speech of Senator Malone

**Before the Foreign Relations Committee of
the American Senate.**

August 29, 1919.

Mr. Malone. I come here, Sir, to-day not as counsel in any technical or legal sense to speak for the people of India. I come as an American citizen; I come, however, as their chosen representative, largely because it has been decreed, I understand, by this Committee that only American citizens are to come here as representatives.

The Chairman. That is in conformity with the Senate rules.

Mr. Malone. Otherwise, I should ask you to hear the most distinguished citizen of India in this country, Mr. Lajpat Rai, who is here to-day. So if my discussion of Indian affairs is inadequate, it is due to the fact that I have only the casual understanding that an American citizen could have of affairs in India.

However, I speak to-day for a people who represent one fifth of the population of the world, who are 350,000,000 in population, and who have a territory about two-thirds the size of the United States. And there is no question of political expediency or advantage to America, and at the present time surely no question of commercial advantage to America. So that the plea that I make is based upon the humanitarian purpose for which we are supposed to have gone into the war, and the humanitarian purpose which is alleged to be the purpose of the covenant of the League of Nations, and I do respectfully submit that if the covenant in its present form is passed it may break the hearts of the world. The hearts of 350,000,000 people in India and millions in Ireland and millions in Egypt will be broken if it is passed in its present form, and we come here with a specific request and that specific request is this: that this distinguished Committee so amend the League of Nations as to make it obligatory on every signatory to the covenant and to that treaty to provide democratic institutions for the people who live under the government of any

ON INDIAN HOME RULE

signatory. Ireland, Egypt, and India are very much in the same position with relation to Great Britain in these circumstances, and yet, though as a man of Irish origin I regret to say it, India has a strategic position superior to that of Ireland in this respect, that England asked—and the request was granted—that India should be permitted to sign the treaty, and England designated Mr. Montagu and an Indian citizen to act as signatories for India. Therefore India is one of the nations whose signature is on the treaty. Therefore, India is in a better position strategically than Ireland or Egypt, who do not appear on the treaty.

Now I have no illusion about England wishing to grant any democratic advantage to India in giving her this distinction. I am persuaded that England merely wanted to get one of her six votes down on a document, and India provided one of the six. I cannot speak for England for many reasons, but I believe that she wished to get the vote and she did not ask India to choose her representatives to sign the document. The Government of India is only the agent of the Government of England. In the Montagu-Chelmsford report, issued by the authority of the British Parliament in 1919, it is specifically admitted that the Government of India by England is an absolute despotism. The chief body which actually represents the people of India is the Indian National Congress which, of course, under the circumstances, is unofficial. It met, however, very completely and very fully but unofficially last December after England had appointed two representatives, and passed the following resolution (reading):—

"That this Congress urges that in justice to India it should be represented by an elected representative or representatives, to the same extent as the Self-governing Dominions at any conferences that may be held to deliberate or settle the terms of peace or reconstruction."

Pursuant to that resolution, the Congress appointed three men to represent the people of India at the Peace Conference. One of them applied for passports, and England refused the passport. Then this representative of the three delegates, appointed of the National Congress for India and the Indian people, wrote to the President of the Peace Conference, M. Clemenceau, which letter, it may be said in passing, received no reply. In that letter he had a paragraph that I think is cryptically significant of the whole situation. He says:—

"It is unnecessary for me to dwell upon the imperative importance of solving the Indian question for the purpose of insuring the future peace of the world and the progress of the people of India. India is self-contained, harbours no design upon the

integrity of other States, and has no ambition outside India. With her vast area, enormous resources, and prodigious population, she well aspires to be a leading Power in Asia, if not in the world. She could, therefore, easily be a powerful steward of the League of Nations in the East for maintaining the peace of the world and the stability of the Empire against all aggressors and disturbers of the peace whether in Asia or elsewhere."

And if there be anything to the suggestion of a "yellow peril" at any time, a happy, contented self-governing India, an India that has proved her worth to civilisation in the present war, would have a stabilising influence if she had her institutions self-chosen.

"But with India politically enchained, it is impossible for her to occupy her proper place among the nations of the world or to develop and realise her potentialities, so as to be able to render decisive assistance to the League of Nations in forcing the supreme object of its creation, viz., the peace of the world

Gentlemen, India will be either stable, contented, and happy and a bulwark against any possible yellow peril—if there be such a thing, which I doubt very gravely—she will either be that or else continue discontented, with growing poverty, with growing suffering. Six million Indians died in the last three months of 1918 from devitalisation and from Influenza because of the exploitation of India by England, not for India but for England, the drawing of resources out of India making it impossible for her to maintain an adequate food supply

We face the world to-day with two alternatives, either a stable, happy, nation, a bulwark against any menace, or a discontented India, the basis of future exploitation. And then there will be turned upon a region* God knows how many wars that she may have, because I remember in one of the liturgical hymns about India, there is a description of war, which, when translated literally, means a desire for cattle. The coinage of India at that early time was cattle, and the native population very literally in describing war gave the definition of war as a desire for cattle.

Now, if there should be a desire in the minds of the growing nations of the world to use India as a ground of exploitation, India discontented, unstable, unhappy, and unfree, will provide a fine field for future trouble.

Now, gentlemen, it has been said publicly and privately that the question of India is a domestic question for England to decide. No question, gentlemen, to my mind, of my nationality, of any

ON INDIAN HOME RULE

people, whether they be 1,000,000 or 350,000,000 and be domestic question, if the whole world is called upon to decide or less common council to decide upon it, and it has the machinery which will make the liberty of mankind not a domestic but an international question.

But in the second place, specifically the case of India cannot be a domestic question since England has made India a signatory to the treaty. Therefore, the Government must consider their situation. Now, either she is to be an honest-to-God signatory to the treaty or she is not. If she is, what is her position? Why gentlemen, her position is as good as my country under a mandatory. I do not know just exactly what a mandatory is, I have not been able to find out, but it is supposed to be some kind of a trusteeship, a guardianship, for other people until they are able to stand on their own feet and govern themselves. But if India is a territory—is to be looked upon as a territory, not a mandatory, because she can never speak under present conditions except through England—if she had a dispute with Canada she could not appear and appeal to the machinery of the League in its present form, because she could speak only through England. She is merged in England. She could not speak except through England. So if she had a dispute with Canada, England could if she wished have her appeal before the council under the present machinery, but India herself could not do it. So she is neither fish nor fowl in the present circumstances. She was signed to that treaty for English, not for Indian purposes.

But we wish to take advantage of the strategic position which England has given her to clam the rights of an honest-to-God nation that has signed the treaty, and it does seem no extraordinary thing in America after the war that we should ask that every nation signed to the treaty with the altruistic purposes which those nations claimed to have should free every people serving, living and trying to live under their own government.

I am not here in any anti-British spirit ; I surely am not. Mr. Chairman, I am not here making any argument against the English people. I am making arguments against the present Government of England over 350,000,000 people.

I should like to point out in conclusion what India did during the war. India gave 1,475,000 men to the war. She contributed dollars 1,000,000,000 in money, more than any other Dominion of England. Besides untold quantities of stores and provisions, she suffered war losses of 100,000 men. The vitality of the people

was so low, as I said, that during the last three months of 1918 she lost 6,000,000 people.

The average income of an Indian citizen is Dollars 10, and his taxes are 1·60. There is not much opportunity for accumulating wealth in India under these conditions, with an income of Dollars 10 and taxes of Dollars 1·60, virtually 20 per cent.

That the British Government is not prepared to apply the principle of self-determination to India is proved by recent events. The system which England has already spoken of as the system of democracy which she proposes for India is not even a fiscal autonomy for India. It is not even a provincial autonomy for India. And while the forms are highly altruistic, the substance is very practical and leaves India just exactly where she is.

The people of India ask that having served in this war substantially, having suffered death on the battlefield and death at home, and having believed that the purpose of the Allies was democracy, we shall stand in the International Court of Equity all of us with clean hands and that we of America who meant what we said shall see that England stands also there with clean hands. And the specific request that we make of this honourable Committee is that there be such a change in the covenant as will make it specifically imperative on every signatory to the document that all people under each signatory shall be provided with democratic institutions.

I beg to read a resolution which Mr. Rai has handed me, and which I omitted, passed by the Indian National Congress in December last—

“In view of the pronouncement of President Wilson, Mr. Lloyd George and other British statesmen, that to ensure the future peace of the world the principle of self-determination is to be applied to all progressive nations be it resolved that this Congress claims the recognition of India by the British Parliament and by the Peace Conference as one of the progressive nations to whom the principle of self-determination should be applied.”

There can be no justification whatever for withholding the application of this principle to India. The plea of unfitness usually advanced by ignorant people or vested interests is untenable and untrue. The civilisation of India is admittedly much more ancient and venerable than that of Rome or Athens. British statesmen themselves have often declared that India was civilised centuries before the modern nations of Europe emerged from barbarism. Indian society has been held together for

thousands of years without foreign aid or intervention. Peace, order and good Government existed in India for hundreds of years and its annals compare favourably with any period of European history. Even democratic forms of Government flourished in various parts of India centuries before Alexander the great invaded Hindustan. All educated Indians passionately protested against the imputation of unfitness as a calumnious libel upon their capacity for self-government on democratic principles. I am thoroughly convinced that the pressing problems of the poverty of India, physical degeneration, industrial regeneration, economic development, technical and primary education and delicate questions of caste and custom can never be solved by men exclusively wedded to Western civilisation but can be successfully surmounted by Indians alone. I submit Europeans are disqualified for the task : Indians alone are fit for it.

Gentlemen, you know what is said : There are so many accusations that India is not fit for self-government. India is not, under those circumstances, fit for self-government such as the English or Western civilisation would impose upon her. But India is fit for self-government, for governing her own institutions, her own people speaking through England, if you will, an England which would recognise the culture, the conditions, and the diversity of institutions of India. The only barrier to self-determination, Mr. Chairman, in India is the continued rule such as India has been given. The fact that men speak different languages is no barrier to self-determination of India through self-chosen institutions. That does not prevent their coming together in a country, in a desire for political freedom. The wonderful work that has been done in the Philippine Islands in 20 years by the United States in preparing that people substantially for self government makes the present treatment of the people of India, with their thousands of years of culture and art and character, untenable.

And gentlemen, I submit that this is not a fiction—this argument. You deal with a concrete situation. You are now at a critical time, and may I say, Mr. Chairman, that I am at least one American who sees no reason whatsoever why a piece of machinery like the League of Nations, which it is hoped by its chief advocate will provide the machinery for the peace and the liberty and comfort of millions of mankind for centuries, should be rushed through without a complete discussion by the people of every nation ; surely not by this country, who asked to do our share toward the completion of that covenant without regard to any political consideration.

We should see that this document and every provision in it is thoroughly discussed, completely opposed and argued for. A year or two years spent on the discussion of a piece of machinery which is supposed to guide mankind for centuries would not be long, and we can pause and think it over and stop to consider the meaning of it. I have asked to-day merely the consideration of this Committee—and you have been very generous in your time, sir—to the one problem of India. Will there be an India content and free under democratic institutions, which shall be demanded and required by our nation, or will it be an India open for future exploitation, for wars, and, for graveyards for her sons?

I wish to leave briefs for all members of the Committee.

The Memorandum

The following is the Text of the Memorandum submitted by Mr. Malone, Senator, U S A., to the Foreign Relations Committee, U. S A., Senate, on behalf of India.

To

The Hon'ble Members of the
Foreign Relations Committee, U. S. Senate, America.

Sirs,—Under instructions from representative Hindu organisations in this country having a membership of Hindus and Americans, I have the honour to submit the following brief for the favourable consideration of your Hon. Committee in connection with the ratification of the Peace Treaty now pending before you.

India is a dependency of the British Empire. Its Government is by a statute of the British Parliament vested in the Secretary of State for India at Whitehall, London, as one of the many departments of the British administration. The civil and military Government of India is delegated to a Governor General in Council, appointed and nominated by the said Secretary of State without any reference to the people of India. The Secretary of State is the final authority in all matters, executive, administrative, and legislative, and even judicial, in so far as he or the Governor General of India under him appoints all the presiding officers of the courts of justice in India. The Legislative function of the Government of India is vested in a Legislative Council of sixty members, the majority of whom are servants of the Crown, appointed by the Secretary of State or the Government of India. Thus no legislation can be introduced or finally carried in that assembly which is not approved or accepted by the Secretary of State. The Government of India is only the agent of the Home Government. That the Government of India is an "absolute" despotism has been admitted in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report issued by the authority of the British Parliament in 1918 (see Articles 7 and 34).

By virtue of her services during the War the Peace Conference at Paris accepted India as a "belligerent power with

particular interest entitled to be separately represented by "two delegates in addition to the representation of the British Government by the Panel system." But the Government of India does not represent the people of that country, not being elected by them nor being appointed by their consent, owing no responsibility to them. India was at the Peace Conference represented by two nominees of the British Government. Thus India's representation at the Peace Conference was not a representation of the Indian Nation through properly elected ministers or representatives. Consequently the Indian National Congress, the unofficial Parliament of India, in its session held at Delhi in December last, passed the following resolution :

"That this Congress urges that in justice to India it should be represented by an elected representative or representatives to the same extent as the self-Governing Dominions, at any Conferences that may be held to deliberate or settle the terms of peace or reconstruction. In view of the shortness of time and in anticipation of the request being acceded to by His Majesty's Government this Congress elects as its representatives Lok Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Mr. M. K. Gandhi, and Mr. Sayed Hasan Imam."

In pursuance of this resolution Mr. Bal Gangadhar Tilak, one of the representatives appointed by the said Congress, applied for permission to attend the Peace Conference. But he was refused passports. Consequently under rule 11 of the regulations promulgated by the Peace Conference he submitted a written representation to the President of the Peace Conference to be laid before the Conference for favourable consideration. Paragraphs 3, 4 and 10 of the said representation run as below.

It is necessary for me to dwell upon the imperative importance of solving the Indian question for the purpose of ensuring the Peace of the World and the progress of the People of India. India is self-contained, harbours no design upon the integrity of other States, and has no ambition outside India. With her vast area, enormous resources and prodigious population she may well aspire to be a leading Power in Asia if not in the World. She could therefore easily be a powerful steward of the League of Nations in the East for maintaining the peace of the world and the stability of the British Empire against all aggressors and disturbers of the peace whether in Asia or elsewhere. But with India politically enchained it is impossible for her to occupy her proper place among the Nations of the world, or to develop and realise her potentialities, so as to be able to render decisive as-

sistance to the League of Nations in enforcing the supreme object of its creation, viz the Peace of the World. Apart from this consideration India herself may become an apple of discord among the Great Powers of Europe, and there is every reason to anticipate that. In future, Europe will have keen competitors in Asia and in America, if not for the conquest of India, at least for the produce of India, occasioning jealousies and rivalries culminating in wars. This will happen so long as India has no power to determine her internal and commercial policy without interference from Whitehall—an interference which is viewed with suspicion in India, in Europe and in Asia. From the point of view of the peace of Asia, and from the point of view of the peace of the world, it is, therefore, absolutely necessary that India should be self-governed internally, and be made the bulwark of liberty in the East. There can be no doubt that such an objective is worthy of the highest and noblest statesmanship, accords with the principle of right and justice, and harmonises with the declared aspirations of the people of India.

Internally there can be no contentment or peace amongst a fifth of the population of the globe unless the people are free to carve out their own destiny.

After this world-wide War for liberation of mankind from the menacing domination of Germany, and the dawn of a New Order, it is superfluous for me to urge that no civilised nation should be governed by any other nation without its consent, upon theories of trusteeship propounded ostensibly for the benefit of the ward. India therefore demands as her birth-right the application of the principle of Self-Determination, or the purpose of empowering her people to tackle and solve the complex problems of India according to the genius of her people. The task is beyond the capacity of aliens. However talented and benevolent they may be, Governors, saturated with ideals of Western civilisation, without real and genuine sympathy with Indian civilisation, are unfit for, and should not undertake the guidance and destiny of the great Indian people. The Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League, two political institutions recognised throughout India as the most representative spokesmen of British India, have preferred this demand in the following resolution passed at Delhi in December last:—

"In view of the pronouncement of President Wilson, Mr. Lloyd George and other British statesmen that to ensure the future peace of the world the principle of Self-Determination be applied to all progressive nations, be it resolved that this Congress claims, the

recognition of India by the British Parliament and by the Peace Conference as one of the progressive Nations to whom the principle of Self-Determination should be applied."

There can be no justification whatever for withholding the application of this principle to India. The plea of unfitness, usually advanced by ignorant people or vested interests, is untenable and untrue. The civilisation of India is admittedly much more ancient and venerable than that of Rome or Athens. British statesmen themselves have often declared that India was civilised centuries before the modern nations of Europe emerged from barbarism. Indian society has been held together for thousands of years without foreign aid or intervention. Peace, order and good Government existed in India for hundreds of years, and its annals compare favourably with any period of European history. Even democratic forms of Government flourished in various parts of India centuries before Alexander the Great invaded Hindustan. All educated Indians passionately protest against the imputation of unfitness as a calumnious libel upon their capacity for Self-Government on democratic principles. I am thoroughly convinced that the pressing problems of the poverty of India, physical degeneration, industrial regeneration, economic development, technical and primary education, and delicate questions of caste and custom can never be solved by men exclusively wedded to Western civilisation, but can be successfully surmounted by Indians alone. I submit Europeans are disqualified for the task; Indians alone are fit for it.

India and the League of Nations.

The Covenant of the League of Nations has been signed for India by the Rt. Hon. Mr. Montagu and H. H. the Maharaja of Bikaner, neither of whom derived any authority from the people of India, who have never been consulted about the constitution of the League of Nations. Any decision therefore arrived at by the League of Nations will not be binding on the Indian Nation.

The people of India refuse to attach any weight to a League of Nations which does not provide for the application of the principle of Self-Determination to the nations that are held in subjection by the signatories of the Covenant. The Covenant of the League of Nations as at present settled makes no provision for requiring its signatories to apply that principle to their own dependencies. The British Government has refused to apply that principle to India, now or hereafter, by the announcement of their policy made on August 20, 1917. They still adhere to that policy. That announcement is directly opposed to the principal

object of the War, and to the main purpose of the League of Nations. The announcement runs as follows:

The policy of His Majesty's Government with which the Government of India are in complete accord, is that of the increasing association of Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of Responsible Government in India as an integral part of the British Empire. They have decided that substantial steps in this direction should be taken as soon as possible, and that it is of the highest importance as a preliminary to considering what these steps should be that there should be a free and informal exchange of opinion between those in authority at home and in India. His Majesty's Government have accordingly decided, with His Majesty's approval, that I should accept the Viceroy's invitation to proceed to India to discuss these matters with the Viceroy and the Government of India, to consider with the Viceroy the views of local Governments, and to receive him with the suggestions of representative bodies and others."

"I would add that progress in this policy can only be achieved by successive stages. The British Government and the Government of India on whom the responsibility lies for the welfare and advancement of the Indian people, must be judges of the time and measure of each advance, and they must be guided by the co-operation received from those upon whom new opportunities of service will thus be conferred and by the extent to which it is found that confidence can be reposed in their sense of responsibility."

"Ample opportunity will be afforded for public discussion of the proposals which will be submitted in due course to Parliament."

The Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League have protested against the language of this announcement in the face of which the inclusion of India as a member of the League of Nations can be of no benefit to her or the world. The Government of India has been so far administered in the interest of the British Empire to the neglect of purely Indian interests, and the Constitution of the League of Nations provides no guarantee that it would be otherwise in the future. Only recently J. Austin Chamberlain admitted that in the past she had been a drawer of water and a hewer of wood for the rest of the Empire. Consequently, it is respectfully urged for the consideration of your Hon. Committee that the Covenant of

the League of Nations be so amended as to make it obligatory upon all its signatories to immediately recognise the right of India and other dependencies of the British Empire like Ireland and Egypt to determine their own form of Government.

The Constitution of the League as settled in the Peace Treaty leaves several important matters vital to the peace of the world unprovided for. It makes no provision for the settlement of disputes between the people of India and the people of Great Britain. The Government of Great Britain and the Government of India being identical there can never logically be any dispute between India and Great Britain which could be referred to the League of Nations or to the International Court of Justice contemplated by the Covenant of the League of Nations. The people of India are no part of this League and the Government of India is only an agent of the Government of Great Britain. Thus India, although a member of the League of Nations, is practically in a worse position than the territories to be administered by the mandatory of the League. While the people of the latter can legitimately complain to the League of Nations for the redress of their wrongs, for the change of the mandatory, or for the recognition of their independence, India can never do so against any action of Great Britain in India or relating to India. Thus while theoretically India is politically independent in the meaning of article 10, virtually her position is worse than that of the countries to be administered by the mandatory.

What then, is the meaning of the expression "existing political independence" in Article 10 in relation to India? Suppose there is a dispute between India and Canada. How can that dispute be brought before the League of Nations, when both India and Canada are under Great Britain? India, being governed by Great Britain, can never place any of her disputes before the League of Nations independently of Great Britain. India's existing political status is nil. But her inclusion as an original member of the League of Nations entitles her to claim that the question of her political status is not a domestic question of Great Britain but one between her and Great Britain. India is thus entitled to point out to the other signatories of the League of Nations that she cannot perform her duties as a member of the League, nor accept any obligations, as such, without the League helping her to an independent political existence. Viewed in this light the question can very fitly be considered by your Committee. India, being

an original member of the League, cannot be considered to be a territory under the control of Great Britain, within the meaning of clause B. Art 23.

India made very substantial contribution to the success of the War. She sent 1,457,000 men, contributed about a billion dollars in money, besides untold quantities of stores, provisions and equipment, so far that she was bled white to her own loss. Even in normal conditions about a half of the Indian people (i.e. 150 million) are insufficiently fed, not getting "a full meal a day", vide Lord Sinha's statement made to the Overseas Press in 1918. But on account of the War drain their sufferings were terribly multiplied. The vitality of the people was so low that during the concluding months of the War she lost 6 millions from influenza alone, while her war casualties amounted to 100,000. Many Hindus enlisted in the U. S. Army and fought to free other nations in Europe. They respectfully urge upon your Hon. Committee that their own country be allowed the privilege of Self-Determination.

Considering the average annual income of an Indian (\$10) India is a very poor country. Her poverty has increased considerably by reason of her economic exploitation by the British Nation. She not only suffers from taxation without representation, but also from the burden of a huge military army which is being maintained mainly for Imperial purposes. In 1884 India's military expenditure was only 57 million dollars; in 1914-15 it was over 125 million dollars, 1918-19 it was 145 million dollars and for 1919-20 it has been fixed at 206 million dollars, which is 40 per cent of her total revenues, while the Government expenditure on education has never exceeded more than 20 million dollars. The industrial backwardness of India has been testified to in mournful language, both by the Montagu-Chelmsford report and the report of the Industrial Commission only recently issued.

That the British Government is not prepared to apply the principle of Self-Determination to India is also proved by recent events. Since the armistice fresh coercion laws have been enacted in spite of the unanimous protests of the Nation, and when the people organised a Nation-wide strike in connection therewith they were put down by the military using machine guns and throwing bombs from aeroplanes, resulting in the death of hundreds, and injury to a still larger number. Martial Law was proclaimed, which has sentenced, up to June 20, 73 persons to death, 147 to transportation for life and 204 to

rigorous imprisonment. Most of these are prominent men of the Punjab which province contributed the largest number of soldiers. A number of citizens were flogged in the streets. Many papers have been suppressed and the security deposits on many others have been forfeited.

America joined the War in order to destroy Imperialism and militarism, and to establish Democracy all over the world. The main object of the League of Nations is the same, because peace cannot be established without it. Under the circumstances the people of India respectfully point out that not only the present constitution of the League fails to secure that object, but on the other hand it practically guarantees the perpetuation of Imperialism and despotism which America's participation in the War was intended to destroy and the restoration of which the League of Nations is intended to prevent.

Dudley Field Malone

On Behalf of the People of India.

August 29, 1919.
New York City.

Mr. Tilak's Representation

TO THE

Peace Conference.

From,

BAL GANGADHAR TILAK,
ELECTED REPRESENTATIVE OF BRITISH INDIA,
10 Howley Place, Maida Vale, London, W. 2.

To.

MONSIEUR GEORGES CLEMENCEAU,
SENATOR, PRESIDENT OF THE PEACE CONFERENCE.
Paris.

LONDON, *March 11, 1919*

SIR,

Under the Rule XI of the regulations promulgated by the Peace Conference and by virtue of the resolutions of the Indian National Congress quoted below, I have the honour to request that you will be pleased to place this representation before the Conference for favourable consideration

2. I beg to assure you that all India has heard with unmixed gladness that "the Conference assembled to fix the conditions of Peace" includes India as a "belligerent Power with particular interest" entitled to be separately represented by two delegates in addition to "the representation of the British Empire by the panel system." But, unfortunately, under the existing autocratic system of Government, British India cannot be represented by a Minister responsible to the people. India may be politically divided into two parts: one composed of British India and the other of the Native States. His Highness the Maharaja of Bikanir has been selected and nominated by the Government of India to represent the Native States, and S. P. Sinha (now Lord Sinha of Raipur) has been selected and nominated by the Government of India to represent British India; but this has been done without consulting the people of India, or obtaining their approbation. On this point the consensus of Indian opinion was faithfully expressed by the President of the Indian National Congress held at Delhi in December last, when he declared that "it will remain a matter of regret that British India will not be represented at this great Conference by a person appointed by the Government on the recommendation of the elected representatives of the people."

[Here follows the Congress resolution.]

Upon the decision of the Peace Conference to concede separate representation to India, I addressed a letter to the Prime Minister of England, suggesting the formation of a panel of twelve persons elected by representative institutions in India to give effect to the decision of the Allied Powers and the wishes of the people of India. But the Secretary of State for India replied "that he is unable to support the request." In view of the great conflict of opinion between the Government and the people regarding the constitutional reforms proposed by Government and those demanded by the people, this refusal is very regrettable. Under the circumstances, I feel constrained to avail myself of the opportunity afforded by Rule XI to submit these observations for the consideration of the Conference. It is impossible to discuss the arguments in support of the people's demand in a brief letter; but I am ready and willing to appear before any person or committee to substantiate the reasonableness of the demands, or to furnish any information or explanation that may be required, provided passports are granted to me. As a matter of fact, I applied for a passport before the Indian National Congress resolution reached me, for the purpose of attending the proceedings of the Conference in the capacity of a Journalist: but the British Government decided against me, upon the gratuitous assumption that "my wish to secure admission to the Conference as a visitor and spectator cannot be attained."

Importance of Solution.

3. It is unnecessary for me to dwell upon the imperative importance of solving the Indian questions for the purpose of ensuring the future Peace of the World and the progress of the people of India. India is self-contained, harbours no design upon the integrity of other States, and has no ambition outside India. With her vast area, enormous resources, and prodigious population she may well aspire to be a leading Power in Asia if not in the World. She could therefore easily be a powerful steward of the League of Nations in the East for maintaining the peace of the world and the stability of the British Empire against all aggressors and disturbers of the peace whether in Asia or elsewhere. But with India politically enchained, it is impossible for her to occupy her proper place among the Nations of the world, or to develop and realise her potentialities, so as to be able to render decisive assistance to the League of Nations in enforcing the supreme object of its creation, *viz.*, the Peace of the World. Apart from this consideration, India herself may become an apple of discord among the Great Powers of Europe,

and there is every reason to anticipate that, in future, Europe will have keen competitors in Asia and in America, if not for the conquest of India, at least for the produce of India, occasioning jealousies and rivalries culminating in wars. This will happen so long as India has no power to determine her internal and commercial policy without that interference from Whitehall—an interference which is viewed with suspicion in India, in Europe and in Asia. From the point of view of the peace of Asia, and from the point of view of the peace of the world, it is, therefore, absolutely necessary that India should be self governed internally, and be made the bulwark of liberty in the East. There can be no doubt that such an objective is worthy of the highest and noblest statesmanship, accords with the principle of right and justice, and harmonises with the declared aspirations of the people of India.

4. Internally there can be no contentment or peace amongst a fifth of the population of the globe unless the people are free to carve out their own destiny in the same way as Canada, Australia and other British Dominions, while remaining a member of the family of free-nations in the British Commonwealth. Indeed, there can be no real progress without liberty. All capacity for initiative is paralysed. Self-confidence is undermined. In countless invisible ways subjection demoralises nations and retards both their moral and material progress.

After this world wide-war for liberation of mankind from the menacing domination of Germany, and the dawn of a New Order, it is superfluous for me to urge that no civilised nation should be governed by any other nation without its consent, upon theories of trusteeship propounded ostensibly for the benefit of the ward. India therefore demands as her birth-right the application of the principle of Self-Determination for the purpose of empowering her people to tackle and solve the complex problems of India according to the genius of her people. The task is beyond the capacity of aliens. However talented and benevolent they may be, Governors, saturated with ideals of Western civilisation, without real and genuine sympathy with Indian civilisation, are unfit for, and should not undertake, the guidance and destiny of the great Indian people. The Indian National Congress and the All-India Muslim League, two political institutions recognised throughout India as the most representative spokesmen of British India, have preferred this demand in the following resolution passed at Delhi in December last:

"In view of the pronouncement of President Wilson, Mr. Lloyd George and other British statesmen, that to ensure the

future peace of the world the principle of Self-Determination be applied to all progressive nations, be it resolved that this Congress claims the recognition of India by the British Parliament and by the Peace Conference as one of the progressive Nations to whom the principle of Self Determination should be applied."

5. There can be no justification whatever for withholding the application of this principle to India. The plea of unfitness, usually advanced by ignorant people or vested interests, is untenable and untrue. The civilisation of India is admittedly much more ancient and venerable than that of Rome or Athens. British statesmen themselves have often declared that India was civilised centuries before the modern nations of Europe emerged from barbarism. Indian society has been held together for thousands of years without foreign aid or intervention. Peace, order, and good government existed in India for hundreds of years, and its annals compare favourably with any period of European history. Even democratic form of Government flourished in various parts of India centuries before Alexander the Great invaded Hindustan. All educated Indians passionately protest against the imputation of unfitness as a calumnious libel upon their capacity for Self-Government on democratic principles. I am thoroughly convinced that the pressing problems of the poverty of India, physical degeneration, industrial regeneration, economic development, technical and primary education, and delicate questions of caste and custom, can never be solved by men exclusively wedded to Western civilisation, but can be successfully surmounted by Indians alone. I submit Europeans are disqualified for the task, Indians alone are fit for it. The fitness of Indians is asserted by the Indian National Congress, and is recognised by the British Labour Party

[Here are quoted the respective resolutions.]

6. It must be admitted that opinion is not unanimous in India regarding the whole of the reforms proposed. Unanimity in detail is unattainable in a population of 250 millions in British India. During the brief occupation of Belgium by the Germans a few were found even there who were not ashamed to proclaim that they were content with German Government. Conflict of views, therefore, is inevitable in India. Nevertheless such divergence of views as manifests itself is not due to any doubt of the capacity of Indians for full Self-Government, but rather to the various degrees of desire to proceed on the lines of least resistance, or anxiety to enlist official sympathy and disarm official antagonism, arising from the natural reluctance of the bureaucracy to part with power or facilitate the democratisation of the Government of

India. The capacity of Indians to adjust their differences is demonstrated by the Concordat between the Hindus and the Muhamadans announced in 1916 at Lucknow and alluded to in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report (Report, para, 27) Once the principle of Self-Determination is conceded, all conflict of opinion will vanish, and the people would formulate a scheme acceptable even to those who profess to differ at present. As matters stand, in spite of the official attitude, an overwhelming majority of the people are united in their demands—the dissentients being numerically negligible. They clamour for the principle of Self-Determination, and characterise the present proposal of Government as "disappointing and unsatisfactory," even as the first step towards the ultimate goal of representative and responsible Government.

7. I am loth to discuss the minima demands of the people and the maxima proposal of the Government. I feel, however, that a brief statement of the proposed official reforms and of the popular criticism and claims will reveal the fundamental defects of the proposals and the paramount necessity of Self Determination for an honest, true, and satisfactory solution of the great Indian problem.

Government of India

8. Under the various Acts of Parliament consolidated by the Government of India Act 1915 (5 & 6 Geo 5, ch 61) British India is governed in the name of His Majesty the King-Emperor of India by the Secretary of State for India as one of the many departments of British administration, with assistance of the Council of India. Subject to the control of the Secretary of State, the civil and Military Government of India is delegated to the Governor-General in council in India. The Government of India consists of an excessively centralised system of administration exercised over a territory as extensive as Europe minus Russia and over a population numbering 250 millions, consisting of about twelve co-related sub-nationalities of Aryan and Dravidian descent. The functions of Government are divided into executive, legislative, and judicial departments. But the Executive is not responsible to the Legislative. The Legislative has power to criticise the Budget, to interpellate, and to pass resolution which are not binding upon the Government. But it is in no sense the Grand Inquest of the Nation. Moreover the majority of the Legislative Councillors are officials. The Government of India is theoretically responsible to the Secretary of State, and he is responsible to the Parliament. But this independence and power are considerably fettered by the Council of India which has the Power of the Purse under Section 21 of the Government of India Act, 1916. It is difficult to comprehend how the principle of ministerial responsibility can be

enforced by parliament in the case of the Secretary of State, with the power of the purse consigned to the Council of India. The present Secretary of State has himself condemned the system in these terms : "The whole system of the India Office is designed to prevent control by the House of Commons for fear there might be too advanced a Secretary of State" (Hansard, Vol. 95, No. 93). The result is that we have an autocratic government over an immense area governing one-fifth of the human race under an exceedingly centralised system. The whole system has been denounced as inefficient and paralysing even by Provincial Governors, and by none more emphatically than by the present Secretary of State for India, who stigmatised it as "too wooden, too iron, too inelastic, too antediluvian to be of any use for the modern purposes we have in view. I do not believe that anybody could ever support the Government of India from the point of view of modern requirements." (Hansard, Vol. 95, No. 93) After this denunciation it is surprising and lamentable to find that in the proposed reforms he contemplates no modification in their responsible powers of Government of India and actually recommends some relaxation of the control by Parliament. The principles he lays down run as follow :—

"Provinces are the domain in which the earlier steps towards progressive realisation of Responsible Government should be taken" (Rep., para 189).

"The Government of India must remain wholly responsible to Parliament, and, saving such responsibility, its authority in essential matters must remain indisputable pending experience of the effect of the changes now to be introduced in the Provinces. In the meantime the Indian Legislative Council should be enlarged and made more representative and opportunities of influencing the Government increased" (Report, para, 190).

Some measure of decentralisation is proposed, and in the Provinces, under a system of "Diarchy," the partial control of the Executive is to be introduced and for this reason he declares that—

"In proportion as the foregoing changes take place, the control of Parliament and the Secretary of State over the Government of India and Provincial Governments must be relaxed." (Rep., para. 191.)

9. The net result of this change will unquestionably be to make the Government of India still more autocratic, for it is well known that officials have been impatient of the control of Parliament and of the Secretary of State and have been clamouring for emancipation from their control. But if the central Government remains autocratic and if the head is to be despotic it is hopeless

to expect the body to be democratic. Whatever changes may be introduced, the Provincial Governments can never be really and effectively liberalised and democratised while the Central Government remains bureaucratic and irresponsible. The people of India are entirely dissatisfied with these measures of reform and have demanded partial responsibility in the Central Government immediately and full responsibility within fifteen years.

[The resolution of the Congress and Muslim League on the Government of India is again quoted.]

They also demand the entire abolition of the Secretary of State's Council of India.

10. Passing from the Executive to the Legislative, it is proposed in the Government scheme that the present Indian Legislative Assembly be enlarged to 100 of which two-thirds are to be elected by the people. But the liberality of this alteration is nullified by the creation of a Second Chamber, denominated "the Council of State" consisting of fifty members, of whom twenty-nine are to be nominated by the Governor-General in Council. This looks like taking away with one hand what is given by the other. The creation of the Council of State as a Second Chamber is universally condemned.

The Government of the Provinces.

11. British India is divided into provinces for the purposes of administration. These provinces are the equivalent of the Constituent States of the United States of America, though they have not the same powers and independence. For all practical purposes there are nine provinces. The provinces of Bombay, Madras and Bengal are governed by a Governor and an Executive Council. The provinces of Behar and Orissa by a Lieutenant-Governor in Council, the provinces of Punjab and the United Provinces and Burma by a Lieutenant-Governor without an Executive Council, and the provinces of Assam and Central Provinces by a Chief Commissioner without an Executive Council. All the Provinces have Legislative Councils. In all these Legislatures the elected members are in a minority, except in Bengal where the elected number is twenty-eight, against nineteen officials and four nominees. Although these Legislatures have various powers of criticism and interpellation, and of passing resolution which do not bind the Executive, they have no control over the Executive which is in no way responsible to the members, nor have they any control over the provincial finance.

12. The report of the Secretary of State and Viceroy contemplates the grant of larger powers of administration, taxation, and raising of loans to the provinces and some measure of emancipa-

tion from the legislative, financial, and administrative control of the Government of India. It also contemplates the creation of an Executive Council for every province, but it proposes to establish a new system of Government in the provinces designated a "Diarchy." It consists of an arbitrary separation of the functions of Provincial Government into reserved and transferred subjects. The reserved subjects are to be retained in charge of the Executive members, who are not to be responsible to, or removal by a vote of the Legislature. The transferred subjects are to be at first limited in number and importance, and placed in charge of a minister responsible at first to his electors in the constituency, and after five years to the Legislative Assembly, provided the Government of India so directs. It is claimed that this amounts to establishing the beginning of responsible Government of India. It is so proposed that Royal Commissions be periodically appointed to examine every decade what further subjects may be transferred from the reserved to the transferred branches till complete devolution and responsibility is attained. It also reserves the power of retransferring subjects from the transferred to the reserve subjects for maladministration. In this way an executive is to be established which will be partly responsible and partly irresponsible, partly destructible and partly indestructible. The consensus of opinion, again, is that this Diarchy is unscientific, incomprehensible, and unworkable. It postulates the division of functions of Government, whereas experienced Anglo-Indians declare them indivisible under the existing system of Indian administration. It is difficult to imagine how harmonious working can be anticipated with conflicting political principles at work in one and the same Executive. It would be very easy to devise a system more workable and scientific than this new-fangled Diarchy, but whatever the merits or demerits of this Diarchy, the people resent the implication of their unfitness, on which the so-called progressive stages are founded. When this resentment manifested itself, a responsible statesman and one of the colleagues of the Secretary of State on his mission to India hastened to explain that these cautious steps were not due to any distrust of the capacity of Indians, but merely to deficient acquaintance with Parliamentary procedure. This is obviously a very inadequate reason. The people in Congress assembled demanded immediate and full provincial autonomy and ministerial responsibility without any reserved subjects and without any periodical inquisition and examination into their capacity.

13 So far as the Provincial Legislatures are concerned, Government propose to enlarge them and make them predominantly

elective but here also they contemplate the creation of a separate Grand Committee for legislating upon the reserved subjects. The Committee likewise takes away with one hand what it gives with the other. So far as Bengal is concerned it is actually repressive, for Bengal has at present a small elective majority for all subjects without any reservation whatever. The net result of the enlarged Provincial Council and Grand Committees is that there is little appreciable advance. The Grand Committee has been universally condemned throughout India.

14. I have dwelt upon the official and popular proposals not for comparing their merits, but for the purpose of pointing out that the Government do not realise that the most indispensable and fundamental reform is Liberty—Liberty for the people to work out their own salvation and fashion their own forms of government on assured democratic basis. The prolonged period of probation and decennial inquisition are intolerable in modern civilisation. What is wanted is power for the people in the Central Government. With this power the people would be in a position to decide under the principle of Self-Determination how many provinces there should be, what should be their boundaries, what measures would prove efficient and sufficient as the first step, what speed would be safe for advancing towards full autonomy and responsible Self-Government without foreign control in internal affairs and without periodical examinations into their capacity. In order to assure the British people that the Indians do not desire separation from or disruption of the Empire they would consent that questions of war or peace, foreign affairs, the Army or Navy and Military government be excluded from the Indian purview, provided commissions in the Army and Navy are open to all Indians upon equal terms with Englishmen. These are limitations the people of India are willing to submit to, for a brief period, in order to assure the British Government of their *bona fides*, in the hope that within fifteen years they would be placed on a status of political equality with the Oversea Dominions in all respects.

15. Under the circumstances, in discharge of the duty devolving upon me, as the elected representative of all the British India under the above resolution of the Congress, I earnestly appeal to the Peace Conference, *firstly* to concede to India the same right of representation on the League of Nations that is accorded to the British Dominions, and *secondly* to declare that Indians are quite capable of governing themselves, that as a progressive nation they are entitled to the application of the principle of Self-determination, and that in the exercise of the

principle they are also entitled to determine the form of Government, founded upon accepted democratic lines, which they deem most suitable for Self-development according to the genius of the people. The immortal principles of justice and the rule of right against might justify such a declaration. I beg to assure the Conference through you, Sir, as its President that such a declaration will not only excite the warmest enthusiasm and the deepest gratitude throughout India, with 315 millions of people, but that its enforcement by the British Parliament would ensure the peace of the world, the prosperity of India, and the continuance of a beneficial British connection with our own great Empire of Hindustan.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Yours most obedient servant.

B. G. TILAK.

Mr. Har Dayal

ON

India Under British Rule.

[The name of Mr. Har Dayal, the redoubtable Indian Revolutionary, requires no introduction. After a Brilliant career at Oxford where he was a Govt. of India Scholar, he sacrificed a promising future to become the leader of the revolutionary party in India. In 1914 the German Govt. invited his co-operation and for a year he resided at Berlin and helped that Govt. in planning for a rebellion in India. His experience of German methods, however, soon disillusioned him, and not long since his baptism of Prussianism came his conversion of faith in British Imperialism, after a period of the bitterest hatred of Britain. In the following article which appeared in the *New Statesman* (England) of 22nd March 1919 Mr Har Dayal declares his new faith and at the same time delivers himself on India and Indians in a brazen tone born of despair. It is a sign-post in Indian politics, and hence well worth close attention. It shows how the Indian Revolutionary in *extremes* turns round 180° in his mental horizon, and explains much of recent exhibitions of delicate swings in the political mentality of a class of people—*Ed. An. Reg.*]

I propose in this short article to offer some suggestions and reflections with regard to the future of the British Empire in Asia from the standpoint of a patriotic Indian, who has been during many years a convinced and consistent opponent of British Imperialism, but who has been led to modify his views on account of the tremendous events of the Great World-war. No thinking man can be the same after this war as he was before it.

I. I now believe that the consolidation of the British Empire in the East is necessary in the best interest of the people of India, Burma, Egypt, and Mesopotamia. These countries contain more than one-fifth of the population of the whole world. The progress and welfare of these ancient and gifted peoples must be an object of solicitude for all lovers of humanity. Our attitude towards the British Empire as a political institution, therefore, involves moral principles of the highest order. If the Empire is based on mere tyranny, exploitation, race hatred, brute force, and fraud, and if it cannot be mended in any

way, why then, we must end it and say, 'Down with this abomination of abominations !' I myself maintained this attitude for a long time. If, on the contrary, it can be shown that the Empire has grown up through historical necessity and that it does serve a useful purpose in the social evolution of the human race, we may decide to accept it as a fundamentally sound and beneficent institution, which should be improved and developed rather than undermined and destroyed.

II. On a superficial view, it appears that the British Empire in India is an altogether iniquitous institution, like the Ottoman and the Austrian Empires of infamous memory. The English have conquered many small States in Asia since that fateful battle of Plassey, and they have certainly been guilty of gross violations of plighted faith and wanton abuse of military power. Clive, Warren Hastings, Wellesley, and Dalhousie may be "national heroes," to-day, but they were surely no saints. And an Empire which has thus been reared by crushing and enslaving several "small nations", and some big ones too, cannot claim our homage and sympathy, for it is essentially an immoral institution. It must be abolished, dismembered, and forgotten. Certainly the principle of Nationality would lead us to condemn the British Empire of Asia as a reactionary and indefensible institution. If the Bengalis, the Marathas, the Burmese, and the other nations of Asia aspire to national independence and claim their birthright of nationhood, who shall say them nay? Surely not the champions of the freedom of Bohemia, Serbia, Belgium, Poland—and the Hedjas !

III. But we must discard all *a priori* doctrines and abstract theories and fix our attention on the stern facts of the political world situation, if we wish to formulate a sound and practicable programme for the intelligent patriots of India and Egypt. Nationality is nothing but a catchword if a National State cannot further the development of the mass of the people. The State is a means to an end, it has assumed many forms in the course of human history. The National State, or the tribal State, is, properly speaking, of modern growth. We need not idolise it as the highest product of human wisdom and experience. It has its advantages and its limitations. Life is not logic and the application of the so called "principles" of nationality cannot solve the problems that have to be faced in India and Egypt. As a weapon against alien tyranny the theory of the National State can serve a good purpose. But all political theories are only tools to work with. Let us not be the slaves of the theories. Let us study the facts themselves carefully and judiciously.

IV. The break-up of the British Empire in Asia would lead only to a change of masters of the people of India and Egypt. These peoples will not be able to defend their countries against other sturdy European nations that may harbour ambitious designs of world-empire. They will be too weak even to keep out the Asiatic barbarians that have overrun and devastated their fertile plains so often in the past. And the causes of this weakness are manifold. These nations are patriotic in their own way; but their patriotism is lukewarm and passive. They are not capable of sacrificing much for freedom; if they were keenly patriotic they could not have been conquered by England. Their ancient history is indeed noble and interesting, but it is rather mouldy with age and evidently lacks the inspiring power of recent achievement. The climate of India and Egypt is enervating, and disposes men's minds to repose and contemplation rather than to sustained activity. In the long run, the South cannot resist the North, just as the inhabitants of the plains must succumb to the hardy sons of the hills. History seems to prove that warm countries produce superior intelligence, while cold regions breed strong and courageous races. However that may be, it is certain that the Indians and Egyptians cannot prevail in battle against the Germans, Russians, the Kurds, the Afghans, and the Japanese, even if they are determined to fight for their countries with the courage of desperation. It was not Mahmood and Islam, not patriotism, nor military skill, but the climate of Afghanistan, that won the day at Somnath, the mountaineers could hold out longer. It is a question of greater resisting power. Thus it is foolish for Southern races to imagine that they can in the long run hold their own against the Northerners if it comes to a trial of strength between them.

Further, the upper and middle classes of these countries are absolutely incapable and degenerate. I weigh my words carefully when I pen this severe judgment. The aristocracy and the educated classes of India and Egypt are perhaps among the most contemptible specimens of humanity extant. Without courage, without patriotism, without religious faith, without political principles and ideals, without love of art and learning, without ambition and a sense of duty, these parasites and drones only exploit the peasants and working men and render no service in return. They eat, drink, beget, and pass their days in ignoble ease and aimless sloth while the society which they are supposed to lead perishes before their eyes. They cannot administer, or fight, or take the

initiative in progressive movements, or discharge any of the duties that devolve on the aristocracy of all civilised countries. Such hopeless degeneracy has seldom been witnessed in the history of nations. And if the shepherds are unfit, what must become of the sheep? The Indian and the Egyptian peoples, deserted and betrayed by an incompetent leading class, cannot organise an efficient system of defence against foreign enemies. And there is no prospect of the speedy regeneration of these classes. Moral stamina cannot be restored quickly. They seem, indeed, to be still more demoralised than before by the seductive influences of European life. They learn all the vices of Europe with remarkable rapidity, but they seem unable to imbibе its virtues. Many of them are thoroughly denationalised and lose even the faint spark of genuine patriotism that their fathers possessed. Stones may yield oil, but nothing good can be expected from this effete class. It is like the barren fig-tree, which must be consumed in the fire.

These reflections suggested themselves to me with greater force than ever before as I watched from Berlin the course of events in the Near East in the winter of 1915-16. Serbia was crushed and occupied about that time, and the famous "Balkanzug" began to run between Berlin and Constantinople. Huge placards, with the words "Hamburg-Bagdad," could be seen in the windows of the newspaper offices in Berlin. All this set me thinking. The Germans were supposed to be the allies of the Turks against the other European Powers, but now the Turks found that they had got taskmasters instead of friends. Germany poured men and material into Turkey. "Bagdad" was the goal of German ambition. All barriers that had stood between Teutonic Imperialism and the much-coveted treasures of old Asia had disappeared. A German Empire in Asia was well-nigh within the range of practical politics. That spectre frightened all thinking Orientals, who had hitherto looked upon Germany as their champion against British Imperialism. The cry "Berlin—Bagdad" was ominous in our ears. Turkey had really been conquered without a blow. The foolish Turks had themselves opened the doors to their masters. It was the story of the man, the hounds and the stag over again. I began to think about our beloved India and her north-western frontier. The Germans intrigued with the Afghans and other wild tribes in Persia and Turkestan. The menace of a German-Turkish-Pathan invasion could no longer be overlooked. And in that moment I saw clearly that India would simply be overwhelmed

by her old enemies and by new ones, if the German adventurers obtained a foothold east of Suez. Whatever may happen, no son of Ind will ever consent that foreign soldiers should be allowed to enter India again from the north-west, whether they come as friends or foes. It is the cardinal principle of all political parties in India that the north-western frontier must remain inviolate under all circumstances. No prospects of future gain can allure us to open that portal to strangers, whoever they may be. This is the lesson of Indian history, written by our fathers in their blood.

Imperialism is always an evil, but British and French Imperialism in its worst forms is a thousand times preferable to German or Japanese Imperialism. The English and the French are at least gentlemen in personal intercourse, and they have free institutions at home, which exercise a liberalising influence on their colonial policy in spite of themselves. The meanest English or French Jingo cannot abolish the *Magna Charta* or blot out the words, "*Liberte, Egalite, Fraternite*," but the Germans have no tradition of freedom. The Prussian rules over all the Germans, and the Prussian is perhaps the most detestable biped on earth. He is selfish, avaricious, heartless, arrogant, unscrupulous and servile. A slave and a bully, he is cruel to the weak and obsequious to the strong. He understands only the law of Force, and worships Power and Rank. He is an upstart, and has all the vices of the parvenu. He suffers from incurable megalomania to which political kleptomania and other serious disorders have been added during the last thirty years. He may be a patriot, a poet or a pedant, but he is never a gentleman. He wishes to exploit every one he meets, and his word cannot be trusted. All who know him despise and hate him. There is a good reason for this universal verdict against him. We should rejoice with exceeding joy that he has been humbled and thrown down from his high pedestal. I have lived in Prussia for two years during the war, and know what I am talking about.

The defence of India is thus a very grave problem. As of old, India is the cynosure of all ambitious Imperialists, from Berlin to Tokyo. Even a Turkish beggar once uttered this remarkable sentiment: "May our Sultan become Emperor of India!" Now I ask, "How can we obtain the generals and officers for our army of defence?" We have brave soldiers, though even our infantry may require a little stiffening with the stubborn British soldiery, but the upper and middle classes of India can never supply competent officers and generals for a national army. In war everything depends on leadership. The events of this world-

war have impressed me with the importance of having the best possible officers for the Indian army, no matter where they come from. A good officer is the product of a living social system. Tradition, education, religious faith, sense of duty, physical strength, heroism—all these go to make a European officer, but our bourgeois classes have none of these things. They may accept commissions and wear uniforms, but they will never lead a charge or gain a victory. Many of them will be wounded on the back, like the Ottoman officers in the Balkan wars. It is better that the Indian army should guard the frontiers under the command of British officers than that the Afghans, the Kurds and the Germans should pour into the country after having defeated a "national" army led by cowards and weaklings. India cannot afford the perilous luxury of an Indian bourgeois corps of officers. This is my deliberate opinion on this vital question.

And as the world is infested with Imperialists of every nationality, it is the part of wisdom for us not to tempt Fate, but to stay under the protection of the British fleet and army in our quiet, sunny home of Hindustan, and to make the best of our position in the Empire. We are not equipped for the deadly rivalries and fierce struggles of this age of iron Imperialism. Others will not leave us alone, if we once lose the shelter of the name and aegis of Great Britain. Exposed to the buffeting of chance and force, we shall have to suffer worse evils than those that now afflict us. Partition, forced conversion to other creeds and similar calamities have befallen weak peoples in Asia and Europe even in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Let us not jump out of the frying-pan of British Imperialism into the fire of—who knows what?

V. As regards the internal administration of India the question must be discussed from the standpoint of the peasants of India and not of the upper and middle classes. India is an agricultural country, and the cultivators of the soil form more than 85 per cent. of the population. They constitute the Nation. The princes, the landowners, the merchants, the lawyers, the money-lenders, and other classes, who live without doing much hard work, are only the froth and foam on the surface of Indian society, "mere chaff," in Carlyle's words, "which let the wind blow where it listeth." They are really quite a superfluous appendage to the real society of Indian workers, manual and intellectual, and, as I have already shown, they can discharge none of the public duties that the bourgeois classes of other countries conscientiously perform.

Now, it is a matter of indifference to the peasant whom he pays for the work of Government, so long as his own sons cannot govern. He must give a certain portion of his produce to support magistrates, constables, generals, and officers, who may be Indians or Englishmen or Chinese. He demands in return protection against marauders and invaders, through an efficient organisation of the police and the army, incorruptible judicial officers for the settlement of dispute, an active meteorological department for his assistance, and other such necessary institutions of a peaceful agricultural society. The money that he must spend on these indispensable adjuncts is loss to him. It makes no difference to him whether it is wasted by a Mr. Ramaswami in a Nautch party or invested by a Mr. Robertson in a dozen bottle of whisky. The chief point is that the police and the army should do their duty, as he has stipulated. Now we see that the British officials at least keep their part of this bargain; they do defend the frontiers and suppress thugs, cattle-stealers and other enemies of the cultivator. They have the requisite energy, sense of duty and physical courage. Of course, they charge a very heavy price for these services, but they are not mere drones and bloodsuckers like the Indian taluqdars, the banias, and the lawyers who simply take the peasant's money and do nothing for him. Why should the peasant continue to support this lazy and useless class? A common nationality cannot justify extortion and parasitism.

In short, we must organise the peasants for the promotion of their interest, and entrust the defence and administration of the country to those who are fit, irrespective of race or creed. The majority of the higher officials in the Police Department and all the officers and generals in the army should be Englishmen or Europeans. Other offices can be bestowed on members of the Indian bourgeoisies, but preference should be given to the educated sons of the peasantry, when such a class makes its appearance. India must be governed in the interests of the peasant, and he is free to choose his servants, his night watchmen and his book-keepers according to their capacity and honesty from among all nations, until he can manage these things for himself. The Indian bourgeoisies has no prescriptive right to exploit him for ever.

VI. If we accept the postulate that the Empire must be maintained and defended for the good of the people of India and Egypt, we must go further and define the relations that

should subsist between the English and the Indians, between the Indians and Egyptians, and in general, among the different peoples that live under the British flag. What is the bond that shall unite them? Should they continue to hate and distrust one another, while they acquiesce in the political union as a necessary evil? Or should they not discover or forge new spiritual bonds which may convert Imperialism into as idealistic a creed as Nationalism is to-day? An Empire in which the various nations lead a mutually exclusive life and only wait for an opportunity to break loose or to fly at each other's throats, would be a sorry caricature of a State. We do not wish that the British Empire should grow into a magnified Austria-Hungary. But how can such a disastrous result be averted?

Of course, the first principle should be that all "provinces" of the Empire (I use the word advisedly) should manage their internal affairs without mutual interference. Autonomy is the only possible basis of amity and co-operation. National feeling will thus be gratified to some extent, in so far as it is not incompatible with the unity of the Empire. England learned this lesson after she lost the American colonies but she applies it only to the colonies inhabited by whitemen. She must also treat the other civilised nations of the Empire in the same way. She cannot have one measure for the Boer and another for the Brahmin. The Indians are not inferior in culture and capacity to the Australians and the Canadians, and they will insist on equality of rights within the Empire. It is to be hoped that England will do her duty before it is too late. Of course, the defence of the Empire and other Imperial questions will be referred to a Central Imperial Council representing all British subjects.

VII. Home Rule by itself is no remedy for the disruptive forces that threaten the unity and solidarity of such a composite and extensive State. Home Rule may indeed feed the separatist tendencies and create hostile camps within the Empire if some corrective is applied to counteract its disintegrating effects. How then can the moral unity of the Empire be secured? Every State must give more than bread and peace to its citizens. Man does not live by bread alone, and he will not fight for bread alone. We must consider if some moral aims and ideals can be realised through the great institution of the British Empire so that all British subjects may feel pride in its mission and try to further it as best as they can.

Dull would he be of soul who cannot discover a vast field for idealistic activity within this Empire. Here is a State extending from Ireland to the Straits Settlements and from Hudson's Bay to New Zealand. It is merely for size the biggest political organisation that the world has ever seen. Every variety of product is found within its borders. The palm and the pine together may be taken as adequate symbols of this Empire. More than one fifth of the population of the globe lives under its flag. Some of them are savages and cannibals ; others are tribes in a primitive stage of development ; others again, are ancient and civilised nations, which are emerging from a period of torpor and decline, while new communities like Australia and New Zealand are just starting on their history. The Empire may be compared to a large patriarchal family or a vast cosmopolitan association. At the head of all stands England, the organiser, the harmoniser, the concert-director of this huge co-operative body. London is the heart and the brain of the entire system. This State, so constituted, must not be rent asunder : it must be reformed and developed. Power and unity belong to it to-day : to-morrow will come Equality, and Justice, and Fraternity, and Beauty, and all that ennobles, enriches and sanctifies human life on earth.

It is not possible to enumerate all the movements that may be organised in order to give each one of us a spiritual interest in the Empire. We have first of all the great struggle for equality of political rights for all civilised nations of the Empire. This is a glorious task. England has conquered the Orientals and the Africans, and naturally gives more to Englishmen than to the others to-day, but these others have studied English history and admired English institutions. They will reproach England for her inconsistency and selfishness, and the unjust institutions based on racial inequality will slowly disappear. Of course organisation and agitation and much nose-making will be necessary, as all Englishmen are not philosophers. But the consummation is inevitable. England has set her hand to the plough and cannot turn back.

This is a noble ideal. To raise the Indians, the Egyptians, The Burmese and the Zulus to the political status of the Englishman within this State ; to teach these backward peoples the meaning of the words Liberty and Democracy ; to rescue them from the slough of selfishness and indolence, and turn them into eager aspirants for the full rights of citizenship ; to make Men out of slaves or savages—what greater realms can any young Alexander of idealism dream of conquering during the coming centuries ?

VIII. After Democracy comes Education ; or rather, education must come with or before democracy. Education must unify and cement the Empire from within. It must be an Imperial concern. A State which neglects the education of its citizens cannot last long. Aristotle and Plato have taught us this great truth with convincing eloquence. The Empire as a State must direct the education of all British subjects, otherwise it will be like a house built on sand. The Imperial educational system will create the spiritual bonds that are to hold the Empire together for centuries. English literature must be interpreted to the Oriental nations. English literature is England's noblest gift to the world. It is among the greatest achievements of human genius and human aspiration. The language in which Spenser, Milton, Shelley, Wordsworth, Tennyson, Browning, and Swinburne have delivered their message can fully be adopted as the tongue of many nations. All Oriental nations will profit immeasurably by learning English and thoroughly mastering its vast, varied, and inspiring literature. It will enrich their spiritual life and stimulate the genius of their own gifted poets and thinkers. English literature is a magic fairyland, and its treasures are of untold worth. Blessed is the man or woman who knows this tongue well, for it is the key to the temple of Freedom. No Oriental nation would be a loser if it forgot its own tongue and learned English instead. Superstition, erratic sentiment and fantastic mysticism are the great themes of Oriental poetry. There is not much solid nourishment in it for the mind or the heart. A thousand years and more of Oriental poetry have made us what we are—unpractical metaphysicians or selfish cowards, or passive slaves. Let us now drink deep at another fountain and listen to sweet music wedded to lofty idealism or burning love of liberty, or ardent aspiration for human perfection, or unquenchable zeal for truth. These are the themes of England's songs, and her children are fed with such meat so they are like eagles who gaze at the sun with undazzled eyes. The Orientals can also share in this glorious heritage, if they so desire. Of all the benefits that an Imperial system of education will confer on Asia and Africa, the introduction and interpretation of English literature is undoubtedly the greatest.

English history and law are the other great products of English life that must be transplanted in India and Egypt. English history, beginning with the Magna Charta and ending with the decree granting the suffrage to women, is the most complete record of "Freedom slowly broadening down from precedent to precedent" in the annals of human evolution. England

is admitted by all historians to be "the mother of Parliaments" in the modern world. It is verily "the land where girt with friends or foes a man may speak the thing he will."

The American Declaration of Independence is also an immortal document of English history. Greece in the ancient world and England in the modern age have initiated the democratic movement which will also free all slaves in Asia and Africa and elevate them to the rank of full citizens. To-day, English Imperialism is undemocratic, but the despotic system digs its own grave because English history is taught in the schools of the Empire. We too have read of Cromwell and Hampden, Washington and Jefferson, Clarkson and Wilberforce, Cobden and Ernest Jones. It has been well said, "You cannot argue a man into slavery in the English language." All the rights and liberties of the English citizen will in course of time be enjoyed by all British subjects. But we must not isolate ourselves from that inexhaustible reservoir of manhood and civic virtue which is called English society. We must live in England, learn from England, work with Englishmen and English women, and study English and American history, till we too catch a breath of that spirit which has made England free and great. Then the miasmatic vapours of servility and sycophancy which choke the human mind in the climes of the East will be dispersed and dissipated, as the fog melts away in the rays of the morning sun. A primer of English history is worth more than all the histories of Asia, with their sickening record of Sultans, massacres, slavery, empires and degeneracy.

Let us not deceive ourselves. We must make up our minds on this question. The Orientals who do not wish to love and revere England as their spiritual mother must work on other lines. They may foment national insurrections or agitate for Home Rule, or profess loyalty to England as a measure of prudence. But the Empire cannot develop as an organic, healthy State if the Orientals prefer their barren literature and their uninspiring history. If they believe that they have nothing to learn from England, they must organise separatist movements which will aim at the final disintegration of the Empire, though they may adopt the phraseology of loyalty as at the present moment. They should understand that a large and progressive State, based on English ideals, is infinitely preferable to a number of small Oriental States, inspired by no ideals at all or by the antiquated ideals of Oriental life. If we do not seek moral union with England, we cannot sincerely acquiesce in the political union. A State cannot endure if several different systems of education prevail in it. For

my part, as I have said, I know of nothing in the Orient greater than English literature and English history. The Orientals who think otherwise must formulate political ideals according to their estimate of Oriental literature and history. We are at the parting of the ways now. We may work with England or against her, but let us be sincere and consistent.

Greek and Latin must also be taught in the schools of the Empire, so that a common basis of education may be firmly established. English literature owes much to Greece and Rome, and no liberal education can be complete without a knowledge of Greek. Asia, too, must have her Renaissance, and it can come only from Greek philosophy, literature and art. England must transmit to her subjects what she herself received from Greece and Rome centuries ago. Moreover, Greek philosophy will undermine superstition in Asia; Greek and Roman history will teach the Orientals that nations have different missions in history. Rome did for the Greek race what the Greeks could never do for themselves. She united them in one State, which endured long after Rome herself had been sacked by the barbarians. Rome conquered the Hellenic world, but that conquest was a blessing in disguise, as it laid the foundations of a powerful State, which repelled the savage Arabian hordes and preserved the treasures of Greek civilisation for the entire human race. The history of the Roman Empire will teach the Orientals that they should look forward and not backwards, and that injustice and inequality will slowly give place to unity and fraternity, as the British Empire grows and develops during the coming centuries. The introduction of Greek studies in Asia is one of the most sacred duties of English statesmen.

IX. East and West will be united in the British Empire. England will achieve what Alexander dreamed of and what Rome partially accomplished. Kipling will turn out a false prophet, for East and West will surely meet, and they will meet in London, Oxford, Cambridge, Cairo, Delhi and Khartoum. They have already met as comrades on the battlefield and at least one Oriental already meets the English Peers as their peer, and sits in the English Cabinet as an equal member of the Government. East and West have had many sanguinary conflicts in the past, but the British Empire will present to us the unique spectacle of Britons and Orientals working hand in hand in the service of the State. Thus the demon of colour-prejudice will be vanquished, and all European nations will learn a much needed lesson.

Humanity will advance a step nearer to the final goal of harmony and unity, and the Parliament of the British Empire will pave the way for the "Parliament of Men."

X. To sum up: Asia needs Britain's strong arm for her safe and progress. The Empire will endure only if three conditions are fulfilled. First, all citizens of the British Empire must be granted equal political rights in course of time. Secondly, England must not inflict economic injustice on the other nations. The Empire is rich enough for all and we need not exploit one another. Thirdly, all British subjects must love and revere England as their spiritual mother and Greece as their spiritual grandmother. Thus the "British Empire" of to-day will be converted into the "British-Oriental-African Commonwealth" of the future. And that is our goal and ideal.

REPORT OF THE Indian Overseas Association

This Association which was established on 17th December 1919, with the Aga Khan as Chairman and Sir M. Chagji M. Bhowmager as Deputy Chairman, for the purpose of maintaining the rights and privileges and protecting the interest of Indians residing in places outside India, has since been active promoting the welfare of Indian Communities settled in South and East Africa, British Guiana, the West Indies, Fiji, Ceylon, Mauritius, British Columbia, Australia and the Mandated Territories.

South Africa

The Association has carried on an active correspondence with the Colonial and India Offices with a view to secure a wider reference to the proposed Commission promised by the Union Government after the passing of the Asiatics Trading and Land Act (Transvaal), 1919, and also to ensure satisfactory Indian representation before the Commission.

Sir Benjamin Robertson and the Hon. Mr. V. S. Srinivasa Sastri have been appointed to represent the Government of India before the Commission, and Mr. C. F. Andrews, who has a wide knowledge of the subject, has proceeded to South Africa on behalf of the Imperial Indian Citizenship Association of Bombay, in order to assist the Indian community in the presentation of their case.

The Association learns that the Union Government have agreed to refer not only the trading question, but also that relating to the ownership of land, to the Commission. As the Association is of opinion that the question of occupation of premises situated in mining area is of vital importance, it has urged that the operation of the Gold Law and other similar enactments should be referred to the Commission.

British East Africa

While appreciating, after the lapse of many years, the nomination of two Indian members to the Legislative Council, the Association, quoting the precedents of India under the Reform scheme, Fiji, British Guiana and Trinidad, has urged that the franchise be conferred upon qualified Indians in the Protectorate.

Having regard to the fact that the question of the administration of the whole of East Africa is shortly coming up for consideration by His Majesty's Government, the Association has

pressed upon the Government the desirability and necessity of giving effect, as a matter of justice and equity, to the demand of the British East Africa Indian population for equality of status and the removal of galling disabilities designed to reproduce the unfavourable conditions prevailing in South Africa affecting the resident Indian population, and restrict, if not even prohibit, Indian immigration into the Protectorate in favour of European immigration, in spite of the fact that Indians commenced to develop these lands three centuries before any White settlement was established there.

British Guiana.

The Association has drawn the attention of His Majesty's Government to the strong objection to, and protest against, the so-called Colonisation Scheme on the part of the East Indian Association (Georgetown), and has received an assurance from the Colonial Office that the fullest consideration will be given to the views expressed by that and similar Associations

Fiji.

The Association has pressed for the termination of existing indentures of Indian labourers in this Colony, and has been notified by the Colonial Office that Orders have been given for the termination of all existing Indian indentures on 2nd January 1920, and for the repatriation, so soon as possible, of freed Indians desirous of returning to India.

Trinidad, Jamaica and Surinam (Dutch Guiana).

Having regard to the strong feeling against the system of Indentured Labour prevailing throughout India among all classes of the population, the Association has since addressed an inquiry to His Majesty's Government seeking information as to the numbers of indentures at present in force in these territories and the steps, if any, being taken by His Majesty's Government to secure their cancellation at an early date.

Ceylon.

The Association has made representations to His Majesty's Government with a view to securing improvements in the draft Labour Ordinance shortly to be introduced into the Legislative Council, and particularly to obtain the omission of the clauses imposing criminal punishment for breach of contract.

The Association has also made representations with a view to promising the education of Indian children on the Ceylon Estates

Mauritius

The Association, being alarmed at the movement in French Mauritian circles in favour of the transfer of the Island to

France, in spite of the fact that the large majority of the inhabitants are Indians who had not been consulted in the matter, inquired of His Majesty's Government what steps have been taken in this direction, and has received an assurance from the Colonial Office that no serious consideration need be given to the movement.

British Columbia.

The Association has protested against Canadian Orders in Council restricting the issue of certain classes of fishery licences to White persons, and its representations have been referred to the Governor-General of Canada for observation.

Australia.

Having regard to the Commonwealth Government's ~~views~~ taking to remove certain existing disabilities affecting Indians resident in Australia in the light of the Reciprocity Resolution passed at the Imperial War Conference, 1918, the Association has directed the attention of His Majesty's Government to the differential operation against Indians of Queensland Sugar Cultivation Act, 1913, the interpretation of which was recently ~~ruled~~ stated in an Appeal before the Privy Council, when a Judgment ~~adverse~~ to the Indian appellants was delivered. The Association has requested His Majesty's Government to press for the repeal or necessary modification of this enactment.

Mandated Territories.

With the coming into force of the Peace Treaty with Germany, Mandates under the League of Nations have now been conferred upon certain countries for the administration of the former German Colonies. Thus the Samoa Islands fall to be administered by New Zealand; South West Africa and German East Africa by the British Government. The Association has accordingly made representations to His Majesty's Government to maintain for His Majesty's Indian subjects the rights as to immigration and residence, which they have hitherto enjoyed in these respects, and equal rights in the future with all other of His Majesty's subjects.

The Association has also reminded His Majesty's Government of the danger to Indian interests of the movement officially favoured in New Zealand to supplement Native labour in Samoa by indentured labour, and has received an assurance that no further emigration from India under Indenture will be countenanced by His Majesty's Government.

S. L. Polak
Hon. Secretary.

Resolutions of The Convention of Associations British East Africa.

The following are extracts from the January Sessions (1919) of the Convention of Associations of British East Africa, a body of British Exploiters corresponding to the European Association of India.

RESOLUTION.

"This Convention wishes to point out to the Government that during the discussion of the petition *re*. Indians, as also those affecting the native peoples of this country, they had the assistance of four Missionaries, one being Roman Catholic and three being from the Missionary Conference, which was sitting in Nairobi at the same time as the Convention.

"That whereas our Nation has assumed responsibility for the future of the Indigenous East African peoples and of the countries they inhabit,

"And whereas our National Ideals of enlightenment and progress are crystalised in our Christian Western civilization and it is our duty to make sure that the best contained therein is readily available for the needs of awakening Africa,

"And whereas the maintenance of this country depends entirely on the prestige and force of character of the white man,

"And whereas certain Indians have entered this country as traders, clerks and artisans,

"And whereas these people follow in all things a civilization which is eastern and in many respects repugnant to ours,

"And whereas their social status brings them more frequently into contact with the African and thus subjects him to intimate personal influences antagonistic to the ideals of the west,

"And whereas the African has shown that he possesses latent qualities which under western guidance hold promise of material development, and an aptitude for filling the various needs of industry, more particularly those which involve the use of mechanical appliances,

"And whereas Indian competition denies him all incentives to ambition and opportunities of advancement,

"And whereas the Indian community in this country are agitating for adult suffrage and by this means seeks to gain control over the destinies of the country.

"And whereas the Imperial Conference at a meeting held on July 24th, 1918, (*See the Indian Annual Register 1919*) considered

the matter of reciprocal migration between India and other component parts of the Empire, and passed four resolutions, of which the principal is as follows:—

"It is an inherent function of the Governments of the several communities of the British Commonwealth including India that each should enjoy complete control over the composition of its own population by means of restriction on immigration from any other communities....."

"and thereby recorded as the final judgment of the British Commonwealth that the principle of Self-Determination shall govern immigration and the composition of populations—

"We, the Convention of Associations representing the White Community of the country, pray his Excellency the Governor to approach the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, so that the functions thus solemnly pronounced to be inherent in the Government of this British Community may be exercised by declaring forthwith that the right of Self-Determination rests with the European Government of this country acting for the Europeans and in trust for the Native peoples and should ask the Secretary of State to rule that the position should not be prejudiced by giving any system of franchise to Asiatics nor by allowing them to acquire land except in townships on short leases, nor by the employment of Asiatics in Government work and that steps should be taken at once to restrict Asiatic immigration in order that this stronghold of European Colonisation in Central Africa may stand beside her sister Colonies in their Asiatic Policy.

"And further we beg His Excellency the Governor to make known to the Imperial Conference, through the Rt. Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies, our earnest petition that to the conquered territory, formerly called German East Africa, the same policy towards the Asiatic be applied; for the indigenous peoples of this country and of the conquered territory are of the same types even to the extent of tribes having being severed and economic relations centuries old having been interrupted by the late artificial frontier. We can conceive, short of the retrocession of the territory to Germany, of no transaction more immoral and more certain to recoil on our heads than the betrayal to the Asiatic of a section of the African peoples whose destinies have fallen into our hands and who at present are unable to protect themselves. We submit that to buy off Indian or other agitation at the expense of the Natives of Africa would be a policy neither wise nor honourable."

Report of the Economic Commission British East Africa Protectorate.

The following are extracts from the Economic Commission Report of the British East Africa Protectorate, appointed by Sir Henry Conway Belfield, K. C. M. G., the Governor and Commander-in-Chief :—

The Hon. Mr. F. W. Major, C. M. G., Chairman ; Major E. S. Grogan, W. A. Kemoe, Esq., T. A. Wood, Esq., the Hon. Mr. P. H. Clerke, the Hon. Mr. W. C. Hunter and E. Powys Cobb, Esq., Members

"Before the advent of the imperial B. E. A. Company Indians were established on the coast, where they seized the opportunity afforded them by the abolition of slavery, to oust by loan and foreclosure the ancient Arab trade and civilisation of which Zanzibar was the centre. But except for occasional incursions by half caste Baluchis, the interior was untouched by Indian influence till British control was effected. The introduction of the coolies employed on the construction of the Uganda Railway was the first connection of Indians with the interior. The employment of Indian labour for this work was due, it is believed, purely to considerations of convenience, and here it is instructive to note that not only did the capital cost of the Indian-built Railway work out excessively high—more than double the sum for which a reputable firm of British Contractors had offered to execute the task with African labour, but that the working costs per train mile of the Uganda Railway are higher than those of the railways of the South African Union, though the percentage of white men employed on the latter is more than twenty times as great.

"It may be permitted to question whether the authorities of the time realised the immense Imperial significance, for good or evil, of their action in promoting contact between the natives of East Africa and the decadent civilisation of India. The inevitable effect of the intervention of an intermediate race between European and African is that that race absorbs most of the occasions of personal contact with the African. Hence such intimate influences as the African of this country is at present receiving are mainly imparted to him by the Asiatic, and are predominantly Indian rather than British.

"East Africa is in a somewhat different position from any other countries of Africa in respect to this problem.

"The Self-Governing states of the Union, together with the Rhodesias, control Indian immigration, with a view to ultimate exclusion. In Natal, Indian labour was at one time introduced, but its introduction was subsequently agreed to have been a mistake, and drastic steps have been taken to limit and localise its effects.

"In the African Protectorates under the Colonial Office, Indian immigration is not prohibited, with the result that in East Africa the immigrants have not been confined to the trading class, but have included coolies, clerks, artisans and mechanics. East Africa was for long protected from this invasion, but latterly for political reasons, considerable encouragement was given to Indians there.

"It is the distinguishing peculiarity of this country that here the Indian plays the parts of a clerk, artisan, carpenter, mechanic, etc., functions which the African is capable with training of performing, and does elsewhere perform, satisfactorily. The presence of the Indians, organised as they are to keep the African out of every position which an Indian could fill, deprives the African of every incentive to ambition and opportunities of advancement.

"It may be admitted that the Indian has played and still plays a useful part in opening up trade, stimulating the wants of the natives and inducing them to part with their products for purposes of export. For this service he is entitled to credit, but the essential point is that the same service might, with due encouragement, have been performed by the Native peoples.

"In every direction, the sphere of the Indian in this country is not complementary but competitive with those of the European and African. Even in the minor sphere the European, if the Indian would submit to the civic, moral and commercial obligations current in European Society, has nothing to fear from Indian competition, the contrary theory which formerly found favour in local governing circles having been completely exploded by the history of the past thirteen years. But with the African, the case is different. He is not strong enough anywhere to stand against the competition of a more crafty race. So long as that race is organised to keep him in servitude, by shouldering him out of all the posts which lie in the path of his advancement, he must be content to remain a mere hewer of wood and drawer of water.

"There are, therefore, strong economic reasons against the free admission of certain classes of Indians into the country."

"There are unfortunately other reasons of even greater weight against all Indian immigration into this, or indeed any part of Africa.

"Physically, the Indian is not a wholesome influence because of his incurable repugnance to sanitation and hygiene. In this respect the African is more civilised than the Indian, being naturally cleanly in his ways: but he is prone to follow the example of those around him. Plague, though said to be "endemic" in the country, has certainly been imported, if not originally then on later occasions, from Bombay, and Indian quarters are almost invariably the foci of each successive outbreak. The same may be said of all dirt-born diseases. The Indian is everywhere the despair of the sanitarian. He is a menace not only to himself, but especially to the natives of the country.

Moral Depravity of Indians

"The moral depravity of the Indian is equally damaging to the African, who in his natural state is at least innocent of the worst vices of the East. The Indian is the inciter to crime as well as vice, since it is the opportunity afforded by the ever-ready Indian receiver which makes thieving easy. If the Indians were eliminated, the number of offences against property, now high, would be reduced to manageable proportions.

"The Empire is faced with a serious dilemma which cannot be evaded. The choice lies between the vital interest of the African and the ambition of India. The presence of the Indian in this country is quite obviously inimical to the moral and physical welfare and the economic advancement of the native. The matter is one of the highest Imperial importance, and we regard it as imperative that the Empire should definitely decide, and that without delay, whether the welfare of the African is to be subordinated in his own country to political considerations and the pretensions of the more restless elements of India. Upon the decision as to East Africa, the future of the whole continent will largely depend, for if Indians are to be allowed to stream in at any one entrance in unlimited numbers, it will scarcely be possible to localise them indefinitely in any particular territory.

"Our own view of this question is that there can be no excuse for meeting out to the African treatment to which India herself would never submit.

"On purely economic grounds, we submit the admission of the Indian was a cardinal error of policy. It involved the economic stagnation of the African throughout a large tract of Africa, and the consequent retardation of progress for the sake of what promised to be at best but a temporary convenience. In our view,

the error ought gradually, but without unnecessary delay, to be rectified, by similar means to those by which the same error is being rectified in Natal.

"The Railway and other Government Department should as quickly as possible replace Indian employees by Europeans in the higher grades and Africans in the lower. Further, Asiatics who are allowed to remain in this country should be obliged to conform to the same sanitary standards as Europeans as a condition of their residence here. It will probably be found that this will result in a great reduction in their numbers.

"The Imperial Principle which is to control the migration within the Empire of different peoples has been finally laid down by the Imperial Conference in July last in the following terms :—

"It is an inherent function of the Governments of the several communities of the British Commonwealth, including India, that each should enjoy complete control over the composition of its own population by means of restriction on immigration from any other communities."

"It is, therefore, essential that a decision of policy in reference to East Africa should be come to without further delay, and that such decision shall be based upon the principle of Self-Determination and shall consider only the interests of the indigenous native and Arab population and of the race responsible for their control.

"It is our firm conviction that the justification of our occupation of this country lies in our ability to adapt the native to our own civilisation.

"If we further complicate this task by continuing to expose the African to the antagonistic influence of Asiatic, as distinct from European philosophy, we shall be guilty of a breach of trust."

The following Note by the Rev. C F. Andrews, who went to East Africa on deputation to enquire into the condition of Indians resident there, explains the last two extracts.

There are certain points in connection with these Nairobi Convention Resolutions which are worthy of special notice.

First of all, it will at once be recognised by any careful reader that the Petition *re*: Indians, as it is called, which was passed unanimously by the Convention, bears a marked resemblance to the paragraphs dealing with the same subject in the Government Economic Commission Report. Indeed, in some prominent passages, the phrases used are identical.

This may be accounted for by the fact already mentioned that all the non-official members who served on the Economic Commission were serving at one and the same time on the Executive Committee of the Convention of Associations. It may be well, in this place, to give their names in full as follows :—

The Right Hon. Lord Delamere.

The Hon. W. C. Hunter.

Major Ewart Scoot Grogan.

Thomas Alfred Wood Esquire.

E. Powyss Cobb Esquire.

These gentlemen came out, at different times, to East Africa as settlers. Mr. Hunter is an Estate Agent and Accountant.

The two official members, who served on behalf of the Government on the Economic Commission are as follows :

The Honourable Francis William Major, Chief of Customs, Chairman of the Commission.

William Alfred Kemp Esquire, Treasurer of the East African Protectorate Government.

Neither of these two Government officials raised any protest against the insertion of the paragraphs on the Indian question in the Report. Both of them signed their names to it. They must, therefore, take their full responsibility for the position finally adopted. It would not, however, be difficult to surmise that Lord Delamere and Major Grogan were leading personalities in deciding the Indian question, both on the Economic Commission itself and on the Convention of Associations.

*When we examine further the two parallel documents we find that a claim is made by each in a very solemn manner to be allowed to exclude Indians as undesirables under a decision lately reached by the Imperial Conference in London about immigration control. (See Annual Register, 1919, 'India in the Imperial War Conference.') That the controlling party in that decision was a self-governing dominion, and in its original form it did not refer to Protectorates at all. That, however, is a merely technical point of *no very great importance*.

But what is far more serious to notice is the assumption made by the Convention of Associations that it, and it alone, truly represents the British Commonwealth in its colonising and civilising work in the East Africa Protectorate ; that this White community alone has acquired the right, by the very fact of its belonging to the dominant European Race, to represent the East African Government which is called a purely European Government ; that the Indian community does not belong to the British Common-

wealth, and has no right of representation before the Imperial Conference,—not even in its own defence.

Interpreting as well as I can the resolutions passed at the Convention concerning the Indian community, I paraphrase them as follows:—

“The Indians are intruders,—that is the gist of the whole matter. Certain people, called Indians, have entered this country. The ruling White Race has no community of sentiment with them. Their habits and mode of life are repugnant: their ideals are antagonistic. These intruders are now standing between the natives and the natural protectors of the natives, the white community. The Indians must, therefore, be made to leave the country as quickly as possible. For the only protector of the native must be in future the dominant White Race.”

This policy of exclusion of the Indian ultimately from the whole of the British Commonwealth in Africa must be carried out by a definite policy, on the same lines in Central Africa as those adopted by the sister Colonies further South. That is to say, restriction of immigration must be immediately enforced by law, and all trading and land rights must be curtailed and no franchise must be granted. No Government service, in future, must be open to the Indians. Thus when every avenue of trade and land and franchise and Government service *within* the Protectorate is closed up more and more tightly, and when all further immigration into the Protectorate of new families is restricted, the whole position of Indians will be so insecure that very few will remain. Short leases in townships might still be permitted for a few Indian traders but, of course, the lease should not be long enough for any permanent building to be erected or any settlement foothold to be obtained. As leases fall in, these Indians also may be dealt with. Thus East Africa,—“this stronghold of European colonisation in Central Africa, may take her place besides her sister Colonies in this Asiatic policy.” For by such a policy it may well be expected, that the present Indian residents, (when the Economic Commission Report number at about 12,500) will soon dwindle into insignificance. Thus, in the end, all British East Africa, from Mombassa to Capetown will be reserved for European settlement only. There will be no complication of the problem of pure European Colonisation.

When the Indian by these political methods has been compelled at last to leave the country, then the ruling White Race can fulfil its true and solemn function, committed to it as a trust by the Imperial Government, of civilising the native by means of

its own Christianity and its own Christian Western ideals of enlightenment and progress

"To sum up the whole matter, Indians cannot in any true sense be indentified with the British Commonwealth or associated with its Government in East Africa. Wherever they are found in Africa side by side with the British they are aliens. They are antagonistic in their ideals. They are repugnant to the White Race. This is not a question of Temperate Zones merely. It refers to Tropical Zones as well. They can, in no sense, be regarded as a "Community of the British Commonwealth," however much they may claim British citizenship. Self-determination of the "communities of the British Commonwealth" rests with the Europeans. This dominant and exclusive position of the white community, as the only Community within the British Commonwealth, possessing self-determining and representative powers, must not be prejudiced by giving any system of franchise to the Asiatic. If the Indian community in the British Commonwealth, when leaving the shores of India for Africa, has no more citizenship than that, there truly, and without any rhetorical exaggeration, it has become "a pariah within the Empire."

This assumption, that the white community alone in Africa represents the British Commonwealth and that citizenship in that Commonwealth must never be extended beyond the white Race—this assumption, if once finally accepted and endorsed, would change the whole structure of the British constitution and would throw back all the progress that has been made in the Constitutional reform for many generations. It would at once put the British dominions far behind the French in political advancement. What is far more serious, it would be a direct breach of charter after charter, treaty after treaty, and covenant after covenant; on the basis of these charters and treaties the British Commonwealth throughout the world has been built up. The Queen's Proclamation of racial neutrality which brought peace after the Great Mutiny is only one example of such covenants between sovereign and people. Such sovereign, on coming to the throne, has repeated these covenants and on the faithful fulfilment of them to the very letter the stability of the whole structure of the British Constitution abroad depends.

India herself, within her own interior dominions, has gone forward for a century past, slowly but certainly, towards the fulfilment of the great Charters. In the last five years of the War the pace has been far more rapid. The reason for this has been that, in spite of all expectation of the enemy to the contrary,

in spite of the dead-weight of the subjection and disarmament which has enervated her manhood, in spite of a thousand hindrances of autocracy and racial domination, India when the time came gave with both hands all that was left to her, all she still possessed, to carry on the great struggle. She remained steadfast to the Allied Cause up to the end.

On the fields of Flanders and Gallipoli, in Mesopotamia and Palestine and in East Africa, Indian soldiers have fought under the British Flag, as comrades and free men, not as slaves. All too late the King's Commission has been given at last to Indian officers. India herself has been welcomed as a self-governing nation of the British Commonwealth within the League of Nations, side by side with Australia and New Zealand, South Africa and Canada. The new era which all this represents has been proclaimed by His Majesty the King, and the King's oldest son will inaugurate it on his coming visit to India.

It is strange indeed that at such an hour as this when history is being made and the British Commonwealth throughout the world is starting upon a new career of progress, the members of the Nairobi Convention should be so out of touch with the spirit of the times that they should endeavour to limit the boundaries of that world Commonwealth in which we live to the franchise of a single race. Nothing could be more out of harmony with all that the great War has been fought to achieve. On every side there has been a breaking down of racial barrier, not a building up. The tide is still flowing that way, in spite of the reaction which the exhaustion after the great struggle has caused.

What I ask of my fellow-countrymen is a reconsideration of this Convention position with regard to the constitution and frame work of the British Commonwealth, which was adopted in a time of strain and unnatural tension without sufficient coolness of thought. Now that life has become more normal, I would urge that the whole problem of the Commonwealth be studied thoroughly and closely in all its consequences and its bearing.

Before closing this chapter, I am obliged to refer to one more assumption made by the Nairobi Convention which is even more gravely serious in its consequence than that which I have already pointed out. The fact that it seems to have been made quite unconsciously tells me again of the strained and abnormal conditions under which the Resolutions were framed. I will try to explain it with perfect clearness.

If there is one thing more than any other that has differentiated the British Commonwealth abroad from all the other great dominions of the past, it has been the pledge, faithfully given and

undertaken, of complete religious neutrality. Only with such an understanding could vast countries containing many millions of Muhammadans, Buddhists, Hindus, and followers of other creeds (far outnumbering those professing the creed of the sovereign himself) have been kept together with the utmost loyalty in a common allegiance.

Yet this petition *re*: Indians of the Nairobi Convention of Associations advocates a policy of the protectorate Government which would directly favour one special religion and would penalise others. That is to say, it openly demands a breach of religious neutrality on the part of the government.

This is the only meaning I can deduce from the clauses of the Petition which, for the sake of clearness, I will quote again in full at this point:

"Whereas our national ideals of enlightenment and progress are crystallised in our Christian Western civilisation and it is our duty to make sure that the best contained therein is readily available for the needs of awakening Africa . . . and whereas these (Indian) people follow in all things a civilisation which is Eastern and in many respects repugnant to our own, and whereas their social status brings them more frequently into contact with the African and thus subjects him to intimate personal influence antagonistic to the ideals of the west,....."

The petition *re*: Indians goes on to demand that in consequence of these very things the Indian settlers should be excluded from East Africa and the protectorate should be made a close preserve for Christian Western civilisation.

I have been told on good authority that the word Christian was deliberately added after a prolonged discussion on the petition *re*: Indians, and that it was lastly accepted by all the representatives of the Associations. There can be no question that, as the petition *re*: Indians now stands, in its final shape, this word "Christian" is emphatic and affects vitally the meaning. The presence of missionaries, to which special attention is drawn by the petition itself, gives point to the word "Christian" and makes clear the reason for its insertion. To paraphrase very briefly, it is because the Indian follow a mode of life which is not Christian, that their presence among the Africans is undesirable.

We find, then, that the Convention of European Associations of East Africa, claiming to represent not only the British Nations but also the British Commonwealth throughout the world, has actually framed a petition *re*: Indians asking for permission for the exclusion of Indians in the name of Christianity. The ultimate aim in view is to drive the Indians

out of Africa, because their own civilisation is antagonistic to the religious beliefs of the petitioners which are embodied in their own civilization. After the deliberate insertion of the word "Christian" in the petition I do not see how there can be any logical escape from that interpretation. It is a policy which has always had a great fascination for the missionary propagandist, and it would appear to me that the presence of the missionaries influenced the leaders of the Convention of Associations far more than they suppose and caused them to make this fatal blunder.

In order to show how fatal the blunder has been, let me take a parallel case. As a pure and simple *reductio ad absurdum*, the next obvious step to take, when once the Indian had been cleared out of the way, would be to remove the Arab out of the missionaries' path of Christianising the African, on exactly the same grounds as the Indian. The fact that he had been an intruder into the indigenous African's country only a little longer than the Indian should surely not stand in the way of such a logical conclusion.

It hardly needs to be pointed out that any such breaches of religious neutrality under the British Constitution would be a far more serious infraction of all treaties and treaty rights than the breach of racial neutrality referred to in a previous paragraph. The racial neutrality clauses in the different treaties have been always conditional: the words have been added to the treaties "as far as may be": what has been aimed at in all such covenants is a hope for the future which must be steadily and persistently fulfilled. But the religious neutrality clauses have from the first been absolute and unconditional, and to any one who has studied constitutional history, breaches of neutrality such as that which the Convention of Associations deliberately contemplates are absolutely void—I would almost add the word ridiculously impossible. If a direct infraction of racial neutrality, destroying rights already won, would have serious consequences to the stability of the British Commonwealth established throughout the world, breaches of religious neutrality, if once put into practice, would shake it to its very foundations.

Again, as I look back at the special period when the Convention petition *re*: Indians was drawn up, conviction becomes all the stronger that the constitutional blunders which have been committed in the name of the British Commonwealth, have been due to the strained condition of men's mind directly after the War and to the impossibility at such a period of calm and collected thinking.

Now that the Government of the East Africa Protectorate

and also the Imperial Government itself have repudiated the findings of the Economic Commission on the Indian question and by so doing invalidated the position taken by the Convention of Associations, I have a great hope that the justice of the plea which I have made for a reconsideration of the whole position will be acknowledged and that an armistice will be called immediately to this internecine war between Indians and Europeans which may ultimately be transformed into a settled and permanent peace.

C. F. ANDREWS.

East African Indian National Congress.

15th November 1919.

Resolutions adopted at the Second Session of the East African Indian National Congress held on the 15th and 16th November 1919. at Nair's Building Nairobi, under the presidentship of Husseinbhai Suliman Virji Esqr. the leading Indian resident

Resolution No. 1

"That this Congress of representatives of the Indians of British East Africa, Uganda, Zanzibar and Ex German East Africa, places on record its expression of unswerving loyalty towards His Majesty's throne and person, and its sense of hearty co-operation with the local Governments of the East African Protectorates and territories."

Proposed by the President and carried unanimously

RESOLUTION No. 2

"That this Congress deplores the practice at present obtaining of imposing restrictions on land sales and mortgages between the European and the British Indian subjects of His Majesty the King Emperor and humbly prays His Majesty's Government to be pleased to instruct the local Governments to remove all such restrictions"

Proposed by Mr Hashambhai Jamal of Kisumu. Seconded by Mr Muhammadbhai of Kisumu.

RESOLUTION No. 3

"That this Congress is of opinion that at least one-third of the seats on the Legislative and Executive Councils of the British East Africa Protectorate be allotted to the Indian Community by election, and that similar provision be made in the case of Zanzibar, Uganda and ex-German East Africa, as soon as Legislative and Executive Councils come into existence in the said Protectorates."

Proposed by Mr Hassanali Mussaji Mulla Dawoodji of Mombassa. Seconded by Mr. Yusufalli Esmailji Jeewanji of Zanzibar.

RESOLUTION No. 4

"That this Congress respectfully appeals to the local Governments of the East Africa, Uganda and Zanzibar Protectorates to recognise the services of the Indian Volunteer Corps in East Africa in the same way as those of the local European Troops."

Proposed by Mr G. B. Tadwalker of Nairobi. Seconded by Mr. Savale of Mombasa.

RESOLUTION No. 5

"That this Congress submits to the local Government that recognition be accorded to the Indian University degrees for the learned professions."

Proposed by Mr. Mangal Dass of Nairobi. Seconded by Mr. Savale of Mombasa

RESOLUTION No. 6

"That all Indian Medical Practitioners not below the rank of Sub-Assistant Surgeons be allowed to carry on independent Medical practice in British East Africa"

Proposed by Mr. H. H. Mody of Mombasa. Seconded by Mr. Zuzarti of Londiani.

RESOLUTION No. 7

"That this Congress is of opinion that the higher posts of trust and responsibility in the Civil and Military Services of all the Protectorates of Eastern Africa such as those of Judges, Magistrates and Officers in the army, should be thrown open to capable Indians and equal opportunities of advancement be given to them along with other sections of His Majesty's subjects, and prays the local Governments to take steps in the matter at an early date."

Proposed by Lala Ralla Ram of Londiani. Seconded by Mr. V. K. Buxi of Mombasa

RESOLUTION No. 8

"That this Congress respectfully submits to all the local Governments that respectable Indians should be appointed Justices of the Peace, Honorary Magistrates, and Visiting Justice to the Prisons."

Proposed by Mr. H. S. Trivedy of Nairobi. Seconded by Mr. Sharma of Nairobi

RESOLUTION No. 9

"That this Congress requests the local Government to extend to the Indian community the privilege of trial by jury of their own Countrymen."

Proposed by Mr. Hassanalli Mulla Dawoodji of Mombasa. Seconded by Mr. S. D. Puri of Machakose.

RESOLUTION No. 10

"That this Congress requests the Government of the East Africa Protectorate to consider favourably the case of small Indian Shambaholders of Nairobi and other places and to renew their leases "

Proposed by Mr. H. S. Trivedy of Nairobi. Seconded by Mr. S. D. Puri of Machakose.

RESOLUTION No. 11

"That this Congress requests the local Governments that steps be taken to provide for adequate representation of the Indian community on all commissions and the other public bodies or boards "

Proposed by Mr. Rana of Daresalam. Seconded by Mr. Manibhoy Jamna Hammed of Kisumu.

RESOLUTION No. 12

"That this Congress is of opinion that the Bill known as the 'Segregation of Races Bill' is a racial bill of the worst possible type, and is subversive of all economic principles and prejudicial to the rights of private ownership and destructive of all vested interests of the Indian community in the East Africa and Uganda Protectorates, and therefore it emphatically protests against it and respectfully urges the Government of the E. A. P. not to proceed with it "

Proposed by Mr. M. A. Desai of Nairobi. Seconded by Mr. Buxi of Mombassa. Supported by Mr. Mangal Dass of Nairobi.

RESOLUTION No. 13

"This Congress emphatically and indignantly protests against the expressed opinion of the Convention of Associations that the Immigration of British Indians should be restricted with a view to their ultimate exclusion. This Congress is of opinion that the presence of the British Indians in East Africa in no way interferes with the desired advancement of the children of the soil, but on the other hand their presence is conducive to their advancement."

Proposed by Mr. M. A. Desai of Nairobi. Seconded by Mr. P. L. Pandya of Kisumu.

RESOLUTION No. 14.

"That this Congress appeals to the local Governments to requite the services of the Indian Soldiers who took part in the

local campaign by making them grants of land in the same way as is done in the case of British Soldiers of European descent."

Proposed by Mr. G. B. Tadwalkar of Nairobi. Seconded by Mr. Habib Jamal of Daressalaam.

RESOLUTION No 15

"That this Congress is of opinion that Indians should be granted plots both residential and business in all townships, on a lease of 99 years, and that such plots should not be merely on an annual tenancy, as the latter method gives no security to the plot-holders and retards the development of the country, that the area of such plots should not be less than 5000 square feet, and the annual rental should not be calculated on a different basis from that applied to European plot-holders"

Proposed by Mr. Quar-ud-deen of Nyeri. Seconded by Mr. H. S. Trivedy of Nairobi. Supported by Mr. Diwanchand of Nairobi.

RESOLUTION No. 16

"This Congress respectfully prays the Imperial Government to definitely declare their policy about the equality of political status of Indians in Eastern Africa Protectorates and territories"

Proposed by Mr. Varma of Nairobi. Seconded by Mr. Lahori Ram of Nairobi. Supported by Mr. Rana of Daressalaam.

RESOLUTION No 17

"That this Congress, in consideration of the services rendered by the Indians in conquering the Ex German East Africa, respectfully prays the League of Nations and the mandatory power thereunder, to reserve the said territory for the purpose of Indian Colonisation"

Proposed by Mr. B. S. Varma of Nairobi. Seconded by Mr. L. M. Savla of Mombassa.

RESOLUTION No. 18

"That this Congress is of opinion that in view of the termination of hostilities over a year ago, the time has arrived for the Government to press upon shipping companies the necessity of reducing their rates of freights and passage in order to reduce the cost of living in all the Protectorates of Eastern Africa as soon as possible."

Proposed by Mr. H. S. Trivedy of Nairobi. Seconded by Mr. H. H. Mody of Mombasa.

RESOLUTION No. 19

"That in view of many disabilities, discomforts and hardships

continually suffered by Indian passengers and shippers by the European managed steamship lines calling at the East African and Zanzibar ports, and the great increases in the complaints of the sufferers, it is most necessary and advisable to save the Indian public from such disabilities imposed upon them at the pleasure of European Managers, by organising a purely Indian line of Steamers; an earnest appeal should, therefore, be made to the leading Indian capitalists of East and South Africa and India to combine strongly and to organise a line to meet the requirements of the Indian traders and public."

Proposed by Mr. Eusuf-ali Esmailji Jeewanji of Zanzibar. Seconded by Mr. Muhammad Bhai of Kisumu

RESOLUTION No. 20

"That this Congress requests the Government to extend the right of Municipal and Legislative Franchise to the Indian women side by side with their European sisters on educational qualifications."

Proposed by Mrs Ealita Savale of Mombassa. Seconded by Mrs. Indirabai Panthwardya of Nairobi.

RESOLUTION No. 21

"In view of the fact that a large number of Indians, who have served and have been serving the various Military Departments during and after the termination of the great War in the capacity of mechanics, artisans and clerks, have been practically denied all the Military privileges and also the civil concessions granted on the recommendation of Sir Alfred Lascelles on unjustifiable grounds, the Congress, therefore, urges upon the Government to recognise their services as civil or military officers and grant them the respective privileges for their relief"

Proposed by Mr G. B. Tadwalkar of Nairobi. Seconded by Mr R. G. Bargaonker of Nairobi

RESOLUTION No. 22

"That this Congress is of opinion that the Government of East Africa should adopt such measures to settle the question of Exchange and Currency as will be finally decided upon by the Government of India after the report and recommendations of the Committee appointed for that purpose by that Government and now sitting in London"

Proposed by Mr. Savale of Mombasa. Seconded by Mr. Hassanalli Madatalli of Nairobi

RESOLUTION No. 23

"That this Congress most strongly urges the Government

to take immediate steps to remove the humiliating discrimination on the Uganda Railway carriages, waiting rooms, lake steamers and Nairobi Rickshaws by which humanity is divided between Europeans (although for the purpose of taxation the Indians are classed with Europeans) and the Indians are grouped with the non-Europeans."

Proposed by Mr. Hassanalli Maddatalli of Nairobi. Seconded by Mr. S. D. Puri for Mr. Dharamsi Khimji of Machakos.

RESOLUTION No. 24

"That this Congress respectfully prays the Imperial Government to arrange for an early payment of the value of pre-war and interim German currency notes in possession of Indians in East Africa and various other claims such as debts, loans, requisitions, etc., against the German Government and German subjects"

Proposed by Mr. Himmatsinghji Rana of Daressalaam. Seconded by Mr. M. A. Desai of Nairobi.

RESOLUTION No. 25

"That this Congress emphatically protests against the flogging of Indian prisoners in the name of discipline in local gaols, and urges the Government to withdraw the powers imposing this barbarous punishment granted by the Prisons Ordinance, 1918, to Superintendents of Prisons, whereby the Superintendent who is necessarily the complainant, turns into a Judge, which is fundamentally opposed to the principles of equity and justice. This Congress also urges the Government that the present scale of diet and clothing for Indian prisoners in the East African gaols being wholly inadequate, to alter the same to suit their health, their custom, habits and sentiments and also to make improvements in their general treatment"

Proposed by Mr. Sharma of Nairobi. Seconded by Mr. Bhutt of Mombassa.

RESOLUTION No. 26

"This Congress respectfully requests the local Governments to take immediate steps and make suitable provision for improving the education of Indian children. This Congress further urges the necessity of establishing model High Schools for Indian children in the capitals of the said Protectorates, and primary schools in the townships having at least twenty boys of school-going age."

Proposed by Mr. Lahori Ram of Nairobi. Seconded by Mr. Mathurbhai of Nakuru. Supported by Mr. Yusufalli Esmailji Jeewanji of Zanzibar.

RESOLUTION No. 27

"That in view of the cessation of hostilities this Congress requests that Indian subjects of His Majesty the King should no longer be compelled to have passports to travel from one part of His Majesty's Dominions to another, namely, India and Eastern Africa and vice versa"

Proposed by Mr. Rana of Daressalam Seconded by Mr. H. H. Mody of Mombassa

Resolution No. 28

"That this Congress respectfully draws the attention of the local Governments of the Protectorates to the dire necessity of establishing hospitals, where Indians may have facilities for medical treatment and requests the said Governments to take early steps in the matter"

Proposed by Mr. Hassanali Mulla Dandji of Mombasa.
Seconded by Mr P L. Pandya of Kisumu

Resolution No. 29

"This Congress deplores the omission on the part of the Government of East Africa Protectorate to appoint any Indian member on B E A Economic Commission and resents and expresses its strong indignation at the slanderous, misleading and untruthful portion of the Report which affects the Indian community and hereby records its disapproval thereof."

Proposed by Mr. Shums-ud-deen of Nairobi. Seconded by Mr. M. A. Desai of Nairobi.

Resolution No 30

The following items were adopted as one resolution to be submitted to the Government of Uganda Protectorate. (a) "That plots for buildings be granted to the Indian community on 99 years leases, that shorter leases be extended with an option of getting them turned into freehold. (b) That arrangements be made to allot Crown lands to the Indian community for agricultural purposes, and that Indians be allowed to purchase freehold land from the natives. (c) That trade should be free, and that, as in India, there should be no licences or restrictions. (d) In view of the constant increase of thefts and crimes in the country the Government be pleased to secure the services of trained Indian and European Police and Civil Servants. (e) That Government should open schools at all centres where there are 20 boys or non-natives, of school going age. (f) That there should be equal treatment of non-natives, as they pay equal taxes. (g) That Indians be represented on all bodies. They will be a great

help as they will supply first-hand information (g) That more accommodation be provided for Indians on steamers and Railway in first, second and third classes (i) Indian soldiers be allowed to settle in the country (j) Registered medical and legal Practitioners of India be allowed to practise in the country.

Proposed by Dr Lahna Singh of Kampala Second by Mr. Asha Ram of Jinja Supported by Mr. M. A. Desai of Nairobi

Resolution No. 31

"That in the humble opinion of this Congress, the claims of Indian shop-keepers of the Kisumu District in the Nyanza Province in connection with the loot by the native tribes of the district in 1914 are payable by the local Government of East Africa Protectorate and not by the Foreign Claims' Committee, in as much as the property was looted by the natives of the District themselves, and not by German Troops and therefore this Congress most respectfully prays for an early payment especially in view of the fact that money from the natives of the said District has already been realised."

Proposed by Mr. Muhammadbhoy Kassumbhoy Lakha of Kisumu. Seconded by Mr. Hassumbhoy Jamal of Kisumu.

Resolution No. 32

"That this Congress does not approve of the present practice of the Zanzibar Government of investing its surplus revenue with other Governments and is of the opinion that such surplus revenue be utilised in establishing agricultural bank and such investments as would be conducive to the economic interest of the Zanzibar Protectorate."

Proposed by Mr. Yusufali Esmailji Jeewanjee of Zanzibar Seconded by Mr. Rana of Darassalaam.

RESOLUTION No. 33

"That this Congress requests the Government of the Zanzibar Protectorate to immediately organise a Municipality in Zanzibar, with a good proportion of elected Indian Representatives."

Proposed by Mr. Bakshi of Mombasa. Seconded by Mr. Rana of Darassalaam.

RESOLUTION No. 34

"That this Congress is of opinion that the clause in the Bill of Lading of the British India Steam Navigation Company which reads as follows, be amended to the value of Rs. 1,500 per freight ton and Rs. 750 per package :—

"The company will not be accountable for gold, silver, bullion specie, jewellery, precious metals, plated wares, documents, works

of art, watches, silks or other precious or valuable articles in any respect, or goods of any description whatever beyond the value of Rs. 500 freight ton, or, relatively for any portion thereof, or beyond the amount of Rs. 250 for any one package, or, relatively for any portion thereof, unless a declaration of the value of such goods has been made prior to shipment, and a special written shipping order or advice note granted for same, and unless the Bill of Lading be signed for such goods, and the value declared there."

Proposed by Mr. Bukshi of Mombasa, seconded by Mr. Hasanalli Mulla Dawoodji of Mombasa

RESOLUTION No. 35

"That this Congress, representing the entire Indian community of British East Africa, Uganda, Zanzibar and Ex German East Africa professing various religions, views with grave anxiety, (1) the threatened dismemberment of Turkey from European powers, (2) the intended transference of the holy places of Islam from the temporal power of Khalifa, (3) the distribution of the Turkish Empire among the Allies, and trusts His Majesty's Government will secure fulfilment of the pledge given by the Right Honourable Mr Lloyd George regarding Turkey on the 6 January, 1918, to the effect that the religious places like Mecca, Madina, Asia Minor and Constantinople as their capital having a predominant Muslim population must remain under Turkish Sovereignty."

RESOLUTION No 36

"That this Congress urges the Local Government of the East Africa Protectorate to repeal the Deportation Orders passed under Martial Law in 1914, 15, 16 against Messrs, E. W. Ritch, R. B. Patel, Meharchand Puri, Tirath Ram, Bansilal and all other members of the Indian community "

Moved by the President.

RESOLUTION No 37

"Inasmuch as the Indian community pays a larger share of the Municipal taxes, owns very considerable vested interests and has a preponderating majority in the population of the township of Nairobi, this Congress requests the Government of East Africa Protectorate to grant to the Indian community the right to elect the same number of members as that of the non official European members on the Nairobi Municipal Committees."

Proposed by Mr. M. A. Desai and seconded by Mr. Mangal Dass, both of Nairobi and ex-elected Indian Municipal Members.

Resolution No. 38

"Giving due regard to the necessity of formation of a permanent Standing Committee to conduct the work of the Congress, this Congress resolves that such Committee shall be appointed, and Mr. B. S. Varma shall be its first General Secretary.

Proposed by Mr. G. B. Tadvalker of Nairobi. Seconded by Mr. M. A. Desai of Nairobi.

Resolution No. 39

"This Congress firmly resolves that this is the opportune moment for sending to England a deputation, without delay, of the Indian representatives from East Africa, Uganda, Zanzibar and ex-German East Africa to represent the Indian cause personally to the Right Honourable the Secretaries of State for the Colonies and for India, the public, Members of Parliament, and the prominent Indians in England."

Proposed by Mr. B. S. Varma of Nairobi. Seconded by Mr. Shums-udd een of Nairobi. Supported by Mr. G.B. Tadwalker of Nairobi.

Resolution No. 40

"Resolved that an adequate fund be raised for the permanent maintenance of the Congress and for sending an Indian Deputation to England to get the grievances of the Indian community in Eastern Africa redressed"

Proposed by Mr. M. A. Desai of Nairobi, Seconded by Mr. G. B. Tadwalker of Nairobi.

Resolution No. 41

"That this Congress hereby authorises the President to send copies of the Proceedings to the Governments concerned and to such newspapers, public bodies and personages as he may deem fit"

Proposed by Mr. B. S. Varma of Nairobi. Seconded by Mr. M. A. Desai of Nairobi,

Indians in E. Africa

Statement of Sir G. Barnes.

At the meeting of the Imperial Legislative Council on the 19 Sep 1919 Sir George Barnes, replying to Sir Dinshah Wacha's question regarding Indian traders in East Africa, said :

The attention of the Government of India has been drawn to a statement which was published in the press made by the Committee of the Indian Merchants' Chamber and Bureau regarding East African Trade. I regret to say that the statement of the Committee, that colour prejudice has begun to make itself felt in East Africa, appears from the information which we received from the various sources to be not unfounded. In March last, we received a Deputation of Indians from East Africa, headed by Mr Alibhai Jeerami, and were much impressed with the sober and convincing way in which they stated their grievances. His Excellency the Viceroy at once telegraphed a summary of their grievances to the Secretary of State, and urged strongly that their claims should receive sympathetic consideration. The memorial presented by the Deputation was subsequently forwarded to the Secretary of State with a despatch in which the Government of India urged that there was no justification in a Crown Colony or Protectorate for assigning to British Indians status in any way inferior to that of any other class of His Majesty's subjects resident in the colony. The Government of India further urged not only that the more galling disabilities of Indians in East Africa should be removed, but also that their claims to a share in the Government of the country by adequate representation on the Legislative Council and on local bodies should be sympathetically considered. The committee's statement also refers to another grievance which was not mentioned by the Deputation, namely that an attempt is being made to remove Indian ginners from the leading industrial places like Kampala. It had already been brought to the notice of the Government of India that the cotton policy of the Uganda Government was likely to injure Indian trade interests. We have more than once addressed the Secretary of State on the subject, protesting most strongly against the restrictions on trade which particularly affect the Indian owned ginners at the ports. The Hon. Member will be glad to hear also that a meeting of the Uganda Chamber of Commerce, at