

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

OF

Maulana Mohamed Ali,
B.A. (Allahabad & Oxon.)
at the Thirty Eighth
Annual Session of



The Indian National
Congress held at
Cocanada,
December, 26, 1923.

i. 954
CH

nted at the Jamia Millia Press, Aligarh.

6216

لا غالب الا الله

FRIENDS AND FELLOW-WORKERS,

It has been the custom for every occupant of the Presidential chair of the Indian National Congress to thank the delegates that have conferred on him the highest honour it is in the power of the Indian nation to confer on an Indian. It has also been customary for him to disclaim that his merits deserved such signal honour and to declare his unfitness to rank with those that had previously occupied the Presidential chair. I have no doubt that the innate modesty of my predecessors infused into these disclaimers and declarations a sincerity that saved them from the banality of mere conventions. But it is no such modesty that makes me further stale them by repetition. When two years ago, just on the eve of my imprisonment, a few of the Provinces had honoured me also with their nominations, I was still in a position to withdraw my name and to give at least partial expression to the shock of surprise I felt on that occasion. This time, however, fate had taken the matter almost entirely out of my hands; for soon after I was discharged from prison, I received from the Reception Committee here the telegraphic message that in a few days it would meet to put the seal of its agreement on the choice of the Provincial Congress Committees.

Believe me, if the circumstances that had led to the Special Session at Delhi, and, still more, if that session itself had not revealed to me conditions that made the withdrawal of my name something in the nature of desertion, I would have withdrawn it even at that late stage. I consider it a presumption to preside here, and one reason for my reluctance and hesitation must be obvious to all. It must be remembered that my association with the Indian National Congress is of very recent date. It was only in 1919 that for the first time I attended the Congress as a delegate, and then, too, my participation was not in the ordinary course. As some of you may remember, my brother and I had just been released from confinement as State Prisoners in the Betul gaol in which our internment during the last four years of the War had culminated. We had, of course, proceeded straight to the Congress that had already commenced its session in martyred Amritsar, and since we could not have been elected as delegates in the usual way, the good people of Amritsar had forthwith adopted us as their own. The Nagpur Session that was held in the following year was the first, and, as it happened, also the only one previous to this which my brother and I attended as delegates elected in the ordinary course. Those who had hitherto occupied the Presidential chair had been veterans that had grown grey in the service of the Congress. Can it, therefore, be merely conventional if one who is after all among the babes and sucklings of the Congress thanks you for such an unusual mark of your favour ?

The only consideration which could justify this favour was that, although my association with the Congress was recent, it was coupled with my association with one of the very greatest, if also one of the latest Congress-men, one whom all eyes

search in vain in this Pandal to-day. Ever since I first attended a session of the Congress as a delegate in 1919, his had been the one dominating personality. More than ever we need our great chief, Mahatma Gandhi, to-day; and if God has willed that in his place one of his humblest followers, though not the least loving among them, should assist you in your deliberations, I can only feel what the Arab poet felt when he wistfully wrote :

“The death of great ones made us great !”

But although the man who was most responsible for Mahatma Gandhi's incarceration hoped that by burying him alive, as he called it, he would kill the spirit that the Mahatma had infused into the nation, I feel certain that it lives just as surely as the Mahatma lives himself. Relying on God's assistance, and on your own kind indulgence, which, I think, I may with confidence bespeak, I invoke that spirit to-day, in the hope that with its aid I may prove not altogether unworthy of the high office to which your suffrage has all too generously called me.

Friends, the only one who can lead you is the one who had led you at Amritsar, at Calcutta, at Nagpur and at Ahmadabad, though each session of the Congress had its own elected President. Our generalissimo is to-day a prisoner of war in the hands of the enemy, and none can fill the void that his absence from our midst has caused. As for myself, I am but a comrade whom your loving kindness has called out from the ranks, and I plead for its continuance not only during the discussions of this session, but also throughout the year in which I am required by your constitution to assist you as your President.

THE FUNCTION OF THE PRESIDENT.

On one point, however, you too are entitled to an assurance from me, and I offer it to you without hesitation. I have been a fighter all my life, and, of course, I have been in the habit of throwing all the vehemence of an impulsive and impetuous nature into my fights. But your choice of me as your President has robbed me of my freedom, and to regain that freedom, if for nothing else, I would have willingly foregone the great privilege of presiding on this occasion. However, in the cast you have assigned to me the unfamiliar role of the peacemaker, and even a fighter like me has to confess that, if anything is better than a fight, it is peace. I have, therefore, deprived myself of the opportunity to fight in order to help the cause of peace and unity, and I do not regret the surrender. As your President I am here to serve you to the best of my power, and not in the capacity of a slave-driver, and if, in following the convention of political societies like yours, I have to inaugurate this session with an address, it is essentially in the spirit of a servant of yours that I do so, and not as a dictator. I am here to assist you to form judgments on the various issues that may come up for your decision, and, so far as it lies in the power of a fellow-worker and comrade of yours, I hope to help you to form only sound judgments, and to form them without waste of time, temper and energy. But these judgments must be yours, not mine; or, if you will, ours collectively in the truest sense. I have referred to the Mahatma's dominating personality, and we must admit how difficult it was to shake off his spell even for those rare individuals that desired to do so. I feel certain that Mahatma Gandhi neither asked, nor wanted anyone to surrender his judgment to him; and I have been told that just before his arrest he regretfully

realised that quite a number of his followers and admirers, who had readily, and in all sincerity, signified their agreement with him, had failed to realize that they were offering their allegiance only to the man, and were not accepting his measures as well on the strength of their own clear conviction. It will be an impertinence for me even to disclaim any such influence as the Mahatma undoubtedly exercised over the people, and I am anxious that every vote cast on any side should be the result of the voter's own deliberate judgment, carrying with it the fullest individual responsibility. As for myself, if I kept back from you my own view of any matter of vital importance merely for fear that it might not be acceptable to you, I shall certainly not be serving you truly. For another thing, it would not be consistent with true democracy. But we shall only be making a mockery of democracy if freedom was denied to the delegates of the Congress merely to please its President, or silence was imposed on the many just to secure the good-will of the few.

CONGRESS SESSION NOT DIVISION LOBBY.

Nevertheless, we have to understand that the country did not elect six thousand delegates, and we have not travelled to Cocanada from every corner of it as to division lobbies, merely to cast our votes, and to register our individual judgments already formed before we set out on our journey. What good could we do to ourselves and to others if, like Omar the Tent-Maker Poet of Persia, we "evermore came out by the same door where in we went"? If we do not wish to turn our journey into utter futility and so much labour lost, the opinions we had formed, individually or in groups, before we started, must be tested here by comparison with the opinions of our fellow-delegates

and influenced by them. And it is no shame, but, on the contrary, very often much to our credit, if we change our views in deference to the judgments of others whom we credit with greater sagacity or experience, or to the cumulative weight of the judgment of a large majority of people, although they be in no way superior to us as individuals, even though at the time itself we are not fully convinced that our own views are wrong. I am second to no man in my respect for deeply cherished convictions. But convictions are not on every occasion to be treated as matters of conscience, and I have the support here of Cromwell, one of the most conscientious statesmen known to history, who used to implore his fellow-workers to remember that it was possible they might be mistaken.

PLEA FOR SELF-RESTRAINT AND ACCOMMODATION.

Every delegate has the right to give expression to his views with perfect freedom, and to do so on as many questions as he likes. He has also the right to move as many resolutions as he pleases; to move amendments to as many resolutions proposed by others as he thinks fit; and to divide the house as frequently as he chooses. But no real work is possible if such rights are exercised without proper consideration for the opinion and convenience of others, and particularly without regard for the best interests of a distressed and distracted nation. Our great chief had often to deplore that the enthusiasm of our people in their assemblages lacked self-restraint and discipline, and, in truth, it was their innate peace-loving nature and their good humour that so often proved their saving grace. Self-restraint and discipline can be taught to the masses only by such leaders as the Congress delegates, and the self-restraint and discipline of the delegates

themselves is the best guarantee of the self-restraint and discipline of the masses. Above all, I trust that in giving expression to our views, no matter how strong, we shall avoid such partisanship as feeds on malice and revels in violent recriminations. Our great chief is noted throughout the world for his gospel of Non-Violence, and it would be a sad commentary on our allegiance to one who would not tolerate violence in thought or word towards an enemy if we excluded from our boasted Non-Violence our best friends. I would not for the world change popular enthusiasm into quietism or indifference. We need discipline, not death. We must have the necessary steam to propel the national machinery; but it must be under proper control. Closely allied to this is the principle of compromise and accommodation. Ours is nothing if not a war of principles, and we cannot afford to forsake principles even for the sake of peace. But short of that we are being called upon by the state of our nation to-day to make every sacrifice in order to accommodate those who are as staunch nationalists as ourselves, but who do not always see eye to eye with us. It is our particular distinction that our great chief has spiritualized politics, and we can no longer be content with a politics that is completely divorced from ethics. But in politics we may not always be able to secure the best. Life is one long second best, and there should be no bar against the second best if, by being content with it for the time being, we can carry large sections of the nation with us on the road to victory. Above all, let us not think of winning party victories when we have still to win the great victory of freedom against slavery, and of justice against a whole nation's wrongs. Forgive me, friends, for this homiletic preface, but I think I owed it to you as well as to myself. And now let us begin.

**THE MUSALMANS AND THE CONGRESS:
THE EFFECT OF THE MUTINY ON THE MUSALMANS**

I have referred to the fact that my association with the Congress is of very recent date; but this admission is not merely personal. It involves the political history of the community to which I belong, and if I give a brief outline of it to you, it is only for the purpose of elucidating a problem which is the most vital of all the problems we have to solve to-day. When, in 1885, some Indian leaders, assisted by their British sympathisers, founded the Indian National Congress, the Musalmans of India did not participate in the movement except in a few individual cases. If their lack of Western education made them unfit to take part in a movement essentially that of the classes educated according to Western notions, their political temper made them an element that was not unlikely to prove dangerous to any political movement. They had already lost the rule of India, but the tradition of that rule had survived. This had increased the aversion they had always felt for the new type of education. The rule of India had finally passed from Muslim into English hands by slow and hardly perceptible degrees in the hundred years that intervened between the battle of Plassey and the Indian Mutiny; but the Musalmans had not ceased to regard the new rulers of India as something very inferior to themselves in civilisation and culture. This storm of ill-will and disdain had been gathering force for a whole century, and was at last precipitated in 1857. The Mutiny began near Calcutta as an affair of the Indian army, but in the storm-centre of Delhi and of my own Province, where it had to be fought out if English rule was to continue in India, it soon attracted to itself many forms of discontent, and religion was inextricably mixed up with politics. Although

so many Musalmans had, at enormous risk to themselves, assisted the British at a time when hardly anyone could have predicted their eventual success with any degree of assurance, it was the Muslim aristocracy in those parts that suffered most from the terrible aftermath of the Mutiny. In fact, in its permanent results, even more than in some of its terrors, it could, without any great exaggeration, be compared to the social upheaval that the French Revolution meant to the old nobility of France. The remnants of Muslim aristocracy, deprived of all influence and of many of its possessions, certainly did not expect the return of Muslim rule. Nevertheless, a whole generation of Musalmans kept sullenly aloof from all contact with the culture of the new rulers of India which in their heart of hearts they still despised. They were in no mood to take advantage of the education provided by the Universities of Calcutta, Bombay and Madras, founded in the very year in which the Mutiny convulsed the regions which formed the political centre of Muslim India. It was a natural consequence of this attitude of Musalmans who sulked in their tents that when, nearly thirty years later, a new generation of Indians, who owed their education to the English, inaugurated a political movement on Western lines, Indian Musalmans should be unfit by lack of such education to participate in that movement. Nevertheless, the Congress which called itself "Indian" and "National" felt the need of Muslim participation, for it could not justify its title without it.

SYED AHMAD KHAN OPPOSES MUSLIM PARTICIPATION.

Efforts were therefore made early enough to enlist Musalmans as delegates. But at this juncture Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, the great pioneer of Western education among Musalmans,

stepped into the political arena, and in two historic speeches, one delivered at Lucknow on the 28th December, 1887, and the other at Meerut on the 16th March, 1888, decisively checked whatever signs the Musalmans had shown of political activity in support of the Congress movement. It is by no means a difficult task to criticise those speeches, for they contained many fallacies to which no politically-minded Musalman could subscribe to-day. But I am not one of those who declare, merely on the strength of some ill-advised expressions characteristic of so militant a controversialist as Syed Ahmad Khan, that he was opposed to the co-operation of Hindus and Musalmans.

THE TRUE NATURE AND MOTIVES OF HIS OPPOSITION.

Although his own public career after retirement from Public Service was identified with a movement for the uplift of his own community, he was a good Indian as well as a good Muslim, and many of his speeches prove him to have been an ardent patriot inspired with the love of Indian unity. And those who knew him personally can testify to the staunchness of his friendship with many Hindus, which could not have survived the narrow prejudices of which he has sometimes been accused.

No more true is the charge that he was opposed to Muslim participation in politics for all time. Whatever arguments he may have used in the two political utterances to which I have referred, to convince his Muslim hearers, there were two arguments, and two only, that had obviously convinced Syed Ahmad Khan himself of the undesirability of Muslim participation in the Congress at the time. He realised to the full that nothing would suit the temper of the

Musalmans of his day better than the vocation of critics of their British supplanters in the governance of India ; and he also realised that such a pursuit would be as dangerous to the continuance and progress of a peaceful political movement like the Congress as it was easy. This was the first argument that impelled Syed Ahmad Khan to keep his community under restraint in politics. The second argument was no less potent. Musalmans must educate themselves if they desired the uplift of their community, and yet it was no easy task to reconcile Musalmans to Western education even in an institution of their own, which unlike Government colleges and schools, would not divorce religious from secular learning. The easy pursuit of a policy in which the Muslims could act as destructive critics of the hated infidel Government was sure to offer superior attractions to the dull and drab constructive programme of the educationalist, and he therefore set himself to oppose all diversion of Muslim activities into the more attractive, but for the time being less useful, political channel. Reviewing the actions of a bygone generation to-day when it is easier to be wise after the event, I must confess I still think the attitude of Syed Ahmad Khan was eminently wise, and much as I wish that some things which he had said should have been left unsaid, I am constrained to admit that no well-wisher of Musalmans, nor of India as a whole, could have followed a very different course in leading the Musalmans.

Be it remembered that the man who enunciated this policy was not at the time a *persona grata* to the major portion of the community which he sought to lead. He was hated as a heretic because of the heterodoxy of his aggressive rationalism in interpreting the Holy Quran, and his militant opposition to popular superstitions believed in

by the bulk of the orthodox and to shackling customs consecrated by time, though wholly unauthorised by Islam. He was abused and vilified by hundreds of thousands of his co-religionists, and for long the college that he had founded at Aligarh was the *bête noire* of the pious Muslim. And yet the entire community followed his political lead without a murmur. Neither fallacious arguments nor even political clap-trap could have possessed such potency, and it is my firm belief that his advocacy succeeded mainly because of the soundness of the policy advocated.

For two decades thereafter the Musalmans had hardly any politics or any political institution worth the name. On important occasions when Syed Ahmad Khan, and, of course, his British supporters, thought that any demand of the Congress if satisfied would not be productive of good for the Musalmans, he would call together a few of his friends, mostly Trustees of the Aligarh College, who used to form a society bearing some such name as the "Muslim Defence Association," and a resolution of this body would be published in the *Pioneer* and in Syed Ahmad Khan's own local weekly newspaper in due course. That was all that the Musalmans would do in those days in the field of politics.

I am far from denying that Syed Ahmad Khan knew perfectly well that his policy was more than acceptable to his official supporters, who would have in all likelihood put every possible obstruction in the way of his college and his Educational Conference if he had followed another less acceptable to them. But a very close study of his character leads me to declare that he was far from possessing the sycophancy with which some of his political critics have

credited him. Indeed, even the opportunism of which his policy savoured could not have been entirely palatable to a nature so independent as his. In the year 1907, soon after the commencement of a new era in Muslim politics inaugurated by the foundation of the Muslim League, to which I shall presently refer, there occurred a strike of the students of Syed Ahmad Khan's College at Aligarh, owing to the support given against them by their own English Principal and Professors to the Police that had picked up a quarrel with one of them. Just about that time fell the anniversary of Syed Ahmad Khan's death celebrated annually in the College as the "Founder's Day." For that occasion I had written in Urdu an Ode addressed to the late Founder of my college, and referring to this unmistakable indication of the students' self-respect and of their willingness to make the necessary self-sacrifice demanded by the haughty disdain of the foreigner, I had said :

سکھا یا تھا تمہیں فی قوم کو بہ شور و شر سارا
جو اسکی انتہا م ہیں نو اسکی ابتدا تم ہو

(It is you that had taught the community all this "mischief"; if we are its culmination, you are its commencement).

"THE ARCH-REBEL."

That I am not alone in this estimate of Syed Ahmad Khan's character and policy will be proved by an interesting conversation that I shall relate. Once when my brother was still in the Public Service, an old English official asked him who he thought was the greatest rebel in India against British rule. And, correcting my brother's answer, that experienced official had declared that it was no other than Syed Ahmad Khan, loyalist of loyalists ! When my brother protested against

this astonishing judgment, he said: "Do you think young Musalmans who are being taught at Aligarh almost as well as our own boys at Harrow and Winchester, who live their lives and can beat them at their own games, would obsequiously serve them when they come out as Indian Civilians or members of such other superior services. No, Mr. Shaukat Ali, the days of British rule in India are numbered, and it is your loyal Syed Ahmad Khan that is the arch-rebel to-day!"

Like only too many of us, this British official too had failed to realise the paralysing effect of the education given in the colleges and schools established or favoured by this foreign Government, and had only foreseen the dissatisfaction and discontent that it must inevitably produce. With a Muslim University, chartered, aided and controlled by Government still flourishing at Aligarh, so far as the numbers of the teachers and the taught and a University Chest filled with the contributions of the rich are concerned, though robbed of all generous ideals and national and communal ambitions, and existing side by side with another, poor in everything save its ideals and its dreams, into which my old college had seemed to have transformed itself three years ago, I cannot boast that the "arch-rebel" of Aligarh has altogether succeeded in his "rebellious" endeavour. But it is my firm conviction that he had always aimed and intended to produce staunch Muslims and patriotic Indians even if he could not perhaps contemplate a near enough future for India in which his "young barbarians all at play," could be other than "loyal British subjects."

ALIGARH AND THE MUSLIM LEAGUE.

Nearly thirty years after the foundation of the Universities in the three Presidency towns of

India—a period which corresponds with the growth of a new generation—the Congress had inevitably come into existence. It was no easy task that Syed Ahmad Khan had accomplished in founding an Anglo-Oriental College of his own community within two decades of the Indian Mutiny in the very regions which had formed the storm-centre in 1857. In obedience, as it were, to a law of nature, once more nearly thirty years after the foundation of this College, there came into being a political institution of the Musalmans who had not availed themselves of the educational facilities provided by the State Universities, and could not consequently share in the political awakening which those Universities had indirectly brought about. And it is not without significance that fairly prominent among the founders of the Muslim League at Dacca at the end of 1906 were some alumni of Syed Ahmad Khan's own College.

This inaugurated a new era in the political life of the Indian Musalmans. Some months previously a Muslim Deputation had waited at Simla on the Viceroy, Lord Minto, to place before him and his Government a statement of the Muslim demands in connection with the Minto-Morley Reforms then foreshadowed. To follow the fashion of British journalists during the War, "there is no harm now in saying" that the Deputation's was a "command" performance ! It was clear that Government could no longer resist the demands of educated Indians, and, as usual, it was about to dole out to them a morsel that would keep them gagged for some years. Hitherto the Musalmans had acted very much like the Irish prisoner in the dock who, in reply to the judge's inquiry whether he had any counsel to represent him in the trial, had frankly replied that he had certainly not engaged counsel,

but that he had "friends in the jury"! But now the Muslims' "friends in the jury" had themselves privately urged that the accused should engage duly qualified counsel like all others. From whatever source the inspiration may have come, there is no doubt that the Muslim cause was this time properly advocated. In the common territorial electorates the Musalmans had certainly not succeeded in securing anything like adequate or real representation, and those who denounced and deplored the creation of separate electorates for which the Musalmans had pleaded should have remembered that separate electorates were the consequence, and *not* the cause, of the separation between Musalmans and their more numerous Hindu brethren.

SEPARATE ELECTORATES HASTEN INDIAN UNITY.

But little could the official supporters of the Muslim community have suspected at the time that, paradoxical as it may seem, the creation of separate electorates was hastening the advent of Hindu-Muslim unity. For the first time a real franchise, however restricted, was being offered to Indians, and if Hindus and Musalmans remained just as divided as they had hitherto been since the commencement of British rule, and often hostile to one another, mixed electorates would have provided the best battle-ground for inter-communal strifes, and would have still further widened the gulf separating the two communities. Each candidate for election would have appealed to his own community for votes, and would have based his claims for preference on the intensity of his ill-will towards the rival community, however disguised this may have been under some such formula as "the defence of his community's interests." Bad as this would have been, the results of an election in which

the two communities were not equally matched would have been even worse, for the community that failed to get its representative elected would have inevitably borne a yet deeper grudge against its successful rival. Divided as the two communities were, there was no chance for any political principles coming into prominence during the elections. The creation of separate electorates did a great deal to put a stop to this inter-communal warfare, though I am far from oblivious of the fact that when inter-communal jealousies are acute, the men that are more likely to be returned even from communal electorates are just those who are noted for their ill-will towards the rival community.

"UNITED FAITHS OF INDIA."

In the controversy that raged round the representation of Musalmans *as a community* I had taken my full share; but no sooner the Muslim claim had been recognised in practice in the elections to the enlarged councils in 1910, I decided to launch a weekly journal of my own from the seat of the Government of India in order to assist my community in taking its proper share in the political life of the country. I was particularly anxious to help it to understand that, while endeavouring to satisfy the pressing needs of the present, which would inevitably bring it now and then into conflict with other elements in the body-politic, it should never lose sight of the prospects of the future when ultimately all communal interests had to be adjusted so as to harmonise with the paramount interests of India.

I had long been convinced that here in this country of hundreds of millions of human beings, intensely attached to religion, and yet infinitely split up into communities, sects and denomina-

tions, Providence had created for us the mission of solving a unique problem and working out a new synthesis, which was nothing less than a Federation of Faiths ! As early as in 1904, when I had been only two years in India after my return from Oxford, I had given to this idea a clear, if still somewhat hesitating expression, in an address delivered at Ahmedabad on the "Proposed Mohamedan University." "Unless some new force."—this is what I had said on that occasion—"unless some new force, *other than the misleading unity of opposition*, unites this vast continent of India, it will either remain a geographical misnomer, or what I think it will ultimately do, become a Federation of Religions." I had noted the strength of the centrifugal force of Indian communities; and yet hope and faith and the deep yearning for freedom had even then made me realise the latent centripetal force of Indian unity. The lines of cleavage were too deeply marked to permit a unity other than federal; and yet, as I had observed in the address from which I have already quoted, the cleavage was not territorial or racial in character, but religious. For more than twenty years I have dreamed the dream of a federation, grander, nobler and infinitely more spiritual than the United States of America, and to-day when many a political Cassandra prophesies a return to the bad old days of Hindu-Muslim dissensions, I still dream that old dream of "United *Faiths* of India." It was in order to translate this dream into reality that I had launched my weekly newspaper, and had significantly called it *The Comrade*—"comrade of all and partisan of none."

Friends, is it so entirely out of place if I quote a little from the first words that I had contributed to the first issue of the *Comrade* ? In view of the political controversy that had been raging in India, I naturally shrank from relating my dream

when making my *début* before a sceptical, matter-of-fact world. And yet the dream was all the time there for those who did not despise dreams.

"We have no faith (I wrote on the 14th January, 1911,) in the cry that India is united. If India was united where was the need of dragging the venerable President of this year's Congress from a distant home? The bare imagination of a feast will not dull the edge of hunger. We have less faith still in the sanctimoniousness that transmutes in its subtle alchemy a rapacious monopoly into fervent patriotism.

"Even as poor birds deceiv'd with painted grapes
"Do surfeit by the eye, and pine the maw."

those of us who cannot distinguish true gold from the glitter of spurious coins, will one day surfeit by the ear and pine the heart. But the person we love best, fear the most, and trust the least is the impatient idealist. Goethe said of Byron that he was a prodigious poet, but that when he reflected he was a child. Well, we think no better and no worse of the man who combines great ideals and a greater impatience. So many efforts, well-meaning as well as ill-begotten, have failed in bringing unity to this distracted land, that we cannot spare even cheap and scentless flowers of sentiment for the grave of another ill-judged endeavour. We shall not make the mistake of gumming together pieces of broken glass, and then cry over the unsuccessful result, or blame the refractory material. In other words, we shall endeavour to face the situation boldly, and respect facts, howsoever ugly and ill-favoured. It is poor statesmanship to slur over inconvenient realities, and not the least important success in achieving unity is the honest and frank recognition of deep-seated prejudices that hinder it and the yawning differences that divide.

But while providing for to-day, we must not forget the morrow. It is our firm belief that if the Musalmans or the Hindus attempt to achieve success in opposition to, or even without the co-operation of one another, they will not only fail, but fail ignominiously. But every step has to be taken with caution. Nothing in history, ancient or modern, provides a useful analogy to the condition of modern India. History never repeats itself. But it is still the best educative force for mankind, and it has its lessons for us also. The problems of India are almost international. But when the statesmen and philanthropists of Europe,

with all its wars of interests and national jealousies, do not despair of abolishing war and placing Pax on the throne of Bellona, shall we despair of Indian nationality? We may not create to-day the patriotic fervour and the fine national frenzy of Japan with its forty millions of homogeneous people. But a concordat like that of Canada is not beyond the bounds of practicability. It may not be a love-marriage, born of romance and poetry. But a *marriage de convenance*, honourably contracted and honourably maintained, is not to be despised. Let us begin with honest prose, and the Muses will not forbid the banns. Even this is no easy task. But it is one worthy of the sons and daughters of India, and deserves their toil and self-sacrifice. O! Unity,

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

Friends, three years ago we were privileged to catch more than a fleeting glimpse of the unity of which I had dreamed, and if to-day we have to admit, as we must, that the dream has not been realised as fully as we wish, we shall have once more to examine the situation carefully and to face inconvenient facts with candour and with courage. I propose to do that presently, but not to break the thread of my narrative I revert to the situation as it existed at the time when I made my journalistic *début*.

MUSLIMS AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

As I had foreseen the separate electorates returned both Hindus and Musalmans who were not averse to combine in the various legislatures to support the popular cause. Nevertheless, inter-communal hostility did not altogether cease in the country. A new element was, however, unexpectedly added to the situation by the aggression of Western nations against Muslim States and its effect on Muslim sentiment in India, and although there are not wanting even

to-day staunch non-Muslim nationalists who look askance at Indian Muslim feeling with regard to Muslim affairs abroad, a little reflection would show that the new element to which I have referred, even while undoubtedly diverting the attention of Indian Musalmans to some extent from affairs at home, hastened Muslim disillusionment with regard to their traditional reliance on their foreign Government and thereby contributed greatly to Indian unity.

THE OUTLOOK IN 1911.

I had intended the *Comrade* to be the organ that was to voice the sentiments I entertained regarding the need of an inter-communal federation for India. It was to prepare the Musalmans to make their proper contribution to territorial patriotism without abating one jot of the fervour of their extra-territorial sympathies, which are, as you must know, part of the quintessence of Islam. When I first thought of launching on a career of journalism I did not expect that any but a small fraction of my attention and energies would be attracted by Muslim politics outside the confines of my own country. It is true that affairs in Egypt did not present a very re-assuring appearance; nor did the new Constitutions in Turkey and Persia receive, after an initial outburst of welcome, their full measure of sympathy which we in India felt to be due to such heroic and hazardous enterprises from England, the one European Power with which we had all along been exclusively concerned. The only other European Power on our political horizon had been Russia. So long as after the overthrow of France a hundred years previously she was the most considerable of the Powers on the continent of Europe, and had further aggravated that situation by aiming at being a yet greater Power on the

continent of Asia, everyone in India had been sedulously taught by the masters of India's destinies to regard her as the enemy of mankind, and to believe that it was the sacred mission of England to thwart and defeat her. But the the rapid rise of Japan and its signal success in defeating Russia in the Far East, while it encouraged other oriental nations to hold up their heads and to hope, so radically altered the position of Russia that, from being an inveterate enemy, she became a friend and in all but name an ally of England, even though it was her victorious adversary that had been, and still remained, the acknowledged and official ally of that nation. This speedily reacted on Eastern politics, not only in Persia, where Russia openly stood up as a high-handed dictator, and where it was soon to cause a hail-storm of ultimatums, but also in Turkey, where the rivalries of the Slav and the Teuton now re-appeared with added vehemence in the form of a struggle between Entente and Alliance. Once more had the Near East become the storm-centre of European politics.

All this was no doubt disquieting enough to Indian Musalmans who had been brought up from their childhood to regard England as the friend and Russia as the enemy of Muslim States. But the political controversies of Hindus and Musalmans appeared none the less to be their immediate concern in India. The passions that these inter-communal differences had unfortunately aroused just a little previously had lent to them the semblance of acute international conflict, while Turkey and Persia still seemed comparatively remote.

But things did not proceed precisely in the way in which I had so optimistically forecasted. The year 1911 proved a fateful year for Muslim states. The new Governments of Turkey, Persia

and Morocco all began to meet with squalls in their initial voyage of reform and progress; which soon developed into regular storms.

THE DURBAR ANNOUNCEMENT.

In India, too, the year proved more fateful for Musalmans than anyone could have predicted. Just before the close of the year the King-Emperor made a portentous Announcement at Delhi where he had come ostensibly to announce in person in an Imperial Durbar only the event of his coronation that year. It was admittedly an "abrupt departure from the tradition of British Government and a complete dislocation of official habits." But this unusual procedure, and the secrecy which had been maintained, not only at the expense of India but also at that of the Local Governments, were justified on the ground that the Imperial Announcement was "one of the most weighty decisions ever taken since the establishment of the British rule in India", and that the discussion of measures which were being taken in consequence of an agitation that indicated "bitterness of feeling", and was at the same time "very widespread and unyielding", would have in its turn caused endless agitation. As we all know, the Announcement comprised a re-adjustment of territories upsetting Lord Curzon's vindictive Partition of Bengal and the creation of the new Province of Behar and Orissa after the re-union of Bengal, East and West. It also indirectly penalised Bengal by shifting the capital to Delhi. As I wrote in the *Comrade* at the time, I was in favour of both these schemes, "taking each by itself as wholly unconnected schemes", and "irrespective of the time, place and procedure preferred by the Government of India for the Announcement." The Partition in the form then approved was due in 1905, and the transfer

of the capital was needed in 1858. Lords Curzon and Midleton had sinned in a hurry, and it would have seemed that Lords Hardinge and Crewe were repenting at leisure. But it was clear from the King-Emperor's Announcement as well as from the despatches of the Government of India and the Secretary of State, that "the key-stone of the whole project" was the "proposal to make Delhi the future capital of India"; that it was only "as a consequence of the transfer" that the Partition was modified; that the Bengalis were expected to be "reconciled to the change" of capital by "*other features of the scheme which were specially designed to give satisfaction to Bengali sentiment*"; and that the re-union of the two Bengals was no more than "the compensation which will be offered to Bengali sentiment" for "the objections to the transfer which are likely to be entertained in some quarters." There was not a word in the Government of India's Despatch about such things as the financial embarrassment of the administration in Eastern Bengal, the unsatisfactory results of yoking Assam with a part of Bengal, or the difficulties of communication between the Rajshahi Division and Dacca, all of which could have been utilized to justify the unsettlement of a "settled fact." The Partition of 1905 was indeed acknowledged in that Despatch to have fulfilled "two of the chief purposes which its authors had in view". "It relieved", so ran the Despatch, "the over-burdened administration of Bengal, and it gave the Mohameden population of Eastern Bengal advantages and opportunities of which they had, perhaps, hitherto not had their fair share." But Bengal had to be deprived of the distinction of claiming the capital of India as its own capital as well, and of the opportunities it had thus enjoyed of criticising the Government of India and subjecting it to constant pressure from such close

quarters. We had already been familiarised, to the extent of feeling downright moral contempt for it, with the Doctrine of Compensation in the foreign politics of Europe, according to which Morocco had been given to France for the sake of a free hand for the English in Egypt, and Tripoli had been all but given to Italy, while Germany had made her famous *Panther* leap at Agadir. This fatal doctrine had now peacefully penetrated into the internal administration of India. "Eastern Bengal and Assam," wrote the Government of India, "have no doubt benefitted greatly by the Partition, and the Mohamedans of the province, who form a large majority of the population, are loyal and contented; but the resentment among the Bengalis in both the provinces of Bengal, who hold most of the land, fill the professions and exercise a preponderating influence in public affairs, is as strong as ever." As I wrote on that occasion, "what could be easier than to politely disburden the loyal and contented Peter of his few worldly belongings in order to load the discontented, if not disloyal, Paul with rewards and compensation? The Musalmans have no *Panther* to send to Agadir, and it is too well-established a rule of diplomacy that: no *Panther*, no compensation!"

ITS REACTION ON MUSLIM POLITICS.

While I declared in the *Comrade* that "in our judgment the Musalmans should accept the decision of the Government," I could not but say that they had deserved a better fate. Before the Partition they had laboured under many difficulties and had endured everything quietly as only the weak can endure. It was not they that had clamoured and agitated for the Partition. Nevertheless, the Partition came to them as a well-deserved though wholly unexpected blessing. Their condi-

tion had begun to improve, and with that their ambitions and hopes. It may even be confessed that, like all *nouveaux riches*, these political *parvenus* sometimes held their heads too high and strutted about in the peacock manner. But, like the exaltation born of a draught of haschish, it did not last long, and the reaction came with a suddenness and a force that were terrible. The emancipated slaves were, so to speak, once more sold into bondage; and who does not know that revenge is sweet? Their old masters could have been excused if on being placed once more in the position of the slave-driver they had used the lash and the bastinado a little too lavishly. The Musalmans of Eastern Bengal had been made to fight the battle of their rulers, against their neighbours, and now that it was no longer convenient for the rulers to continue the fight, they had made their own peace with all convenient speed, and had left the Musalmans to the mercy of those against whom they had been used as auxiliaries. It would be hard to discover in history a more ignoble instance of betrayal in which "loyalty" has been rewarded with deprivation of recently recovered rights, and "contentment" has been punished as the worst of crimes. Perhaps I may mention without any indiscretion that, when immediately after the Announcement I drove over in haste to interview Sir Charles Bayley, the head of the Local Government now thrown on the scrap-heap, I met Lord Sinha and Sir Benode Mitter, who asked me what I thought of the Announcement. I told them that in the case of the Hindus of Bengal the Announcement had been a matter of "give-and-take," that for "sturdy, loyal" Beharis it had been one of "take" only, but that for the Musalmans of Eastern Bengal it had been one of nothing but "give," and as a reward for their loyalty and contentment they had been given a generous helping of humble pie. And then I walked off with the

mumbled prayer that they might be spared too acute an attack of indigestion ! In the Durbar itself a little earlier I remember that I had been accosted by my old friend Sir Charles Cleveland, Director of the Criminal Intelligence Department, as I was hastily perusing the Announcement. As it happened, I was among the very first in the Press Camp to receive a copy of it from the hands of the official who was distributing them. Sir Charles had humorously asked me if there was anything in the Announcement for me or for him, and I had replied with ill-suppressed bitterness that there was nothing for me, but that there was plenty of work for him. And who can say that my prophecy has not proved true ?

Friends, I have gone into this matter at considerable length only because the Announcement has always appeared to me to be a very distinct land-mark in the political progress of the Musalmans. Nothing could have more clearly convinced them that their dependence upon a foreign government for support against sister communities laid them perpetually open to such betrayals. They now realised that they could place no reliance on such support, whether at home or abroad, and it set them thinking that perhaps at a much smaller sacrifice of their interests they could purchase lasting peace and even secure the friendship of their neighbours and fellow-countrymen.

SELF-GOVERNMENT AS THE MUSLIM LEAGUE'S CREED.

The Muslim League, although never an anti-Hindu or anti-Congress organisation, had at its birth in the very midst of the Partition agitation, naturally emphasised in its creed the protection of communal interests and loyalty to Government, even though it had also included therein the promotion of harmony and concord with

sister-communities. A year after the Durbar Announcement, the Council of the League recommended a change in the creed, and it emphasised in the new creed that it recommended "Self-government suitable for India" as its ideal. In commenting upon this change, which was eventually accepted by the League in its annual session in the following March, I had stated that for the Musalmans their new political creed was but "the half-way house from which their ultimate destination was clearly visible," and I do not think I can do better in helping you to form a just estimate of our position to-day than quote from the *Comrade* of that date the following passage which I would ask all Nationalists, whether Muslim or non-Muslim, to consider carefully:

But it is not so much on the reform of the administration by the administrators and those to whom they are responsible, nor even on the relationship that comes to exist between the ruler and the ruled that the attainment of self-government depends. Self-government is the necessary corollary of self-realisation, and India as a whole has not yet realised herself. Once her conflicting interests, warring creeds and rival communities not only conceive that India can be one in her soul as she is in her body, but feel her unity as an individual feels the unity of his individual self in spite of the diversity of the various members and organs of his body, and the varying moods of his intellect and soul, there is no power in the world that can deny her self-government. But we would warn our countrymen against playing the sedulous ape in their methods of nation-making as we have warned them in the matter of their choosing their political goal.....In India political unity can be achieved not so much by annihilating smaller units that may appear to conflict with the ultimate scheme of unity, but by recognising their force and inevitableness. If we could choose a motto for a society of nation-makers in India, we could suggest nothing better than what the United States of America have adopted. India is to be a *pluribus unum*.

MUSALMANS AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

In foreign affairs the year 1912 had opened

with far different prospects from those of 1911. Up to the last, Indian Musalmans had entertained the hope that things would right themselves. But this did not happen, and the year ended even worse than it had begun. The sad disillusionment with regard to international morality for which the shameless brigandage of Italy in Tripoli was responsible had greatly affected the Musalmans in the autumn of 1911. If any further disillusionment was needed it was supplied by the action of Russia in Persia and Britain's "sanctimonious acquiescence." In both cases the utmost brutality characterised European aggression. Who can forget the massacres in the Tripoli Oasis or the celebration in Persia of the New Year, which coincided with the anniversary of the Tragedy of Kerbala, when, among others, the Siqat-ul-Islam, the highest ecclesiastic of Northern Persia—"a man universally respected alike for his learning, his piety and his tolerance"—was hanged by the Russians. If anything could surpass these things in the anguish they caused to Muslim minds, it was the threatened aeroplane attack on the Holy Ka'ba by Italy and the actual bombardment of Holy Meshad by Russia which followed them. Truly did Mr. Shuster declare at a banquet given in his honour by the Persia Committee in London on his visit there after his expulsion from Persia: "I am not bitter about my own experience, but I should be a hypocrite if I pretended not to sympathise with the bitterness of the Mohamedan people who have so forcibly learned the lesson that the Ten Commandments do not apply to international politics. Let anyone who doubts this review the events of the past year." These bitter experiences were destined to be followed by those still more bitter in 1912 in the autumn of which broke out the Balkan War, which at one time threatened to expel the Turks from Europe after nearly five hundred years.

REACTION ON MUSLIM FEELING IN INDIA.

The attitude of England towards the enemies of Turkey, Persia and Morocco had begun to alienate the sympathies of Indian Musalmans from England ever since 1911 ; and this estrangement could not but react on their relations with the British officials here, who, in spite of their detestation of the Radical politicians in power in England, could not help looking askance at Indians daring to criticise an English Government with a candour and a courage unusual in a subject race. The *Comrade* case, which for the first time brought home to Indians the power of the now defunct Press Act for evil, was concerned, as many of you may still remember, with the forfeiture of a pamphlet received from the Turks. In this they had only appealed to England for Christian succour against the Balkan Allies whose Macedonian atrocities were therein depicted. While this litigation was going on, the fatal developments following on the demolition of part of a small mosque at Cawnpore embittered Muslim feeling still further. In consequence of all this I had proceeded to England, in company with the then Secretary of the Muslim League, to appeal to the British Government and persuade it to alter a policy, Indian as well as foreign, that seemed to bode no good to anybody, and which was sure to drive the Muslims to despair. In this we partly succeeded ; but within a year events of far greater magnitude occurred in which the entire world was involved. The War and the events leading to the participation of Turkey not on the same side as England undid all the good that we had expected to follow the friendly Deputation of Indian Musalmans which we had taken to wait on Lord Hardinge earlier in the year, and which had been received by the Viceroy with every show of good-will.

OUTBREAK OF WAR AND MUSLIM FEELING IN INDIA.

When the war with Germany broke out, I think I fairly represented the feeling of educated and responsible Indian Musalmans who were too self-respecting to play the sycophant when I wrote in the *Comrade* of the 12th August 1914, as follows:—

There are still some sane people among Indians themselves, and though they do not advertise the offer of their personal services to the Government, whatever influence they possess with the people would be used to decrease rather than increase the Government's embarrassment. They could offer no better guarantee than this that they regard India's connection with Great Britain as, at the present stage of India's growth, indispensable; and we are sure that the less lofty motive of self-interest would wear better and stand the strain of circumstances longer than the lip-loyalty of Ji-Huzurs.

Whether Great Britain has respected Muslim Indian feeling in her dealings with Turkey, Persia, Morocco, or not; whether the utterances of His Majesty's Ministers regarding the Turks in their life and death struggle during the last war have been just and consistent, or unjust and inconsistent; whether their action following two breaches of treaty obligations, by Austria in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and by Italy in the Tripolitaine, have tallied or not with the recent public proclamation of their sense of the sacredness of treaties; whether their conscience has revolted or not at the slaughter of babes and sucklings, unprotected womanhood and bed-ridden age in Tripoli and the Balkans; whether the white Colonials' treatment of their coloured fellow-citizens of the same Empire has been fair or otherwise; whether the Home Government has exerted its full pressure on the Colonials to right the wrong, or has only assumed an incredible impotence; whether Indians' claims for an equitable adjustment of rights and duties and for a fair share in guiding the destinies of their own country have been met by the British Bureaucracy in the spirit of friendliness, or of jealousy and rancour; whether in the annulment of the Partition of Bengal the Musalmans were treated with due consideration for their loyalty, or it was underrated and their contentment taken too much for granted; whether the sanctity of their places of worship and the integrity

of their graveyards have been uniformly respected, or sometimes lightly sacrificed to the Moloch of Prestige—we say that, irrespective of any or all these considerations, or rather because we have carefully weighed them all against the one supreme consideration, our need of England and her tutelage at the present stage of our national and communal growth, and found her good exceeding by a great deal her evil, we shall remain loyal to her as only freemen can remain loyal, with a sincere devotion and an unbought submission, and this whether she crushes the naval power of Germany and becomes a dictator to Europe, or the last ship of her mighty Armada sinks in the North Sea and her last soldier falls down and dies round Liège or London... Even if England may not need us, we have need of her. Believing in political purity rather than in political prudery, we have entered the lists with her biggest bureaucrats in India in time of peace. But in time of war the clash of steel in civic battles must cease and the voice of controversy must be hushed, and if we cannot hastily command in others an enthusiasm for this war which we ourselves do not feel, let us once and for all assure the Government that, so far as we and those within the orbit of our influence are concerned, they can sleep in peace. Let alone Provincial satraps and the still greater despots of their districts, their meanest, if not their humblest, policeman will find us at his beck and call whenever civic excitement has to be allayed. More than this we cannot proclaim. Less than this we shall not confess. This is and has always been our creed and to that we shall adhere.

Friends, I fear, I must have exhausted your patience with these long quotations from the *Comrade*, but I feel certain of your indulgence if you would only consider the object I have in view. This long narration is intended to show to the world how different were the feelings of Indian Musalmans towards this Government until quite recent times, and what patience we had shown in the face of injustice, indifference and continued callousness.

TURKEY AND INDIAN MUSLIM FEELING.

At the suggestion of Government, and through

its own medium, I had even cabled, along with my friend Dr. Ansari, to the late lamented Talaat Pasha urging the Turks to think a thousand times before they participated in the War. And even when war was being forced on Turkey by ill-advised threats such as those of the *London Times*, my very long, well-known and in the English Press extensively quoted and highly approved article, in reply to that of the *Times*, on the "Choice of the Turks," had shown to what lengths Indian Musalmans were then prepared to go in assisting their foreign Government.

I shall only quote to you the final conclusion at which after very careful and detailed reasoning I had myself arrived in that article, and which I had recommended to the Musalmans for adoption as the policy of the community :

All truly loyal people (I wrote) have closed the chapter of civic controversy with the officials and into that book they are likely to look no more. Whatever our grievances, whatever reforms we desire, everything must wait for a more seasonable occasion. Even if the Government were to concede to us all that we ever desired or dream; if, for instance the Muslim University were offered to us on our own terms, or the Press Act repeal were to be announced ; or even if Self-Government were to be conceded to us, we would humbly tell Government this is no time for it, and we must for the present decline such concessions with thanks. Concessions are asked for and accepted in peace. We are not Russian Poles. We need no bribes !

A conclusion such as this had recommended itself even to the Calcutta correspondent of the *Morning Post*. And yet it was for publishing this very article that I forfeited the security of the *Comrade Press* and had in consequence to discontinue that paper. It was then that a distinguished weekly journal of England, *The New Statesman*, severely criticised the Government of India in a leading article sarcastically

of their graveyards have been uniformly respected, or sometimes lightly sacrificed to the Moloch of Prestige—we say that, irrespective of any or all these considerations, or rather because we have carefully weighed them all against the one supreme consideration, our need of England and her tutelage at the present stage of our national and communal growth, and found her good exceeding by a great deal her evil, we shall remain loyal to her as only freemen can remain loyal, with a sincere devotion and an unbought submission, and this whether she crushes the naval power of Germany and becomes a dictator to Europe, or the last ship of her mighty Armada sinks in the North Sea and her last soldier falls down and dies round Liège or London... Even if England may not need us, we have need of her. Believing in political purity rather than in political prudery, we have entered the lists with her biggest bureaucrats in India in time of peace. But in time of war the clash of steel in civic battles must cease and the voice of controversy must be hushed, and if we cannot hastily command in others an enthusiasm for this war which we ourselves do not feel, let us once and for all assure the Government that, so far as we and those within the orbit of our influence are concerned, they can sleep in peace. Let alone Provincial satraps and the still greater despots of their districts, their meanest, if not their humblest, policeman will find us at his beck and call whenever civic excitement has to be allayed. More than this we cannot proclaim. Less than this we shall not confess. This is and has always been our creed and to that we shall adhere.

Friends, I fear, I must have exhausted your patience with these long quotations from the *Comrade*, but I feel certain of your indulgence if you would only consider the object I have in view. This long narration is intended to show to the world how different were the feelings of Indian Musalmans towards this Government until quite recent times, and what patience we had shown in the face of injustice, indifference and continued callousness.

TURKEY AND INDIAN MUSLIM FEELING.

At the suggestion of Government, and through

its own medium, I had even cabled, along with my friend Dr. Ansari, to the late lamented Talaat Pasha urging the Turks to think a thousand times before they participated in the War. And even when war was being forced on Turkey by ill-advised threats such as those of the *London Times*, my very long, well-known and in the English Press extensively quoted and highly approved article, in reply to that of the *Times*, on the "Choice of the Turks," had shown to what lengths Indian Musalmans were then prepared to go in assisting their foreign Government.

I shall only quote to you the final conclusion at which after very careful and detailed reasoning I had myself arrived in that article, and which I had recommended to the Musalmans for adoption as the policy of the community :

All truly loyal people (I wrote) have closed the chapter of civic controversy with the officials and into that book they are likely to look no more. Whatever our grievances, whatever reforms we desire, everything must wait for a more seasonable occasion. Even if the Government were to concede to us all that we ever desired or dream; if, for instance the Muslim University were offered to us on our own terms, or the Press Act repeal were to be announced ; or even if Self-Government were to be conceded to us, we would humbly tell Government this is no time for it, and we must for the present decline such concessions with thanks. Concessions are asked for and accepted in peace. We are not Russian Poles. We need no bribes !

A conclusion such as this had recommended itself even to the Calcutta correspondent of the *Morning Post*. And yet it was for publishing this very article that I forfeited the security of the *Comrade* Press and had in consequence to discontinue that paper. It was then that a distinguished weekly journal of England, *The New Statesman*, severely criticised the Government of India in a leading article sarcastically

headed "Encouraging Loyalty in India"! And when the war with Turkey actually broke out, a representative of the Associated Press and Reuter interviewed me at Delhi and subsequently informed me that the interview was much appreciated by the Viceroy who had seen it before publication. I had predicted in the previous article that even if war broke out with the Turks the anchor of the Indian Musalmans' loyalty would hold, and now that war had broken out I repeated that the anchor still held. I asked them to commend their souls to God and to place their services at the disposal of the Government for the preservation of peace and tranquility in India. I compared their position to that of the children of parents who had quarrelled with one another. "Right may be on one side or the other, but the sorrow and suffering are in any case those of the children."

THE LIMITS OF MUSLIM "LOYALTY."

In this interview, as also in the last leading article the *Comrade* was permitted to publish before it closed its doors it was clearly indicated that Musalmans were placing implicit reliance on the solemn pledges given by the British Government and Britain's Allies with regard to their faith and the Holy Places of Islam. I had distinctly pointed out that *Arabia must not be attacked nor must the protection of Islam's Holy Places by a really independent Muslim Power be endangered*. This was the least to which Indian Musalmans were entitled unless their religion was required by their non-Muslim Government to be a matter of no consequence to them as compared with their "loyalty" to that Government. I may add that I had concluded my interview with the statement that the Muslims could be trusted to act on the

precept of Jesus Christ, to render unto Cæsar what is due to Cæsar. But I was informed by the distinguished journalist who had recorded the interview that the Censor of Press telegrams, who was no doubt a good Christian, while passing the rest of the message, had carefully scored out the exhortation of Jesus Christ. No doubt that astute official, who believed in the supremacy of the State over the Church, thought that if the Muslims were reminded of their duty to render unto Cæsar what was due to Cæsar, they might perchance remember the accompanying exhortation also to render unto God what was due to God!

DEFIANCE OF MUSLIM RELIGION AND DISREGARD OF MUSLIM RIGHTS.

This was precisely what happened before very long, and the history of our betrayal is too recent to be repeated in any detail. During the War Musalmans were required, in defiance of their religious obligations, to assist Government in waging war against the Khalifa and those engaged in Jihad. The Jazirat-ul-Arab, which includes Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia, and which Musalmans were required by their faith at all times to keep free from non-Muslim occupation and control, was attacked and occupied by Great Britain and her Allies, and is still under their control in defiance of their Prophet's well-known testamentary injunction. The Holy Places of Islam, *which are not particular buildings merely, but territories*, including the three Sacred Harams of Mecca, Medina and Jerusalem, have been filched from the Successor of the Prophet and Commander of the Faithful, who is their only accredited Servant and Warden, and even to-day he is not permitted to occupy, defend and serve them. The dismemberment of the Empire of the Khalifa; the appointment of non-Muslim Mandatories

to control various portions of it; and the consequent weakening of the temporal power of Islam to the point of danger to its spiritual influence, through the possible pressure of the temporal power of rival creeds, were openly advocated by the Allies, and none of them insisted upon this course so relentlessly up to the last as Great Britain in herself. As we all know, Greece was her own brutal nominee and agent in the execution of this policy even after the armistice in defiance of all laws of peace or war, and howsoever much the other Allies also may have resisted Ismet Pasha at Lausanne, it was Great Britain herself that was the chief obstacle in the path of Ghazi Mustafa Kemal Pasha to the very end of this tragic tale. Discrimination was made against Muslim governments and populations in various other ways also, such as by the denial of self-determination to the Muslim populations of territories forcibly annexed or occupied and controlled by non-Muslim Powers. While all this was going on, Indian Muslim opinion, unrepresented at the Peace Conference, and represented before the Allies themselves only by unrepresentative Musalmans, was vigorously suppressed in India by means of those well-known engines of tyranny and terrorism, the Press Act, the Defence of India Act, Regulation III of 1818 and, finally, the declaration of Martial Law in parts of India, over and above the abuse of the ordinary penal law of the land.

THE TIME WAS RIPE FOR RE-UNION.

I have already declared it as my view that the bitter experience of ill-will against the Muslim States and populations abroad hastened the conversion of the Musalmans to the view that to rely on this foreign and non-Muslim Government for support and sympathy, even after making every conceivable sacrifice for its sake, was futile, and

that if they were in need of support and sympathy they must have a lasting, equitable settlement with the sister communities of India. The same course was clearly indicated by the betrayal of the Musalmans of Eastern Bengal. And the time too was ripe for a Hindu-Muslim re-union. True partnership and association, whether in business, social relationship or in love, requires that there should be no great disparity between those that are to associate together as partners, friends or lovers. The same is true of politics. Union of the rich and the poor, of the old and the young, of the learned and the ignorant, is perhaps possible but far from common; and it was a true instinct that guided Syed Ahmad Khan in opposing, a generation previously, the yoking together of the strong and the weak. During the controversy with regard to the Minto-Morley Reforms, however Musalmans had developed to some extent the quality of self-assertion so necessary in politics. But ever since the outbreak of the Tripolitan war they had had to struggle against the repressive policy of the Government, and it is not with a view to praise my own community that I say it has now to a considerable extent made up the distance between itself and the more advanced communities of India by dint of forced marches which it had to undertake throughout this momentous period.

THE RAPPROCHEMENT.

It was at my brother's suggestion and my own during our internment that in 1915 the Muslim League held its annual session at Bombay where the Congress was also to meet. Maulana Mazhar-ul-Haque, the veteran Congressman, who was nevertheless one of the founders of the Muslim League, and who had valiantly stuck to the Congress all these years in spite of the fact that the bulk of his community was still following

the lead of Syed Ahmad Khan given thirty years ago, was now elected President of the Muslim League with great *éclat*. He was called upon to execute the mandate of his own community and bring about a joint meeting of the political leaders in the camps of the League and the Congress in order to adjust the future political relations of the various communities concerned. Mr. Jinnah's persuasive advocacy was added to the vigour of the President, and, last but not least, the audacious courage and vehement perseverance of that intrepid Muslim patriot, Maulana Hasrat Mohani, brought about the *rapprochement* which was to bear fruit in the following year in the historic Lucknow Compact. So rapid had been the progress of the Musalmans that a mildewed critic from among their own community observed that Lord Sinha, the Bengali President of the Bombay Session of the Indian National Congress, had travelled thither by the same train as his Behari neighbour and brother-lawyer who presided over the Muslim League; and the two had borrowed one another's Presidential Addresses in order to compare notes. But, said the critic with more wit than wisdom, the two Presidents forgot to take back their own productions, and by an irony of fate Maulana Mazhar-ul-Haque had read to his Muslim audience as his own the pungent oration characteristic of the Bengali, and Lord Sinha had done likewise and read to the Congress delegates the cautious and halting address of the "ever-loyal" Muslim.

Government had now come to realise what would be the inevitable result of the Bombay *rapprochement*, and it is a matter of history how the Muslim Leaguers were compelled to conclude *in camera* the session begun under such auspices. Thenceforward, the Congress

and the 'Muslim' League always met for their annual sessions at the same centre and worked in entire co-operation. The result was inevitable and could well have been foreseen. If the Congress President of the Ahmedabad Session was lodged in the Alipore gaol when he should have been occupying the Presidential chair at Ahmedabad, the President of the Muslim League for the same year was indicted for waging war against the King at Ahmedabad itself on account of his Presidential address, and, even when acquitted by the unanimous verdict of the jury on that charge, was consigned to the Ahmedabad gaol after being convicted of sedition. It is a feather in the Muslim cap that while Sriji Das has brilliantly led the Swarajists to victory in Bengal and elsewhere, his Muslim *confrère* Maulana Hasrat Mohani is now sharing the honours of Yerrowda gaol with Mahatma Gandhi, having in the meantime more than doubled his original sentence, in spite of the restricted opportunities for indulging in criminal practices that a prisoner's life affords, and has thus corrected the error of a blundering jury!

MUSLIM REALIZATION OF LARGER INDIAN INTERESTS.

But it was not only a case of safeguarding Muslim communal interests without leaning for support eternally on a foreign Government and harbouring suspicions against sister communities. Musalmans would have been more than human, or less than that if they had been indifferent to the continued injustice done to India and Indians collectively. Having been taught by their political preceptors in the past that Government could never for long leave a wrong unredressed, they had followed the policy of "wait and see". They had waited long, and yet all that they saw was a series of wrongs done to India—wrongs which remained

unrepented and unredressed. Their patience was at last giving way and they were beginning to enlist as Congress members in annually increasing numbers. This was a hopeful indication of their realizing that they had to protect not only their comparatively petty communal interests but also the larger Indian national interests, which were a surely theirs to protect as those of sister communities. They now realized more than ever that by being Muslims they could not cease to be Indians. The Congress sessions of Calcutta, Bombay and Delhi had progressively justified the National appellation of the Congress. But it was reserved for General Dyer to break down entirely the barrier that Sir Syed Ahmad Khan had for temporary purposes erected more than thirty years previously, and to summon the Musalmans of India to the Congress held at Amritsar in 1919 as the unsuspecting Herald of India's Nationhood. The bullets of his soldiery made no distinction between Hindu and Muslim, and clearly Providence had so designed things that a community even more loyal than the Musalmans, namely our brave Sikh brothers, should also dye the sacred soil of their religious capital at Amritsar with their own blood along with that of Hindu and Muslim martyrs.

THE COMING OF THE MAHATMA.

Much of the suffering undergone at Jallianwalla Bagh was, however, of a passive character, not invited nor cheerfully borne, and the terror that the proceedings of the administrators of Martial Law had created seemed at one time to have paralysed the people of the Punjab soon after they had discovered their national identity through common suffering. But the Punjab was not left to sorrow alone. More than one patriotic Indian proceeded to the Punjab; but I feel confident they themselves

would be the first to admit that I do them no injustice when I declare that the most historic event that took place during those eventful days was the "Coming of the Mahatma ! "

The Mahatma's story is too well-known to you all, and now happily to a good many well-informed people outside India also, for me to recapitulate it here. His experiences in South Africa had taught him that it was idle to expect justice for Indians overseas unless justice was done to Indians at home and India secured a government of her own. This, of course, did not mean that the British connection must necessarily be broken; and even to-day not only he, whose forbearance is proverbial, but also followers of his like myself who cannot pretend to be equally forbearing, believe in spite of the bitter experiences of the last few years, that the truest Swaraj for India is not incompatible with the British connection if the British nation and the British Government only undergo a change of heart and make a *pryaschit* for the past. It was no doubt to deliver India from her bonds, spiritual no less than political, that the Mahatma had returned to the Motherland.

But the methods that he himself believed in and inculcated to his fellow-countrymen were not those that would be called "political" in the politics-ridden West. To him, as to all great teachers of mankind, Life was a single synthesis, however much we might analyse it for the convenience of philosophical study, and there was no direct antithesis between the political and the spiritual.

JESUS AND ISRAEL : A PARALLEL SITUATION.

Many have compared the Mahatma's teachings, and latterly his personal sufferings, to those of Jesus (on whom be peace); but the analogy

goes farther than many have yet realised. Jesus was a Jew, and those who lovingly followed him acclaimed him as the Messiah of the House of David who had come to restore to the Israelites their long lost independence and power. Just as the "Tragedy of History" had been illustrated by the doom required by long-gathering guilt in the case of the Ten Tribes of the kingdom of Samaria, who were crushed and practically annihilated or dispersed by Assyria more than seven hundred years before the birth of Jesus, so was it illustrated again a century and a quarter later in the case of their no less guilty brothers of Judah when Nebuchadnezzar, the Babylonian, destroyed the Temple of Solomon, razed Jerusalem to the ground, and, making the Jews his captives, carried them into exile.

Ever since then the Israelites had dreamt dreams of revenge and restoration, and the victory of Cyrus seemed at one time to realise all that had been hoped. The re-building of the Temple had commenced, and after a temporary suspension resumed. Zerubbabel, who was of the line of David, was the hope of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah the son of Iddo, who looked forward to the political regeneration of the Jews, consequent on the overthrow and destruction of "the kingdoms of the nations." The line of David was hoped to be restored in the person of Zerubbabel himself, and the Messianic predictions of earlier prophets thus fulfilled. This prediction was, however, not fulfilled at the time, and whatever became of Zerubbabel, who disappears with the coronation scene in Zechariah, he never wore a real crown nor sat upon the throne of his fathers.

Israel was destined never more to taste the sweets of independence; but, whether under the

yoke of Greeks or of Romans, Israel never lost the hope of restoration. "The triumphal and often cruel entry of Greek and Roman civilization into Asia threw it back upon its dreams. More than ever it invoked the Messiah as judge and avenger of the people. A complete renovation, a revolution which would shake the world to its very foundations, was necessary in order to satisfy the enormous thirst for vengeance excited in it by the sense of its superiority and by the sight of its humiliation." (Rénan).

Herod the Great who had contrived to secure some semblance of independence from Rome had died about the year in which Jesus was born, and "his three sons were only lieutenants of Romans, analogous to the Rajas of India under the English dominion" (Rénan). When during the childhood of Jesus, Archelaus, its ethnarch, was deposed by Augustus, the last trace of self-government was lost to Jerusalem. Judea was thenceforward part of a dependency of the province of Syria, which was governed by an imperial legate. A series of Roman procurators, subordinate in important matters to the imperial legate of Syria, of whom Pontius Pilate is so well-known to Christian history, were constantly occupied in extinguishing the volcano which was seething beneath their feet. Continual sedition, excited by the zealots of of Mosaism did not cease, in fact, to agitate Jerusalem during all this time. To cast down the Roman eagle, and destroy the works of arts raised by the Herods, in which the Mosaic regulations were not always respected, were perpetual temptations to fanatics who had reached that degree of exaltation which removed all care for life. The Samaritans were agitated by movements of a similar nature. The "Zelotes" or "Sicarii", pious assassins who imposed on

themselves the task of killing whoever in their estimation broke the Law, began to appear. A movement which had much more influence upon Jesus was that of Judas, the Gaulonite, or Galilean. The Census which was the basis of taxation by the foreigner was hated as almost an impiety. That ordered in the sixth year of the Christian era had fully re-awakened the theocratic abhorrence of Gentile government and had caused a great fermentation. In fact, an insurrection had broken out in the Northern provinces from which the greatest achievements of the Jewish people had always proceeded. "Men deemed themselves on the eve of the great renovation. the Scriptures, tortured into divers meanings, fostered the most colossal hopes. In each line of the writings of the Old Testament they saw the assurance, and in a manner the programme, of the future reign, which was to bring peace to the righteous, and to seal for ever the work of God." (Rénan)

THE MORAL REVOLUTION OF JESUS.

When Jesus contemplated the world at the outset of his ministry he was called upon to make his choice of the weapons of reform. The conditions of his people and his times, as I think, rather than any fundamental objection to the use of force in all circumstances, as Christian churchmen profess, made him pin his faith to non-resistance of evil. In other words, he decided to defeat force by his own suffering just as Husain, subsequently did at Karbala, although the latter died sword in hand. But whatever view we may take of the choice of Jesus, it is certain that his fundamental idea was different from that of the political reformers of his time such as Judas the Gaulonite, whose example had shown him the futility of the popular seditions of his day. If ever he was the author of the disclaimer: "My kingdom is

not of this world," he must have meant that he was not setting out to defeat Satan "the Prince of this world" with the help of Satanic weapons. He was not "worldly" in his methods; but this does not mean that he was "other-worldly". All that it signifies is that he was "unworldly". Having resisted the temptation to be a political revolutionary on the very threshold of his career as a Teacher, he never succumbed to it. The revolution he wished to effect was a moral revolution, and although he did not escape the fate of "rebels", and was placed on the Cross by order of Pilate with the description "King of the Jews", which is, in spite of its intended irony, significant of the Roman Procurator's political suspicions, Liberty for him meant in the first instance Truth and Self-Purification. Rénan was, to my mind, a typical Frenchman of his times for whom the claims of the State were paramount, and he could neither understand nor appreciate the thorough-going theocracy of Jesus, the "Servant of the Lord." Nevertheless, I agree with him in the conclusion that "as an austere republican or a zealous patriot he would not have arrested the great current of the affairs of his age; but in declaring that politics are insignificant, he has revealed to the world that one's country is not everything, and that the man is before, and higher than, the citizen." Vengeance which was consuming the Israelites, was the Lord's. Jesus counselled the upholders of the *lex talionis* who claimed an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth that he who had been smitten on one cheek should turn the other cheek also to the smiter. So much for the foreign tyrant. As for his own countryman, the Jew, who, falling a victim to his own weakness and a fear of the Gentile masters of Judea, had become a publican or tax-collector on behalf of the foreigner, he too could easily claim a share in the abounding love of Jesus. The idea of being all powerful

by suffering and resignation, and of triumphing over force by purity of heart, is as old as the days of Abel and Cain, the first progeny of Man. But since it so eminently suited the conditions of the times of Jesus, and the record of his ministry, however inadequate or defective, has still preserved for us this part of his teachings in some detail, it has come to be regarded by Christians and even by many non-Christians as an idea peculiar to Jesus.

JESUS AND GANDHI

Be that as it may, it was just as peculiar to Mahatma Gandhi also; but it was reserved for a Christian government to treat as a felon the most Christ-like man of our times and to penalise as a disturber of the public peace the one man engaged in public affairs who comes nearest to the Prince of Peace. The political conditions of India just before the advent of the Mahatma resembled those of Judea on the eve of the advent of Jesus, and the prescription that he offered to those in search of a remedy for the ills of India was the same that Jesus had dispensed before in Judea. Self-purification through suffering; a moral preparation for the responsibilities of government; self-discipline as the condition precedent of Swaraj—this was the Mahatma's creed and conviction; and those of us who have been privileged to have lived in the glorious year that culminated in the Congress session at Ahmedabad have seen what a remarkable and what a rapid change he wrought in the thoughts, feelings and actions of such large masses of mankind.

THE MAHATMA AND SATYAGRAHA.

Mahatma Gandhi had been in direct touch with the Indian Government, had often counselled

the Viceroy, and had continued his assistance to the British Government in its hour of need in South Africa by working as the unpaid recruiting sergeant of that government in India. This had indeed amazed those who could not associate him whose life itself was a Sermon on the Mount with recruitment of blood-spilling soldiers. Yet even so loyal a subject and so staunch a friend was compelled to oppose a measure of that Government which no one reading British declarations of gratitude for India's loyalty in the early stages of the War could have conceived as the possible culmination of that gratitude at the end of that War. A Reform Scheme was under consideration professedly for enlarging the Indians' share in Indian administration. But while one hand was declared to be about to give a wider franchise to India, the other was already busy robbing her even of her narrowly-restricted liberties. This is what my brother and I wrote to Lord Chelmsford, the Viceroy, from our interment at Chhindwara on the 24th April, 1919, when we were about to court imprisonment by breaking the the Defence of India Regulations which had curtailed our liberties four years previously.

The War is now over ; but the spirit of tyranny that it generated is still abroad ; and while, on the one hand, it is being proclaimed in high-sounding phrases that those who are assembled at Paris to decide the destinies of the world on a more equitable and humane basis than Brute Force are not the masters of the People, but their servants, the Government, on the other hand, is denying to the people of India the barest expression on questions that vitally concern them. Not only is the gag not to be removed yet from our own mouths, but a gag of prodigious proportions has been prepared now for silencing more than three hundred millions of God's articulate creatures. The Rowlatt Bill just enacted in the most tyrannical manner has ended the reign of law and substituted a reign of terror in its place, and although it affects every section of the people of India, the Musalmans are certain to be its first and its worst victims. It has been the Muslim Press that has suffered most under

the Press Act, and the same has been true of the Defence of India Act, if we only exclude the unfortunate young men of Bengal rotting in solitary cells or swampy islands, without trial or hope of release. Even those who profess a pathetic optimism and hope against hope that the bureaucracy armed with the strength of the giant will not use it as tyrannically as the giant, need only have access to our own experience to be cured of this distressing delusion. We, who have already had enough experience of "executive discretion" and of "investigating authorities" sitting *in camera*, farcically enquiring into undefined charges, and dealing with undisclosed "evidence" without the help of any code of procedure or law of evidence, submitting reports that cannot bear the light of day, and being finally dismissed as ignorant persons for all their pains, can claim to speak with some authority, and say that the Black Act is nothing more or less than the virtual outlawery of a fifth of mankind.

It was our privilege to point out to Mahatma Gandhi the real import and full scope of the Rowlatt Bills, soon after he commenced his famous Satyagraha campaign. This was the first dawn of the era of Non-Co-operation. The occurrences at Delhi, Amritsar and Lahore, and in Ahmedabad and other parts of Gujarat are matters of history, and although the Mahatma's admission of his "Himalayan error" has been proclaimed to the world by the Government, and the official and unofficial scribes who have been enlisted in its support, none seems to have had the honesty to admit that the Mahatma's blunder would have overtopped Everest if he had not then united his nation as he did in defence of its liberties. At the very worst the "Himalayan error" consisted in miscalculating the extent of the people's discipline and self-restraint. But if Mahatma Gandhi had left the Rowlatt Bills unchallenged, he would have been guilty of a sin of which he could hardly have purged himself by any kind of expiation. Place all the violence of the infuriated mobs on one side, and on the other side place the cowardliness of a surrender to the slavery sought to be imposed on the nation by these Bills, and, in

spite of my utter abhorrence of such violence, I say with all deliberateness that on the Day of Judgment I would rather stand before God's White Throne guilty of all this violence than have to answer for the unspeakable sin of so cowardly a surrender. In saying this I am only applying to the situation four years earlier my chief's own admission in the court of the judge who has ordered that for six years he should "be buried alive." "I knew" admitted the Mahatma, "that I was playing with fire." But he also added: "I ran the risk, and if I was set free I would still do the same"! Christ-like in his methods he has been Christ-like to the end. He had "steadfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem," and not even the prospect of the Cross could make him shrink from treading the path of duty.

NON-VIOLENCE.

I would like to re-state here the position of men like myself with regard to non-violence. I am not a Christian believing in the sinfulness of all resistance to evil, and in their practice, even if not in their theory, the vast bulk of Christians and all Christian States are in full agreement with me. The last War presented an excellent opportunity to these States and to Christians at large to demonstrate their belief in the doctrine of non-resistance, but we know that none of the States followed it, and the few Christians whose practice was not divorced from their professions were the "conscientious objectors" contemptuously called "conchies", who were subjected to ridicule and contumely and were punished like felons. But that was not all. Every national Church blessed the national Flag and sent the national warriors as on a Crusade. As a Musalman and a follower of the Last of the Prophets (on whom be Allah's blessings and peace!),

I believe that war is a great evil; but I also believe that there are worse things than war. "There is no compulsion in faith", says the Quran, because force, and religious conviction have no common denominator. They belong to two very different planes. But when war is forced on a Muslim, and the party that does so has no other argument but this, then, as a Musalman and the follower of the Last of the Prophets, I may not shrink, but must give the enemy battle on his own ground and beat him with his own weapons. If he respects no other argument than force and would use it against me, I would defend my Faith against his onslaught and would use against him all the force I could command,—force without stint and without cessation. But when, in the language of the Quran, "War hath dropped her weapons", my sword must also be sheathed. Warfare, according to the Quran, is an evil; but persecution is a worse evil, and may be put down with the weapons of war. When persecution ceases; and every man is free to act with the sole motive of securing divine good-will, warfare must cease. These are the limits of Violence in Islam; as I understand it, and I cannot go beyond these limits without infringing the Law of God. But I have agreed to work with Mahatma Gandhi; and our compact is that as long as I am associated with him I shall not resort to the use of force even for purposes of self-defence. And I have willingly entered into this compact because I think we can achieve victory without violence; that the use of violence for a nation of three hundred and twenty millions of people should be a matter of reproach to it; and, finally, that victory achieved with violence must be not the victory of all sections of the nation, but mainly of the fighting classes, which are more sharply divided in India from the rest of the nation than

perhaps anywhere else in the world. Our Swaraj must be the Raj of all, and, in order to be that, it must have been won through the willing sacrifice of all. If this is not so, we shall have to depend for its maintenance as well on the prowess of the fighting classes, and this we must not do. Swaraj must be won by the minimum sacrifice of the maximum number, and not by the maximum sacrifice of the minimum number. Since I have full faith in the possibilities of the programme of constructive work of Non-Violent Non-Co-operation, I have no need to hanker after violence. Even if this programme fails to give us victory, I know that suffering willingly and cheerfully undergone will prove to have been the best preparation even for the effective use of Force. But, God willing, the constructive programme will not fail us if we work with a will and accustom the nation to undergo the small sacrifices that it entails.

WHAT SWARAJ DEMANDS FROM THE NATION.

Here I may ask those of my fellow-countrymen who shrink even from these small sacrifices whether they have considered what it is that a soldier who goes to battle is prepared to sacrifice. As the Bible tells us, "Greater love hath no man..... than, that he lay down his life for his friend." Our own compatriots went to war for a cause not their own to the number of a million and a half. Can we who pride ourselves on the strength of our national feeling shrink even from the small sacrifices that Non-Violent Non-Co-operation demands? But in reality our present programme is but the beginning of national work, and Swaraj when it is attained would require even greater sacrifices than those of a soldier! To die for a cause is after all not so very difficult. Men at all times and in all countries have done it, and they have often

done it for very poor causes. To die for a cause is not very difficult. The harder thing is to live for a cause, and, if need be, suffer for it ; and the cause that we must live and suffer for must be the realisation in India of the Kingdom of God.

VIOLENCE OF NON-CO-OPERATORS AND THEIR OPPONENTS CONTRASTED.

These being my innermost convictions, I cannot help marvelling at the audacity of those that attribute to us a desire to involve the country in violence, carnage and anarchy. They presume to demand from us who stand between them and violence an assurance of non-violence. And yet their own hands are red with the blood of the innocents shed in Jallianwalla Bagh—blood still as unrepented as it is unavenged. Contrast this patent insincerity with the frank acceptance by our chief of his full responsibility for Chauri-Chaura and the Bombay riots and you have the measure of the moral worth of Non-Co-operation and of its relentless opponents. The Mahatma's confession is proclaimed to the world by this Christian Government; but I wonder if this Government is also prepared to attribute to the Sermon on the Mount the slicing off by St. Peter of the ear of Malchus ! Who knows how much blood might not have been shed by the disciples of the Prince of Peace if the census of arms taken by the Master had produced a tale of many more than two swords, and had his followers been more steadfast in their support of him than the self-same St. Peter who, according to the Gospels, denied him three times before cock-crow ? When the guilt of Chauri-Chaura and similar unfortunate occurrences is being judged, it is necessary to take into consideration not only that which was done but also that which had been resisted. Never before in the annals of India have the people felt as intensely as

they have done since the dawn of Non-Co-operation, and the marvel is not that the fury of the mob has resulted in so much bloodshed, but that the manhood of India has been successfully revived with so little of it. I challenge anyone to show another instance in the history of mankind where hundreds of millions of people have been roused to stand up for their liberties and have remained so peaceful as the people of India led by Mahatma Gandhi. There is no country of Europe, with all its cold, frog blood, that would not have experienced a deluge of blood in like circumstances. That India has escaped such a deluge is due to Mahatma Gandhi and his co-workers.

CO-OPERATION.

In dealing with the question of Non-Violence I have digressed and anticipated a good deal, and I must now revert to my narrative. At the Congress at Amritsar the main resolution was concerned with the Reforms, and although only four years have passed since that session, it would surprise not a few to know that in the discussions over this resolution my friend Deshbandhu Das, the leader of the Council-entry party, and my late chief, Lokmanya Tilak, were entirely opposed to co-operation and the working of the Reformed Councils, while Mahatma Gandhi had himself moved an amendment to that resolution. This was designed to commit the Congress to the principle of the co-operation of the people with the authorities in working the Reforms in response to the sentiments expressed in the Royal Proclamation. Neither side was willing to give way, and, as is usual on such occasions, the protracted discussions in the Subjects Committee were delaying the discussions in the Congress and prolonging the session. This was the first occasion, as I have already told you, on which

I took part in the Congress, and for a novice my own contribution is not altogether undeserving of notice. My brother and I tried to discover a formula which could be acceptable both to Mahatma Gandhi and to Lokmanya Tilak and Deshbandhu Das. We at last succeeded in this effort, and Srijut Bepin Chandra Pal moved, and I seconded, an amendment recommending to the Congress that "the provisions of the Reforms Act be used, as far as possible, with a view to secure full Responsible Government at an early date." This cleared the air, and finally both parties agreed to support a resolution declaring that "the Congress trusts that, so far as may be possible, the people will so work the Reforms as to secure an early establishment of full Responsible Government." It was with this addition that the Congress passed the resolution moved by Deshbandhu Das and seconded by Lokmanya Tilak, which declared India to be fit at the moment for full Responsible Government, characterised the Reforms Act as inadequate, unsatisfactory and disappointing and urged that Parliament should take early steps to establish full Responsible Government in India in accordance with the principle of self-determination. I have recalled these details only to show that even at Amritsar Mahatma Gandhi and his co-workers were willing to co-operate with Government so far as was possible. And yet otherwise so entirely changed was the atmosphere at this session of the Congress that after my long separation from my people I could not help being greatly impressed by the change. The Hindus and Musalmans were no longer enemies or even rivals, but were comrades and brothers in arms. There was no longer a plethora of set speeches suggestive of mid-night oil, "full of sound and fury signifying nothing." There was a new earnestness which

indicated that the resolutions of the Congress were resolutions indeed, in the sense that the nation was *resolved* to act. And above all, it was clear that fear of fellow-man was no longer to be the compelling motive in India, and that the only fear this land would know in future would be the fear of God. So struck was I by this amazing change that I quoted in my speech at Amritsar the couplet of a fellow-townsmen of mine who had said ;

صد سالہ دور چرخ تھا ساغر کا ایک دور

نکلی جو میکہدے سے تو دنیا بدل گئی

(One round of the wine cup was like a century-long cycle of Time; when we left the tavern we found that the whole world had changed.)

FROM CO-OPERATION TO NON-CO-OPERATION.

But so far it was only a change in the character and outlook of the people. Their policy was, however, also destined to undergo an entire sea-change. And it was Mahatma Gandhi who at Amritsar was insisting on the people's co-operation with the authorities that was destined to be the first and, in the beginning, almost the sole advocate of Non-Co-operation. What was it that had wrought this change of policy? I must confess my feelings towards this Government had undergone a complete change during the War, and in particular since the Armistice towards the end of 1918. When now I read in the old files of the *Comrade* the publicly expressed expectations I had entertained from this Government not only at the commencement of the year 1911, but even as late as the end of 1914, it appears as if I was examining the newly discovered bones of an animal now altogether extinct. It is true that as late as in

December, 1919, I had taken, with regard to co-operation with the authorities, a middle position between Mahatma Gandhi on the one side, and Deshbandhu Das and Lokmanya Tilak on the other which eventually became the position of the entire Congress. But I was even then not very hopeful of the possibility of such co-operation. I had seen only too clearly to what the co-operation of the Musalmans with the authorities had led them. And I had likewise realised that what had happened at Jallianwalla Bagh, in the Crawling Lane, and at the Dak-Bungalow at Manianwalla was not a succession of unconnected incidents in which the thoughtless fury of the officials had suddenly vented itself, but a series of acts symptomatic of the disease from which this foreign bureaucracy was inevitably suffering. I was thoroughly convinced that this disease was congenital with the system, and if the system continued such incidents were bound to recur, and Government would inevitably be a succession of Jallianwalla Baghs unless the British underwent a complete change of heart. The Duke of Connaught, when he came out to India in the beginning of 1921 to open the Reformed Legislatures, appealed to us to forget and forgive. I was, and still am, prepared to forgive; but forget I could not, and would not. To forget only means for the awakened sleeper to go back to sleep and to dream the pleasant dream he had been dreaming before he had awakened to the stern reality. But Mahatma Gandhi was not yet convinced of all this, and his conversion came a little later. For many months after the Amritsar session he continued to live in the hope that England would yet repent, and, while restoring the integrity and independence of the Khilafat, and evacuating the Jazirat-ul-Arab, England would redress the great wrong done to the people of the Punjab. In fact, it was not a mere hope that sustained

him but an absolute conviction, and when he too was at last disillusioned, and would indicate in the process of preparing the programme of his constructive work a profound and through-going want of belief in the good intentions of England' so that even we would suggest that perhaps he was going too far, he used to explain this by saying that he was a more recent, and therefore a more zealous, convert. When the last Petition that Muslim India addressed to England, through the Indian Khilafat Delegation in the interview that we had with the Rt. Hon. David Lloyd George, the ex-Premier of England, proved the utter futility of such appeals ; and when the Punjab wrong was treated as an "error of judgment" to be rewarded by a pension paid out of India's poverty to the murderer of her innocent sons, and to the cold-blooded approver of this "error" who, enjoying the safety of a Government House surrounded by armed guards, had not even the justification of General Dyer, then Mahatma Gandhi lost all faith in co-operation between the rulers and the ruled.

NON-CO-OPERATION.

Much has been said and written about Non-Co-operation and, if our opponents, or even some of our friends, would not understand its significance even now, I cannot hope to enlighten them in this address. I will, therefore, content myself with saying that briefly it means that if we may not resist evil, at least we will not assist it. It is true we expect that if the Indian nation is prepared to make such sacrifices as Non-Co-operation entails, this foreign Government would be absolutely paralysed. But although we do contemplate such a result, it is little more than incidental. Our movement, even though its name suggests that it is of a negative character,

is in reality not so. It is essentially of a much more positive character. It does not directly aim at the paralysis of others; its direct aim is to remove our own paralysis. Every item of the Non-Co-operation programme, with which I shall presently have to deal, has a strong constructive as well as a destructive side, and we shall stand or fall according as we succeed in our construction or not. But if we do not destroy, or, in other words, if we continue to avail ourselves of all that the Government has constructed for the continuance of its own existence, and as a trap for our destruction, we shall neither stand nor even fall, but shall absolutely cease to exist. Even if our direct aim was to paralyse the Government it was entirely compatible with the purest ethics, and even with the doctrine of Love associated with the name of Jesus Christ and now of Mahatma Gandhi. And I maintain that such a paralysis of Government is clearly possible. Friends, very early in my career as a gaol-bird I was struck with the system of co-operation followed in Indian gaols. Every prisoner gets a remission of a few days at the end of every month for "a clean bill of health" during the month; but some of the prisoners who succeed in winning the confidence and favour of the local gaol authorities are made watchmen, convict-overseers or convict-warders, and, besides enjoying other privileges during the rest of their prison life, they earn a more liberal remission of their sentence every month. Every one in this Pandal who has passed through that gateway of freedom called prison—and, I trust, there are a good many present here to-day—is familiar with the work of the convict-overseers and warders who share the duty of keeping watch and ward during the night with the paid warders employed by the gaol administration. As a rule the few paid warders pass the night enjoying tolerably sound

Sleep, or, at the very worst, doze out their period of sentinel duty. But at the end of every half-hour the gaol resounds with the cries of the prisoners who keep the real watch and ward. "All's well !" is repeated from every corner of the gaol, and so long as this continues the paid warders can sleep the sleep of the just. And, this, my friends, is the parable of co-operation. We have lost our liberties and are kept enchained through the services of others who are as much deprived of their liberties as we ourselves, except for a few petty privileges that they seem to enjoy. Meanwhile the few foreigners who keep us in servitude can enjoy sleep and repose because the co-sharers of our servitude repeat from time to time from every corner of India's vast Bastille the reassuring cry, "All is well !" The only difference is that whereas the convict-watchmen, overseers and warders can in this way at least secure their release from prison a little before their fellow-prisoners over whom they keep watch and ward, our co-operating friends, who are our comrades in slavery cannot look forward even to an earlier release. In fact, they have lost even the sense of slavery, and slavishly hug the very chains that keep them enslaved. As I wrote in the prison itself :

چھوڑ میری فکر، غافل، رو خود اپنی قید پر

جسکو تو زبور سمجھتا می و می زنجیر می

(Leave off worrying for me, O, heedless fool; weep over thine own captivity; that which thou deemest to be an ornament is nothing less than a chain.)

A QUESTION FOR MUSALMANS.

Friends, I feel certain, I have exhausted you as well as myself with this somewhat exhaustive

historical narrative, commencing with the Indian Mutiny and coming down to our own era of Non-Co-operation. But in thus narrating past history I had an end in view. I cannot act the part of a dictator to any of you; and yet I want you to co-operate with me. Possessing no such personality as the Mahtma's, and being as unwilling to bind a spell over you as I am incapable of doing it, I could only lead you to the conclusions which after half a life-time of blindness and much blundering I have at last reached by demonstrating to you that our safest guide, the experience of several generations, inevitably leads us to the same. Experience must be our most cherished trophy, for it is a trophy made up of weapons that have hurt us. And here I appeal to the experience of my co-religionists in particular who are being diligently diverted from the path to which their history during the last sixty years and more has guided them. Granted that Non-Co-operation has failed, and that co-operation with our non-Muslim fellow-countrymen is a vain hope, a snare and a delusion—though I am far from granting it except for argument's sake. Still we have got to suggest an alternative policy. I ask them not to accept my lead but to be in their turn my guide themselves. Whither could they lead me, that is now the question! If Non-Co-operation with our foreign masters and co-operation with Indian fellow-slaves of other faiths is not possible, what is the alternative that they have to place before us to-day? Are we to "progress backwards" till we begin to walk on all fours? Shall we co-operate with our foreign rulers and fight with our non-Muslim countrymen as we used to fight before? And if we do that what hope have we of any better results than we achieved for ourselves in the settlements after the Tripoli and the Balkan Wars, or, nearer home, in the unsettlement of a

"settled fact" in Bengal? No, friends, that book is closed and into it we shall look no more. You have no alternative better than Non-Co-operation with the foreigner and co-operation with our neighbours, nor have I. And it is futile to waste our time in worrying over the impossible.

MR. MONTAGU'S RESIGNATION AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE.

It is said that we can have no grievance now after the Treaty of Lausanne. You, friends, are in a better position to know how that Treaty came to be concluded than I who had to undergo for a year and a half solitary confinement in all but a technical sense, and have not been in touch with public affairs. But I have studied in some of the back numbers of the newspapers of those days something of what transpired in connection with the revision of the Treaty of Sevres while I was still in prison. You all know about the historic telegram despatched to the Secretary of State by the Government, of India after consulting and receiving the general concurrence of the Local Governments, including their Ministers. You will agree that it fell far short not only of Muslim aspirations and sentiments, but also of the requirements of Islamic Law, since it did not say anything about the evacuation of the Jazirat-ul-Arab, and only recommended the Sultan's suzerainty over the Holy Places. In fact, the Government of India undoubtedly, even if haltingly, admitted all this when they said, : "We are conscious that it may be impossible to satisfy India's expectations in their entirety", though Mr. Chamberlain had the impudence to say that "the terms far exceeded even the demands of the warmest friends of the Turks." And yet what a storm did the world witness over the publication of even such a telegram. The Secretary of State's resignation

was demanded by the Premier, and the King-Emperor "had been pleased to approve its acceptance." In other words, Mr. Montagu was ignominiously dismissed. As Reuter pointed out, "Mr. Chamberlain's announcement in the House of Commons was received with fierce welcoming cheers from the majority of the Unionists; and the 'Die-Hards,' specially delighted, could hardly contain their satisfaction." "Never before," said another message of Reuter, "Never before has the House of Commons re-echoed with such exultant cheering as greeted the announcement of Mr. Montagu's resignation. It emanated from the Unionist benches, but was so loud and prolonged that it seemed general. Some enthusiasts even waved handkerchiefs." The most charitable explanation with regard to the attitude of Mr. Montagu's own party; and the party that is the rising hope of such Indians as still cling to the idea of receiving freedom as the gift of the foreigner, is contained in the earlier message of Reuter, that "Liberal and Labour members received the news without an expression of opinion." To-day it may perhaps be urged that the Government of India are as anxious as the Muslim leaders themselves to arrive at a satisfactory settlement of the questions still at issue between Musalmans and Great Britain. But of what good is that to us so long as the Government of India is only "a subordinate branch of the British Government six thousand miles away" whose "dictation to the British Government" as to what line it ought to pursue in such matters seems to Lord Curzon "quite intolerable". This is what Lord Curzon wrote to Mr. Montagu before "giving him the sack", even though poor Mr. Montagu thought that he was only being let off with a warning. But evidently he had forgotten that at Denshaw there was flogging as well as hanging, and that Lord Curzon's final court

could be trusted not to let off such criminals as he with a warning, but to warn and hang him also for the same offence.

Not one of those believing Musalmans who is dissatisfied to-day with our policy of Non-Co-operation with Government and co-operation among the Indians could honestly say that Muslim Indian feeling received anything even approaching proper consideration at the hands of Great Britain. And yet hear what this former Viceroy of India, the same who posed as the benefactor of the Musalmans in partitioning Bengal in 1905, has to say about our cry of anguish at the partitioning of the Khilafat fifteen years later. In his letter to Mr. Montagu he writes : "But the part India has sought to play or been allowed to play in this series of events passes my comprehension.....Is Indian opinion always to be the final court of Muslim appeal?"

In his speech before his Cambridge constituency Mr. Montagu has said : "The Government of India were parties to the Treaty of Sèvres. Had the Treaty produced peace, the Government of India would have accepted it loyally; but when it showed, *as I always knew that it would show*, that it could not produce peace, the Government of India pleaded for its revision. I ask whether the Governments of Canada, South Africa or Australia would have remained silent when the so-called peace was destroying the internal peace of their country?" Poor Mr. Montagu ! How easy it is, it seems, to forget that while the Governments of Canada, South Africa and Australia are national governments, the Government of India, over which Lord Reading still presides after the dismissal of Mr. Montagu, is not a national government at all. On the contrary, it is one which was bound to lock up for six long years the greatest leader that the nation had produced for many generations,

in deference to pressure from the very Imperial Government that had treated its partial support of his view in this affair with such open contempt. Dr. Sapru, too, had forgotten this patent difference between India and the Dominions, and had to be reminded of it at the Imperial Conference by the representative of a country once as distressful as our own, namely Ireland. We had ourselves urged upon Mr. Montagu the very consideration to which he referred in his Cambridge speech; but it was all in vain, and our advocacy of the same cause which the late Secretary of State advocated with equally little success was punished in various ways by the Government in India. Those who used to tell me on these occasions that Mr. Montagu was sympathetic had to be reminded that his sympathy had proved wholly sterile. I have always held that Mr. Montagu should have resigned on any one of at least half a dozen occasions even before his ultimate dismissal, and now he tells us himself that "he had been repeatedly on the verge of resignation, but he had hesitated because he did not wish to say to the Mohamedans of India that the solemn pledges which had been made to them were irretrievably lost" Nevertheless, his resignation had to come at last, and to-day he is not only not in the Government, but not even in the House of Commons. Can we then draw from all this any other conclusion than this, that "*the solemn pledges which had been made to us are irretrievably lost*" ? But, no, they are not irretrievably lost. Friends, with the assistance of God, and your whole-hearted co-operation, we will yet retrieve them, or perish in the attempt.

ENGLAND AT LAUSANNE.

This was in March, 1932, and although we

were promised that due weight would be given to Indian opinion, I ask you to consider what was the attitude of England when six months later the brave Turks, relying not upon the promises of Great Britain, but upon God's grace and their own self-sacrifice and courage, drove Britain's brutal nominees into the sea? You all know that better than I do, and I do not propose to detain you over that. Beaten on the field of battle, England now sought to deprive the Turks of the fruits of victory on the conference-table of diplomacy. But here, too, God helped those who helped themselves, and the Treaty of Lausanne proved that the Turks were not only warriors but statesmen as well. Let us hear what Lord Curzon has to say himself of the reasons that brought about the Treaty of Lausanne. Did the English who had commissioned Greece after the Armistice to rob the Turks of Thrace and even of their home-lands in Asia Minor; who were at one time actually considering the question of handing over Constantinople to them; and who had appealed in vain to the Dominions to fight their battle against the now victorious Turks when India could no longer be trusted to make cannon-fodder of her sons after the Karachi Trial—did the English even now repent or relent? The difference between the conditions under which other treaties, including that of Sèvres, were imposed and those in which the Lausanne Settlement was arrived at was pointed out by Lord Curzon at the Imperial Conference in the following words:—

Such (dictation of terms at the point of the bayonet) had been the case with all the previous post-war treaties. These had in each case been drawn up by the victorious Powers, sitting, so to speak, on the seat of judgment, in the absence of the culprit, and imposing what penalty or what settlement they chose. Only when the terms had been drawn up was the beaten enemy admitted to be told his sentence and to make the conventional protest of the doomed man. Such, indeed, was the environment in which the original

Treaty of Sèvres was drawn up and signed, though never ratified by the Turkish representatives. Far otherwise was it at Lausanne. There the Turks sat at the table on a footing of equality with all the other Powers. Every article of the Treaty had to be debated with and explained to them. Agreement had to be achieved not by brandishing the big stick but by discussion, persuasion and compromise.

Commenting upon Lord Curzon's defence of the Treaty of Lausanne and of his praise of Allied diplomacy, which was, according to him, reluctant to break up the Conference on important, but not vital, points, and to revert to a state of war, an Indian newspaper, which is not noted for any excess of sympathy with the Turks, wrote as follows :—

No credit can be given to such pacific and discreet diplomacy when it was based on unwillingness to fight. As Lord Curzon said, "the Turks knew very well that the Allies had no stomach for further fighting; on the contrary, they were very nervous about the bellicose temper of the extremist elements among the Turks." The Allies were never certain," said the Foreign Secretary, "how far the genuine desire of the leading Turks for peace would control the unruly Nationalist and extremist elements." It will thus appear that the Turks obtained what they wanted literally at the point of the sword and the role of the conquerors and the conquered was reversed at Lausanne. It was the Turks who dictated the terms of the Treaty, and the Allies, who dictated the terms of the other post-war treaties, had to accept them..... As a matter of fact the big stick was brandished by the Turks at Lausanne and the Allies "made the conventional protest of the doomed man". Replying to the severe criticism of the Treaty by those "whose motives in making the attack are not free from criticism", he said that "it was the best treaty that could be obtained in the circumstances".

Thus it is once more clear that the Turks secured what they did at Lausanne not because of any regard on the part of England for justice to the Turks, or for the religious obligations and sentiments of Indian Musalmans with regard to the Khilāfat, but in spite of England's open

hostility towards the Turks and utter disregard of the requirements of Islam. Lord Curzon would have once more brandished the big stick; but, sad to relate, it had changed hands.

I have purposely dealt exclusively with a matter concerning the special interests of Musalmans and affecting their extra-territorial sympathies, for it is obvious that the Treaty of Lausanne, far from settling our national affairs and satisfying our national requirements common to all Indian communities, does not even settle the peculiarly Muslim and religious issue of the Jazirat-ul-Arab. But after all, the issues that are our common national issues far exceed in number those that concern the Musalmans alone. All that the Treaty of Lausanne has done is to declare that the Turks have not lost their Swaraj as we had done more than a century ago, and as they themselves were within an ace of doing. The Khilafat Committee's demands, and, in particular the religious requirements with regard to the Jazirat-ul-Arab, still remain unsatisfied. But even if all this had been done, could the Musalmans give up Non-Co-operation with Government and co-operation with other Indian communities? In the first place, that would be an unspeakably shameful breach of faith with their non-Muslim brethren of whose help they have so willingly availed themselves. And, in the next place, Indian Musalmans would be proving that, while they were so anxious for the security of the Turks' and the Arabs' Swaraj, they were indifferent to their own! Well could it, then, be said of them :

تو کار زمین را نکو ساختی که با آسمان نیز پرداختی

(Hast thou arranged the affairs of the earth so well that thou meddlest in those of heaven as well?)

THE TERRIBLE ALTERNATIVE TO NON-CO-OPERATION,

Friends, once more I have perhaps exhausted your patience; but my excuse for it is that I want the Musalmans who are being asked to-day to discard the policy of Non-Co-operation with England to confront facts before they reverse a decision to which their sad experiences of co-operation with England had driven them. It is as clear as daylight that so long as India is not an equal partner with England and the Dominions in the Empire, and so long as her Government is but "a subordinate branch of the British Government six thousand miles away," we cannot be satisfied with the goodwill of the Government of India even if it is proved to the hilt. Besides loyalty to a foreign Government there are other loyalties as well, and so long as Musalmans in India are liable to be punished for disloyalty to Government because they are loyal to their God and to His Last Prophet, as we ourselves were punished at Karachi, and so long as the Holy Land of Islam is under the control of non-Muslim mandatories when we ourselves had been given God's own mandate for it by His Last Messenger as a death-bed injunction, there is no alternative to Non-Violent Non-Co-operation but one, and that, friends, is the terrible alternative of war! Since the vast bulk of those who try to discredit our policy do so because they are slaves to the fear of Government, and, being unwilling to make *any* sacrifice, could not even dream of adopting that terrible alternative, let us hear no more of a change of policy!

MUSLIM CO-OPERATION WITH NON-MUSLIMS

And if we may not co-operate with Great Britain, is it expedient, to put it on the lowest

plane, to cease to co-operate with our non-Muslim brethren ? What is it that has happened since that staunch Hindu, Mahatma Gandhi, went to gaol for advocating the cause of Islam that we must cease to co-operate with his co-religionists ? I know that Hindu-Muslim relations to-day are not precisely those that they were two years ago. But is it possible for any honest and truly patriotic Indian to say that either community is wholly blameless, and that the guilt is entirely one community's ? Friends, I do not believe in diplomacy, and certainly not in that variety of it which is called secret diplomacy. I do not wish to imitate Sir Roger de Coverley, and put you off with the diplomatic dictum : "Much can be said on both sides of the question." Most regrettable events have unfortunately occurred in Malabar, at Multan, at Agra, at Saharanpur and elsewhere, and I am prepared to support the creation of a National Tribunal to judge the respective guilt of the two communities. For it cannot be gainsaid even by the community that has suffered the most that complaints have been made by members of the other community as well, and obviously it would neither be fair nor productive of any satisfactory result if either community is saddled with all the guilt and denounced without an adequate enquiry. I did not shrink at Delhi from proposing the appointment of a truly representative Committee of Enquiry ; but for reasons which it is not necessary to state here no result has yet been achieved of such a committee's appointment. Two things are, however, patent. The law courts established by Government cannot stop their work while we adjudge the guilt of the two communities. And while it is difficult to arrive at the truth by a national enquiry *after* witnesses have given their testimony, true or false, on oath before the courts of law of the Government, reconciliation itself, which is even more important

than the investigation of the truth, is not made easy by the punishment awarded to those who are found guilty by such courts, not unoften on evidence which is not free from suspicion.

THE SUREST REMEDY.

What then is to be done? I have already told you that to accept the version of one party is neither fair, nor would it help us in creating in the other party whose version was disbelieved without any enquiry a disposition towards reconciliation and reform. The only remedy that I can suggest for instant adoption is also the surest, and it was this which was all but adopted towards the end of our discussions at Delhi in the Committee appointed to consider this question. Even after we had decided that a Committee of Enquiry should visit the places where regrettable incidents had followed Hindu-Muslim dissensions, and after we had even nominated the members of this Committee, we were within an ace of cancelling all this because we noted at a later stage of our deliberations a welcome change in the attitude of the leaders on the two sides. There was now a desire to let bygones be bygones and heartily co-operate for the attainment of Swaraj, as they had been doing two years previously. Obviously, the protagonists on the two sides had once more had a glimpse of that unity of which the Mahatma was at once the chief preacher and the best symbol, and the prospect of gaining party-victories once more appeared mean and contemptible in their eyes. But a difference arose on a petty issue and they parted again. Friends, I pray that God may grant them once more a glimpse of that unity, and that this time it may not be as fleeting as it had been before. Nay, I pray that they may keep ever before them a picture of that unity and the glorious vistas of that

freedom which can be seen only through the avenue of national unity, so that all else that is of fair seeming, but which is associated with slavery, may lose its charm for them and be blotted out for all eternity.

THE PETTINESS OF DISTURBING ISSUES.

Believe me, it is not by tawdry, tinselled rhetoric that I hope to settle such vital issues. But, although the issue of Hindu-Muslim unity is vital, and, in fact, the most vital that we have to settle, the issues which disturb that unity are contemptibly petty. Nothing makes me more ashamed than the pettiness of these issues, and I confess I find it difficult to refute the calumny of our enemies that we are unfit for Responsible Government when I contemplate their potency for mischief side by side with their pettiness. Far be it from me to sneer at the modes of worship of my fellow-men; but I feel unspeakably depressed when I think that there are fellow-countrymen of mine, including my own co-religionists, who would jeopardise the recovery of our lost liberty, including religious liberty itself, for the sake of the satisfaction they seem to derive out of cutting a branch of Pipal tree overhanging a public thoroughfare and interfering with the passage of a pole of ridiculous length, or out of beating tom-toms and blowing trumpets before a house of worship at prayer-time while moving in a procession. Friends, if we cannot acquire a better sense of proportion let us be honest, at least with ourselves if not with others, and give up all thought of freedom. We must not talk of Swaraj even within the Empire, let alone out of it. What is Kenya to slaves like us or we to Kenya? Why need we hanker after a place in the King Emperor's palace when we are not even fit for a place in his stables? And what is it to us if the Holy Land of Islam should

attract many a casino and *café chantant*, or the new warden of the Musalmans' Holy of Holies should become one of the long tale of impotent potentates maintained by an Imperial Government only to be pushed off their ancestral thrones whenever they should forget themselves and think that God has made them men and not merely puppets in an Imperial show. If *alams* and *pipal* trees and noisy processions are our "horizon's utter sum", then all our Congresses and Khilafat Committees are mere mockery.

"Let us ring down—the farce is nothing worth."

Let us close this chapter of childish make-beliefs, and, taking the first train back home, let us devote ourselves henceforward to the realisation of the ideal of petty self-concern which alone befits a nation of slaves. Let us at least not take the sacred name of Liberty in vain. Let us add our confession to the claim of our opponents, and admit that God, Whom the great religious teachers of the East in which all the existing religions have had their source, had taught us to regard as just, has yet been so unjust to a fifth of mankind that He has made them totally unfit for self-rule, and has left it to His White creatures hailing from Europe to correct His mistake, and carry on for all time the administration of India. But if we do not want to drag our spiritual ancestors into the mire along with ourselves and to blaspheme a just God, let us elevate ourselves to the height of our ideals and lift the masses instead of sinking down to their low level.

THE ROOT OF EVIL.

But since I have referred to the low level of

the masses, let me say this much for them that what I wrote in 1904 in criticising the education given in the Indian universities is still true, and even to-day "the greater portion of bigotry agitates not the bosoms of the ignorant and the illiterate but excites to fury and to madness the little-learned of the land." And it is not the love of our own religion that makes us quarrel with our fellow-countrymen of other faiths, but self-love and petty personal ambition. "The coming of the Mahatma" had meant the destruction of "the kingdoms of the nations" and the foundation in their place of the one united Kingdom of the Nation to be whose Chief Servant was his great glory. But these little "kings" who had lost their little "thrones" were not reconciled to the idea of national service under the banner of the Nation's Chief Servant, and were pining for restoration. So long as Mahatma Gandhi and his principal co-workers were free, they had not the courage to raise the standard of revolt, and there was no room for them in the economy of the Indian world except as openly despised slaves of the foreigner or as secretly discontented adherents of the National Federation. And so they chose the latter alternative. But, with the Mahatma immured at Yerrowda; they reasserted themselves, and since they could not hope to occupy his position, they have persistently, though not professedly, addressed their appeals to communal passions and jealousies in order to destroy the National Federation and hasten the recovery of their petty principalities. Before the advent of Mahatma Gandhi several streams, some large and some small, were running more or less parallel to each other, and little boats were being rowed on them. But soon after his advent, almost all of them were diverted into one channel and became tributaries of a mighty river rapidly moving on to join the sea. On the broad

bosom of this Ganges there sailed a powerful ship, manned by lusty sailors, captained by the Mahatma and flying the National flag. What the petty ambitions of petty men have been urging ever since the Mahatma's incarceration is that we should scrap the big ship and take to the little row-boats again. But since these little boats are not safe enough craft for the mighty river hurrying on towards the sea, they propose a revolution in Nature itself, and ask that the great river would flow back into its old tributaries. But Nature cannot be thwarted, and the futility of the desire to make the Ganges flow backwards is a thing known even to our village fools. In the name of this Congress, and of the Indian Nation, nay, even in the name of that Destiny which shapes our ends, roughhew them how we may, I warn this little breed of men that, God willing, they will never succeed, and that the Indian Nation cannot look upon their insidious activities with unconcern.

TOLERATION AND FRATERNAL SELF-SACRIFICE.

Friends, to punish the guilty is not without its advantages even in the domain of politics; but the surest remedy for political disunion is, as I have already suggested, to create on all sides a disposition to forget and forgive. But this is not all, and if we desire to prevent a recurrence of regrettable incidents we must remove the causes of friction. Conformity in all things is only too often desired, and this not only by the bigots, but also by some of the most large-hearted of men. Religious reformers have at all times betrayed a fatal weakness for comprehension or the preparation of a religious compound formed of many simples gathered from many different sources. They have hoped that by adopting a policy of inclusion they would be able to form

a faith embracing doctrines culled from diverse faiths and acceptable to all the followers of all these faiths. That is how they hope to attain Uniformity and secure Conformity. But history has shown that the cause of peace and unity has not been greatly furthered by the formation of such eclectic faiths. Only too often have they added one more to the warring creeds existing before and have only increased the disunion they were creating. Such well-intentioned failures have at last made people fall back upon Toleration. This is not the indifferentism and absence of strong convictions which often pass for toleration, but a far more positive principle in life which co-exists with beliefs passionately held. I could not define it better than by quoting an American who declared to a fellow-countryman of his holding very different views to his own. "I strongly disagree with every word of what you say ; but I shall fight, Sir, to the last drop of my blood for maintaining your right to say it!" That, friends, is the best definition of Toleration. The Quran which calls upon Musalmans even to fight in defence of their Faith whenever their freedom of faith is assailed or jeopardised, sums up its teaching on tolerance in the words, "To you your faith, to me mine." If we all agreed to act upon this principle, and at the same time emphasised the features common to different faiths and the spirituality characteristic of all, there would be no strife in the world but peace and tranquility everywhere.

APPLICATION OF THIS PRINCIPLE TO OUTSTANDING ISSUES.

Let us apply this principle to some of the outstanding issues between the various communities of India. If, for instance, processions can be taken out on public roads and no objection

is taken to music being played thereon; a Musalman should not object to a procession with music taken out by Hindus, or by other non-Muslim neighbours of his, unless it interferes with his own exercise of some recognised right such as conducting Divine Service in a fitting manner. If, again, a long pole can be carried in procession through the streets without danger to life and limb, no non-Muslim should object to it if it is so carried "with musical honours." But then the Muslims indulging in such practices which are, to say the least of it, of doubtful religious validity have no right to demand that a non-Muslim neighbour of theirs should permit the lopping off of the branches of a tree which he holds sacred, whether with reason or without it, and which is growing on his land and is his property. If there is no law against smoking in public places, no Parsi should object to a non-Parsi's lighting a cigarette in a street even though he himself holds fire to be too sacred an element to be defiled in this way. Similarly, if it is no offence to slaughter animals, and a man kills a fowl, or a cow, or a pig, or kills any animal to provide food for himself or for others or for sacrificial purposes or in a particular manner not involving cruelty to animals, his neighbour should not object to it on the ground that he holds all life too sacred to be destroyed, or that he looks upon the cow as upon a mother, or that he considers a pig too unclean to be eaten, or that he is required by his own religion to kill animals in a different manner to his neighbour's. In all these cases it is, of course, presumed that the animal slaughtered is the property of the man who slaughters it or causes it to be slaughtered, and not his neighbour's whose property he may not unlawfully seize and use or destroy. But we have not, alas, reached a stage of toleration in India when the free exercise of his right by one of us can escape being

resented by some others. In fact, the worst of it is that some of us, while they insist upon the exercise of their right, sometimes exercise it with the desire to annoy their neighbours, and in a manner that is sure to annoy them. The jeering at men of other faiths when one is taking out a procession required or sanctioned by our own faith, the beating of tom-toms and playing other instruments, which often produce more noise than music, with special vigour before a house of worship of another community, and particularly when Divine Service or some other religious rite is in progress and is likely to be thereby disturbed; the needless lopping off of trees held sacred by Hindus which overhang public thoroughfares, or doing it in an exultant manner; the blowing of cigarette smoke in the face of, or too close to a Parsi or a Sikh; the wanton destruction of a good deal of animal life in the sight or immediate neighbourhood of Jains; carrying a garlanded cow in procession through a locality inhabited by Hindus as well for purposes of slaughter; or slaughtering it in a place where Hindus cannot help seeing it—these and many other such are things that occur only too frequently whenever there is a tension of feeling between the communities concerned. And provocation and insolent exultation of the nature described above often lead to hot words, and not seldom to blows which sometimes end in loss of human life.

HOW TO DEAL WITH SUCH MATTERS.

There can be no measure sufficiently comprehensive to safeguard public tranquility and peace in all such cases, and I can think of no National Pact embracing all such situations, even if it is permitted to assume inordinate proportions, and to include details that must make

us the laughing-stock of the world. The best remedy, I must repeat, is the creation of the correct spirit in which the different communities exercise their rights. But it is possible for a national body such as the Congress to deal with some of the principal causes of friction, and to remove them by bringing about an agrèement between leaders of the communities concerned. And this it must do. But, while attempting to influence public opinion, and to regulate public action through the agency of such leaders, with courage and confidence, a body like the Congress must be careful not to demand from any community that it should relinquish any rights which may, in the present circumstances involve a sacrifice, far beyond its capacity. It must be remembered that Swaraj, although it is our destined goal, and is soon likely to be in sight, has yet to be won, and before it is won we have no sanctions of which we can make use like a Government. We must depend exclusively upon persuasion and example. But even if we had a Government of our own, it could not rightly, or even successfully, compel large sections of the people to give up the exercise of any right unless it provided for them corresponding facilities in some other direction.

COW-KILLING†

The question of cow-killing is an instance in point. I know how sacred a cow is in the eyes of my Hindu brothers, and who knows better than my brother and myself how anxious our absent Chief was to secure its preservation? His action in so selflessly leading the Khilafat movement was no doubt characteristically generous and altruistic; but he himself used to say that he was trying to protect the cow of the Musalmans, which was their Khilafat, so that this grateful community which had learnt

from its Scriptures that there could be no return for kindness save kindness, would be induced to protect his own cow in return. This was, however, only Mahatma Gandhi's way of emphasising his love for the cow. And even before he so picturesquely called the Khilafat our cow my brother and I had decided not to be any party to cow-killing ourselves. No beef is consumed since then in our house even by our servants, and we consider it our duty to ask our co-religionists to act similarly. As for sacrificing cows, my brother and I have never done it, but have always sacrificed goats, since a sacrifice of some such animal is a recognised religious duty. Much can be done in this way, and we have learnt by experience during the three or four years following the Hindu-Muslim *entente* and co-operation that it is not difficult to reduce cow-sacrifice, even before Swaraj is won, to insignificant proportions.

But, much as I desire that even ordinary cow-killing throughout the year for the purpose of providing food should be altogether discontinued, or, at least reduced to similarly meagre proportions, I am only too conscious of the fact that in looking forward to an early realisation of my wishes I am hoping against hope. Musalmans in India who can afford to purchase the dearer mutton eat beef only on rare occasions. But for the poorer towns-folk among the Musalmans it is the staple food. Coming from the centre of Rohilkhand, or the land of the Rohillas, I know how difficult it is for them to discontinue the use of beef in the present circumstances. The Pathan cannot suppress his surprise when he comes across people in India who "eat corn with corn"; and Rampur wags say: "Let there be meat, even if it be a dog's." When following the fashion of British Indian Municipalities, Rampur

also closed many meat shops and opened in their place a central Meat Market, it was found difficult to cope with the demand for beef, and so disastrous proved the results of a keen competition for the reduced supply that the *Markeet*, as it used to be called, was now descriptively rechristened *Marpeet*? In the case of this class of Musalmans the use of beef is at present a more or less acutely felt economic necessity.

The only safe and sure way of stopping cow-killing in this case is to take steps to lower the price of mutton which is prohibitively high, and thus reduce the very large margin that there is at present between the prices of mutton and beef. I am far from desiring that the cost of living should be still further increased for any section of this impoverished land, not excluding my own community, which is admittedly one of the poorest; but I cannot help pointing out that by far the most numerous owners of cows are the Hindus, and that if they did not sell cows after they had ceased to give milk, there would be much less cow-killing than there is to-day. Even now we can encourage goat and sheep breeding in order to save the cow, but when we can frame our Budgets for a Swaraj Government it should be a comparatively easy matter to utilise a considerable portion of the savings from Military expenditure for the same purpose. Nevertheless I appeal to my co-religionists even to-day to discontinue the use of beef and not to wait until Swaraj is won when their sacrifice would be worth much less. The Joint Family system of India and not the free competition of the Manchester School must be our social and political ideal for India's different communities. But if there is to be competition among the communities that form the Indian Joint Family, let it be a competition in forbearance and

self-sacrifice, and I maintain that the community which willingly surrenders more of its cherished rights and strongly-entertained sentiments for the sake of sister communities and the peace and harmony of India will prove the most invincible in the end.

ADJUSTMENT OF COMMUNAL SHARES IN REPRESENTATIVE BODIES AND IN THE ADMINISTRATION.

I have already explained to you what I think about the main cause of communal quarrels and the share of the educated classes in misleading the masses and using them in order to serve their personal ambitions. But matters like cow-killing and processions with music are not the only things that provide sources of friction. The adjustment of communal shares in representative institutions, local, provincial and All-India, and in the administration also, gives rise to bitter communal dissensions, and here it is clearly impossible to shift the blame on to the masses. Once more personal ambitions well or ill disguised as communal interests, play a great part, and specious phrases, such as greater efficiency and superior educational qualifications, are used to cover the injustice intended. This is all the more surprising because similar pretexts when put forward by the foreign bureaucrats are mercilessly exposed by the selfsame people. Since this fallacy of the higher efficiency of monopolists has not yet received its quietus, I am compelled to say that the intelligence of the few can never be a proper safeguard of the interests of the many. And when people are not actuated by motives of broad-minded patriotism, the superior intelligence of one group or section cannot but be regarded by other groups and sections as a rather dangerous possession. It may, however, be that even where the motives are pure they are none the

less suspect. That, friends, is our *karma*, the legacy left by the injustice of past generations, and instead of taking undue offence, we must live down such reputations. In politics as in business credit has first to be established, and a good balance-sheet and a moderately good dividend are far more useful in the long run than the most attractive prospectus. We could have gone much farther on the road to Liberty and Self-Rule if minorities had been quite sure of the company which they were being invited to join. But the common platform of the Congress has now provided an excellent opportunity to all of us to prove the patriotic character of our motives, and however long it may be before we succeed in establishing our credit, nothing can be done without it; and losing our temper over unmerited suspicions, or hustling those who entertain them and trying to jockey them into an expression of confidence that they do not yet feel in us, is poor business.

The Lucknow Compact which forced the hands even of the bureaucracy and compelled it to agree to such poor Reforms as have been doled out to India would in all likelihood suffice for the present for such of us as have decided to enter the Legislatures; and even if it does not, this should spur us on, to quicken the pace and try to reach our national destination of Swaraj all the earlier so that we may re-adjust communal shares in representative bodies. Friends, let me tell you frankly that I do not consider it likely that for some time yet we can afford to dispense with separate electorates. But I can assure you no one would rejoice more than myself on the day that the minorities themselves announced that they needed no such protection. It may perhaps help you to judge of my *bona fides* in this matter if I tell you that

I voted the adoption of the Indian plan

for the protection of the Christian minorities in the Eastern Vilayets of Turkey known as Armenia.

But two intermediate steps may be taken before we abolish separate electorates altogether. The first is that the minorities should be free to elect any Indian as their representative. I shall deem it a great honour the day a non-Muslim minority elects me in preference to its own members to represent it in the national assembly. And I know of no Muslim to whom I could give my vote with greater confidence than to that great Khilafatist, Mahatma Gandhi.

Another step that we could well take would be the progressive creation of mixed electorates, gradually to replace separate electorates. Some of you may perhaps remember that I had opposed the Rt. Hon. Syed Ameer Ali who did not wish to risk any seat by agreeing to the retention of some mixed electorates, and wanted safe, even if fewer, seats for the Musalmans when the Minto-Morley Reforms were being discussed. As inter-communal relations improved the number of seats thrown open for contest in mixed electorates may be increased and those allotted to separate electorates decreased, till all come to be contested in mixed territorial electorates. The same policy should be adopted in throwing administrative posts open from communal to general competition.

All the foregoing considerations have to be kept in view in dealing with the composition of local bodies where, although the issues may often be petty, the passions of the people concerned are more liable to be excited.

A sad enough confirmation of this is furnished by the unfortunate dissensions in the Punjab

over the distribution of municipal seats. The conditions in that province sometimes make me wonder whether Jallianwallah Bagh and the Crawling Lane are really situated in the Punjab.

MENTAL MYOPIA.

In the short passage which I quoted in the earlier part of this address from another address of mine, delivered as long ago as in 1904, I had warned my audience against placing any reliance on the "misleading unity of opposition", and I would be the last person to believe that we can remain a united people merely by feeding on the memory of Martial Law terrors. Many a coalition formed in Opposition and adversity has broken down after the first flush of victory at the polls and in the very first days of Government, and if Swaraj is not only to be won, but also to be retained thereafter, our unity must be based on something more lasting than the memories of common suffering. And yet I am compelled to remind both Hindus and Musalmans who complain so bitterly to-day of one another's injustice that I know of nothing more difficult for either to endure from the other than the cold-blooded decision taken by General Dyer to shoot and to shoot strong at Jallianwallah Bagh and the calculated national humiliation of the Crawling Lane. It seems to me that we in the North suffer from a mental myopia, and as we move forward our sufferings are left behind, and gradually recede into obscurity, so that even at a very short distance of time the troubles of to-day blot out all recollection of the terrors of yesterday. And what is worse, each community remembers only that which it has itself suffered, retaining in its memory no record of the sufferings

THE COMMUNITY OF THE BADMASHES.

But in referring thus to communities we are apt to forget that it is not communities that cause suffering to other communities in the course of popular affrays, but rowdy elements of India's population which cause injury to the peace-loving. The *badmashes* belong to no community but form a distinct community of their own, and to it all is grist that comes to the mill. I was greatly impressed by an article contributed by Lala Lajpatrai from his American exile during the War when Hindu monied classes had suffered greatly in some districts of the Punjab from the depredations of Muslim *badmashes*. There was great danger of intercommunal strife, but the Lalaji hastened to point out that the Hindu sufferers had not suffered because they were Hindus but because they belonged to the monied classes. It was a case of the Haves and the Have-Nots and not a case of the Hindus and the Musalmans. This has always to be borne in mind, particularly when there are not only the two contending parties but a third as well, which laughs just as heartily as we fight and abuse one another. Dr. Tagore has spoken a great deal since the outbreak of rowdyism in the North on the subject of inter-communal quarrels; but the reports of his lectures made me doubt a little whether he remembered what he wrote on the same subject when similar rowdyism, but more deliberate and previously planned, had broken out over cow-killing in Behar in 1917. He happened to be travelling in a compartment shared with him by a British military officer who sneered at Indian aspirations and asked the Poet how his fellow-countrymen could talk of Swaraj when he a foreigner had to be called in

disturbed areas and keep the peace between Indians of different faiths. Then, at least, the Poet remembered that there was a third who laughed while we suffered, and reminded the British officer of his existence. The latter asked whether there were no such quarrels before the advent of the British, and the Poet admitted their previous existence as well but he was then prompt to point out that there was one difference. They quarrelled even then, but they did not let many suns go down upon their wrath because the moment they recovered their lost tempers they also recollected that they had to live together for better or worse, and since life would be infinitely dull without more or less friendly intercourse, the sooner they made up their differences and became friends again the better. But ever since the *tertius gaudens* had come on the scene such quarrels had become more frequent and such reconciliations fewer and farther between.

THE HAND OF ESAU AND THE VOICE OF JACOB.

European husbands and Indian wives have a horror of that triangular family life in which the third side is represented by the mother-in-law. Imagine then the blessed state of that union in which the mother-in-law is not only a permanent feature of family life, but in which she alone runs the household. And worse than all, the mother-in-law that makes each of us pine for single blessedness combines *two* distinct natures in *one* person, and with ever ready sympathy consoles either party, as the occasion demands, and, better still, condemns the other, in the joint role of the mother of *both*! This would indeed be matter for laughter if we had only sense enough not to be the dupes of this double-dealing mother-in-law. But the moment a cow is killed by a Musalman

in a provocative manner, or a noisy procession is taken out by a Hindu in front of a mosque where prayer may be going on, we are ready to rush at one another's throats forgetting that Musalmans have never been known to be wanting when it was their own co-religionists that had to be denounced to the Government as seditionists and rebels, and that Hindus have had no better record of communal cohesion in similar circumstances. Our own sufferings have taught us that there is never a lack of one's co-religionists to do all the dirty work that may be required of them, and when a Musalman is so ready to hurt a brother Muslim, or, for that matter, the entire Muslim community, why need we be surprised if a Hindu is employed to do the same? No, friends, like *badmashes*, traitors belong to no community, but form a tribe of their own. Some of you must have read Labour's denunciation of "International Finance." We have even better reason to denounce "Inter-Communal Goondaism." A Musalman may throw beef during the night into a temple or break an idol, and yet the Muslim community may be just as innocent of this provoking sacrilege as the Hindu community itself; and in similar circumstances the Hindu community may be wholly blameless even though a Hindu certainly threw pork into a mosque or desecrated the Holy Quran.

But even more clear than this is the case of a Muslim Minister who may have shown favouritism towards Musalman in the matter of patronage, and of a Hindu Minister similarly showing undue favour to Hindus. Obviously they are members of a foreign Government whatever caste-mark they may bear. The hands are the hands of Esau, but the voice is the voice of Jacob. And yet the people of a province that has still to stop the pensions of a Dyer and an O'Dwyer

are prepared to co-operate with those who insist on paying for Indian murder out of Indian funds, and to cease to co-operate with their neighbours and fellow-sufferers, only because a Minister who happens to belong to the community of the latter dispenses such petty patronage as the Reforms empower him to do in a manner that does not meet with their approval. After this one wonders what Non-Co-operation means. When the Congress publicly is welcoming Indians who resign their posts, even though it thinks it is perhaps too much just yet to call upon them to resign, there are people who call themselves Congressmen but forget all that Mahatma Gandhi had taught them of Non-Co-operation only because a Minister in their province is giving a few more petty posts to members of his own community than they think he ought to do. Friends, it is not a little embarrassing to me that this Minister happens to be a co-religionist of mine; but believe me, I would have felt even more ashamed than I now feel embarrassed if the complaint about such petty posts had come from my co-religionists. Hakim Ajmal Khan Saheb, for whose speedy and complete recovery we all pray, has related to me what unspeakable shame he felt when co-religionists of his and mine had the hardihood to show some scratches on the walls of the mosques at Multan and some broken pitchers in justification of their counter-claim that if Hindu temples had been destroyed their own mosques did not altogether escape.

THE PARABLE OF THE WISE AND THE FOOLISH MOTHER.

Let me add that I would never have mentioned this had I wanted to complain about the Hindu attitude in the matter. I have done so because

I feel certain that the Muslim mentality does not seem to be any better, and neither community is above these petty considerations. But even if the Musalmans had been any better I would not have complained of the Hindus, for experience teaches us that it serves no purpose for a member of one community to rebuke the members of another. That task must be left to its own members. How often have we not seen little children living in the same quarter of a town playing together and then quarrelling over little things? Every boy rushes back to his own mother with a woeful tale of the wickedness of his playmates, and, of course, an equally pathetic description of his own virtues. The wise mother uniformly decides against her own child and rebukes him ; and if he still persists in his complaint, he is told not to make such unsociable creatures his playmates any more. The street which is usually the common playground is thenceforward declared beyond the bounds. But solitude soon begins to pall upon our virtuous young friend, and a little separation begins to purge his playmates of all their sins so that by the second or third day they are completely absolved, and he asks for, and secures, his mother's permission to play with them once more, though not before he is told that he is not to come to her again with the tale of his undeserved sufferings. And this is the way that peace is secured. But, alas, I have seen foolish mothers as well as wise ones, and perhaps the former constitute a majority. The moment their young hopeful comes to them for sympathy and, even worse, for effective support, they shed motherly tears of deep anguish over him, and when they have exhausted one emotion they make use of another, and, going to the mother of the wicked boy who had been so unjust to their little angel, bitterly complain of him and drop not a few hints that his

upbringing has evidently been neglected. This leads to still plainer hints from the other side that the complainant was a devil incarnate, and that with such parents to bring him up it was not altogether the poor creature's fault. And then the fray begins. The big guns of abuse are sent up at a gallop, and long range howitzers which leave none scot-free up to the seventh generation are brought into action. Then appears the male auxiliary, and if he is equally devoid of common-sense and equally jealous of his *izzat*, he opens fire instantly with something that shatters the *izzat* of the adversary for ever. Thus when the other male auxiliary rushes up to the scene of action on hearing the noise of this bombardment, he calls a truce to this wordy warfare, and, like the practical creature that he is, he promptly breaks the head of the other male. And it is a lucky quarter of the town if hostilities remain confined to the families directly concerned. The best commentary on all this is furnished by the action of the brace of young barbarians with whom hostilities had commenced walking off arm-in-arm to enjoy another game of *gilli-danda* or *kabaddi* just as police may be marching the Big Four off to the lock-up!

It is such experiences as these which have taught us that the best method of settling inter-communal quarrels is neither to advocate the cause of your community, as in my time I have often done, nor even to pose as an arbitrator with an open and a judicious mind, but to earn the abuse of your own community. And since my brother and I have received an earnest of this already, I feel satisfied that not only am I qualifying myself for the office of a genuine patriot, but that I may begin to entertain hopes that the two communities will soon be reconciled. After this, need I say I recommend this course of "political

exercises" to all my friends of every community?

SANGHATAN.

Having explained my own attitude at such length I do not think I am called upon to say much about the Sanghatan. I have certainly never publicly opposed it, and if anyone thinks so he is mistaken, and must have been misled by some ill-reported speech or interview. This is entirely an affair of my Hindu brethren, and if they think they need a Sanghatan they should be allowed a perfectly free hand in the matter. Every community is entitled to undertake such social reform as it needs, and if the Sanghatan is organised to remove untouchability and to provide for the speedy assimilation of the Antyaj and their complete absorption into Hindu society, I must rejoice at it both as a Musalman and as a Congressman. Ever since the Congress at Nagpur called upon the Hindu delegates "to make a special effort to rid Hinduism of the reproach of untouchability" and "respectfully urged the religious heads to help the growing desire to reform Hinduism in the matter of its treatment of the suppressed classes," this question has enlisted the direct interest and sympathy of the Congress. I remember very well that towards the closing months of the year 1921, Mahatma Gandhi was making the removal of untouchability the test of the Hindus' yearning for Swaraj, and if orthodox Hindu religious bodies have now seriously decided to make the required reform in Hinduism, it is bound to rejoice the hearts of that large-hearted Hindu and of all his followers.

But I cannot help recalling that this matter remained in abeyance for a considerable time, and that it was not taken up with any great zeal until after the tragic events in Malabar

hád caused some months later a wave of indignation and resentment to sweep over the distant Punjab, and Multan Hindus had themselves suffered from the unruly passions of the Muslim mob. It is this combination of circumstances which causes uneasiness to many of those who yearn for the unification of India and know how little weight our recently achieved unity can just yet sustain. A broken limb which has just come out of a steel frame should not be too severely strained. We may not believe every suspicion or rumour, but we must not overlook their potency for mischief if they are not quickly removed or disproved; and there is no doubt that people are busy creating the suspicion that the removal of untouchability is not intended to result in the absorption of the suppressed classes into Hindu society, but merely to use them as auxiliaries on the Hindu side in future affrays. This being so, I ask if there is no ground for the uneasiness of Mahatma Gandhi's followers who have been sedulously taught, in the words of our resolution at Nagpur, "to lay special emphasis on NON-VIOLENCE being an integral part of the Non-Co-operation Resolution," and to invite the attention of the people to the fact that "NON-VIOLENCE in word and deed is as essential between the people themselves as in respect of the Government," and, finally, that "the spirit of violence is not only contrary to the growth of a true spirit of democracy, but actually retards the enforcement (if necessary) of the other stages of Non-Co-operation." If in removing the reproach of untouchability we give cause to the world to reproach us with adding to pre-existing violence, will it not sadden the heart of the Mahatma? Friends, let us befriend the suppressed classes for their own injured sakes and not for the sake of injuring others or even avenging our own injuries.

Another feature of the Sanghatan movement is the increase of interest in physical culture. This is all to the good; and if flabbiness and cowardice can be removed from any section of the Indian people there is cause only for joy. Here, too, however, there arises the question of the spirit, and I am sincerely glad that the frank discussions at Delhi last September gave an opportunity to Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya to proclaim to the world that he himself favours the creation of common *akhadas* in which young men of all communities can take their share. As for the protection of life and property and—I regret that I should have to add—the honour of our sisters, he again proclaimed his original intention that common territorial Civic Guards should be formed. It was only because he was told that the Hindu Sabha by which his motion was being discussed could not constitutionally bind other communities that he altered his resolution and agreed to the creation of Hindu Guards.

THE SANGHATAN OF THE CONGRESS CONCILIATION COMMITTEE.

But in entire agreement with Hindu leaders the Hindu-Muslim Unity Committee recommended certain resolutions to the Congress, for adoption on all these subjects, and since they were immediately passed by the Congress let us now see that we give full effect to them. To prevent the possibility of disunion we have, in the first place, to establish at the headquarters of every district, under the supervision of the District Congress Committees, and in consultation with Khilafat Committees, Hindu Sabhas and other responsible local associations, mixed Committees for the maintenance of peace and security throughout the districts. In case of any incident likely to disturb such peace and security,

they would endeavour to minimise its evil consequences and provide for a speedy and satisfactory settlement, and would encourage the people, in case of any provocation, to conduct themselves with restraint, and to refer the matter to such Committees for redress of their grievances, instead of themselves resorting to retaliatory measures. I have since then realised with grief and pain that in some districts the Congress Committees have ceased to function, and that Congress workers have in some cases themselves taken a leading part in exciting inter-communal hostility. This would necessitate for some time at least the formation of supervisory bodies to check the work of the District Committees and to be a substitute for them in areas in which such Committees have not been formed. A permanent Provincial, and a similar National Conciliation Board also seem to me to be called for, and had such Boards been in existence perhaps they could have averted unfortunate collisions in some localities. These Boards could perhaps be utilised also for making enquiries into similar incidents that occur in future in spite of all our precautions, and, if necessary, to apportion the guilt between the communities concerned. Let us be ready with our machinery, and if the people know that we mean to stamp out such rowdyism and to maintain peace, security and inter-communal friendship, there is little likelihood of our having to sit in judgment upon contending communities.

CIVIC GUARDS.

In the next place, the Congress resolved at Delhi that its local Committees be instructed to form and maintain, under their own supervision and control, local Corps of Civic Guards (open to all communities), throughout the country, for the maintenance of peace and order, and for the perform-

ance of other civic duties. Local Committees of the Congress were also to be instructed to induce and encourage the people to take up physical culture, and to provide necessary facilities for this purpose so that our people may be enabled to undertake their self-defence. I have heard of communal *dals* and *akhadas*, but I fear the local Committees have not yet had sufficient time to organise Congress Corps of Civic Guards and open Congress *akhadas*. I, however, know of one School of Physical Culture at Ajmer which sent some of its members to the Delhi Congress, and while pleased with their physical development, I rejoiced still more when I learnt that, in spite of much persuasion to throw in their lot with their community during the unfortunate affray there and indulge in partisan violence, these young men remained wholly non-violent and refused to take sides. Can anyone say after this that the Congress exercises no influence in favour of national unity and non-violence? Wherever we have men like our Arjunlal Sethiji, Maulana Moinuddin and Mirza Abdul Qadir Beg, we may confidently look forward to the maintenance, or, at least, the earliest possible restoration, of peace. Dr. Hardikar has, I am happy to say, interested himself in the creation of Volunteer Corps, and, let me confess, friends, that even to-day when I am presiding over the Congress I feel I would be more in my element if I were working in Dr. Hardikar's place. If only the Government knew how necessary is the formation of volunteer corps of Civic Guards to keep our crowds even more peaceful than they already are and far more orderly and self-restrained, it would not dream of using its Criminal Law Amendment Act against them and their organisers, provided, of course, it too desired peace and order to prevail in the land. In this matter I have a personal end to serve also. Travelling as constantly as I do, and attending

mass meeting by the dozen, and being unfortunately only too often carried in processions, I feel the need of such Corps more than the stay-at-homes among us, and I am often tempted to take in hand the local volunteers attending on such occasions, forgetting for the moment that no man can attend at his own funeral !

SENSE OF HONOUR OF OUR BADMASHES.

But let me say one word on the subject of the protection of the honour of our women before I take leave of the Sanghatan question, and let me preface my last word on the subject with the admission that it is not really mine but my wife's. At Almora, where she was addressing a ladies' meeting composed mainly of her Hindu sisters, she said that if in a place such as Almora, where Musalmans form a very insignificant minority, she found that an anti-Muslim riot had broken out, and her male relations were not available to help her to protect her own or her daughter's honour, she would unhesitatingly appeal to the first Hindu as to a brother even if she knew him to be a *badmash*, and ask him to take her and her children under his personal protection. She said she had enough confidence in the sense of honour even of India's *badmashes* and in their "sportsmanship", so to speak, and I doubt if there are many *badmashes* in India on whom such a personal appeal of a sister in distress will fail to have any effect. Friends, trust disarms even wickedness and succeeds where six-chambered revolvers fail, and Shakespeare knew human nature better than some of us seem to do when he wrote:

"There is a soul of goodness in things evil."

I cannot do better than to appeal to my sisters to teach us to trust each other more than we do

at present, and by their own courageous confidence develop in the worst of us that God-given "soul of goodness."

SHUDDHI

Another movement that has affected Hindu-Muslim relations is Shuddhi. I myself believe in a missionary religion, and by a missionary religion should be taken to mean one in which, in the words of Professor Max Muller, the spreading of the truth and the conversion of unbelievers are raised to the rank of a sacred duty. It is the spirit of truth in the hearts of believers which cannot rest unless it manifests itself in thought, word and deed, which is not satisfied till it has carried its message to every human soul, till what it believes to be the truth is accepted as the truth by all the members of the human family. Christianity and Buddhism as well as Islam are known to be missionary religions, but Judaism, Zoroastrianism and Hinduism are generally regarded as non-missionary.

Now, this has been my complaint for a long time against Hinduism, and on one occasion, lecturing at Allahabad in 1907, I had pointed out the contrast between Musalmans and Hindus, by saying that the worst that could be said of a Muslim was that he had a tasteless mess which he called a dish fit for kings, and wanted all to share it with him, thrusting it down the throats of such as did not relish it and would rather not have it, while his Hindu brother who prided himself on his cookery, retired into the privacy of his kitchen and greedily devoured all that he had cooked, without permitting even the shadow of his brother to fall on his food, or sparing even a crumb for him. This was said not altogether in levity; and, in fact, I once asked Mahatma Gandhi to justify this

feature of his faith to me. It will be strange, then, if to-day, when there are evidences of a missionary zeal in the activities of my Hindu brethren, I should resent their efforts in spreading their faith. More than that, if the Malkana Rajputs are in reality so unfamiliar with Islam as to be taken for Hindus, Musalmans must thank Hindu missionaries for so forcibly reminding them of their own duty to look to the condition of millions of Musalmans whose knowledge of Islam is as defective as their practice of its rites is slack.

Both communities must be free to preach as well as practice the tenets of their respective faiths. There are competing types of culture in the world, each instinct with the spirit of propagandism, and I hope we live in an age of conscious selection as between ideal systems. We cannot surely wish to practise that wasteful, and, at best, a precarious, elimination of "false doctrine" by actual destruction of those who hold it. I hope the age of the Spanish Inquisition has gone for ever, and no one would think of abolishing heresy by wiping out the heretic. Progress is now possible along the more direct and less painful path of conversion. But it must be the result of the exercise of the power of rational choice, and the man whose conversion we seek must be free to choose his faith. What true Muslim could be satisfied by the kind of "conversion" which some fanatical Moplahs are believed to have effected during the period of the Malabar troubles by forcibly depriving some Nairs of their tufts of hair indicating their Hindu faith? No better in the sight of God is that outward conformity which is forced upon a person by bringing undue worldly pressure to bear upon him.

Allegations of such pressure by zemindars and

money-lenders and by a numerical majority of neighbours in the surrounding area have been made and denied, and counter-allegations have been made. This cannot but react unfavourably on national unity; and when over a very small matter the decision to put a stop to all demonstrative and inflammatory methods of mass conversion and reclamation was given up, the Hindu-Muslim Unity Committee at Delhi recommended to the Congress a resolution which was duly adopted, that a Committee be formed to enquire into incidents connected with "Shuddhi" and "Anti-Shuddhi" movements, to visit places wherever coercion, intimidation, exercise of undue pressure or influence, or use of methods of proselytisation inconsistent with such a religious object is alleged or suspected, and to recommend such means as it thinks necessary for the prevention of such practices. Every political party in the West is, or, at least, pretends to be, jealous of its honour, and willingly consents to have a Corrupt Practices Act passed by the Legislature. We who pride ourselves on our greater spirituality must be truly jealous of our reputations, and a national body like the Congress is a proper authority to advise all communities in this matter, if not to enforce a Corrupt Practices Act as part of the unwritten law of the nation. My own belief is that both sides are working with an eye much more on the next decennial Census than on heaven itself, and I frankly confess it is on such occasions that I sigh for the days when our forefathers settled things by cutting heads rather than counting them.

ABSORPTION OR CONVERSION

The quarrels about *arqms* and *pipal* trees and musical processions are truly childish; but

inviting the attention of the Indian newspapers to the extreme necessity of exercising great restraint when dealing with matters likely to affect inter-communal relations, and also in reporting events and incidents relating to inter-communal dissensions and in commenting upon them. It was asked to appeal to them not to adopt an attitude which might prove detrimental to the best interests of India and which might embitter the relations between different communities. It was also recommended to the Congress that its Working Committee might be instructed to appoint in each province a small Committee which should request such newspapers as publish any matter likely to create inter-communal dissensions that they should desist from following such a course of action, and that if, in spite of this friendly advice, no useful result were achieved, these Committees should proclaim such newspapers. If even after this they did not alter their attitude, a boycott of them by Congressmen was to be declared in the last resort. The Congress adopted this resolution also, but I fear its executive has not yet had time to carry out the instructions issued by the Congress. The most important work that we have to do, apart from this of restoring Hindu-Muslim unity, is to organise an adequate permanent establishment for the Congress and its Provincial and Local Committees, for it is no use passing Resolutions in the Congress which cannot be attended to by the honorary executive for lack of a paid, permanent establishment.

Friends, you may perhaps say I have taken up too much of your time in describing and detailing what the Congress did at Delhi and have hardly any proposals to place before you to-day. My answer is that you need few fresh proposals if you are determined to carry out those which you have already accepted. At Delhi we were able

to proclaim to the world that we were not satisfied with the existing state of affairs and that we were resolved to remain united. That itself cleared the air to a great extent; but this was not all. We had provided remedies essentially sound in principle for our national ills; only we have not so far had time to use them. We spent perhaps too much time in examining, analysing and criticising the resolutions we had passed at Delhi, and a large section of Congressmen has been kept busy by the elections. Unless you adopt other measures to restore the national unity, it will be the duty of your executive to carry out the measures already adopted. But your executive will fail to accomplish anything of lasting value unless it has your ungrudging support and active assistance. In fact, you are your own most effective executive, and as your servant specially nominated by you for the year that is now commencing I appeal to you to assist me in carrying out your own orders.

To the Indian Press I would address my most earnest appeal urging the Press to rise to the height of the occasion and not to disappoint the high expectations of one who is himself a journalist. When I was recently at Bijapur again and for the first time visited its famous dome, a friend who was as deeply impressed as myself by that wonderful pile, asked me in a whisper right across the dome if Europe with all its boast of superiority had a whispering gallery such as that of the *Gol Gumbad*. It is no doubt a most astonishing experience to be able to hear distinctly across such a great space everything that is whispered, and the nine echoes heard in that gallery are equally remarkable. My friend was for the moment living the brilliant past of Bijapur over again and felt inordinate pride in the achievements of his Muslim ancestors. It was no doubt a great shock

to him when I whispered back that the **Whispering Gallery of Europe** was even more marvellous. And then I told him that Europe's **Whispering Gallery** was the Press, its **Fourth Estate** ! Every lie softly whispered in the privacy of the **Editor-Proprietor's sanctum** was shouted across all the continents, increasing in pitch and volume with every reverberation till it ended in the united shriek of hundreds of millions, leaving no chance for poor tongue-tied Truth to be heard. And yet it is just as easy to make the world resound with the thunderpeals of Truth as with the shrieks of Falsehood, and it is for the Indian Press to choose whether it will serve as the **Whispering Gallery of Truth** or of Falsehood.

SWARAJ AND FOREIGN AGGRESSION.

Before I take final leave of the Hindu-Muslim question I wish to declare that if India wins **Swaraj** it will satisfy all the religious requirements of a Muslim in India. **Swaraj, Sarv-Raj, or the Raj of all, implies Swadharma, and must imply that in an Eastern country.** It is not therefore necessary that a Musalman should sit on the throne of the Mughals at Delhi, and we have all seen how the greatest Muslim State has ceased to have a Royal Throne and has converted itself into a Republic. Every true Muslim looks back with pride upon the **Thirty Years of the Truly Guided Khalifas** during which the **Successors of the Prophet and the Commanders of the Faithful** (with whom Allah was pleased) were the **Chief Servants of the Commonwealth.** Islam spread over the major portion of the civilised world and its empire extended over all the continents of the known world ; but no Muslim holds dear the memory of Islam's later conquests and expansion as that of the first thirty years when it was the pride of the Muslim envoy to tell the envoys of

the Byzantine and Iranian empires who had been boasting of the despotic power of their respective rulers that the Muslims had themselves appointed their ruler and would depose him just as readily if he acted against the Law of God. Victory has not been snatched from the jaws of defeat and despair by the valiant and God-fearing Turks to no purpose, and I feel confident that once they are free from the distractions inevitable after the victories both of war and peace they will revive with God's assistance the glories not of the Omayyide or Abbaside Empire, but of the first Thirty Years of the Khilafat before there were any kings or dynasts.

I have my own views of the possible adjustment of the relations of all Muslim States and the Khalifa, but this is not the occasion to state them. It would suffice if I state here that Musalmans can satisfy all their religious requirements no matter who is their secular sovereign so long as they recognise that "there is no governance but God's", and that "Him alone are we commanded to serve". As in every religion, there are in Islam certain things which every Musalman is required to do, and certain things which he is required not to do. Between these duties and prohibitions lies a vast stretch of ground in which he is free to roam about except for certain things which are in the nature of preferences. Now a Musalman can obey no creature of God who commands him to neglect one of these duties or to disregard one of these prohibitions, and it makes no difference whether that person is one of his own parents or his master or ruler, whether he is an enemy or a friend, or whether he is Muslim or a non-Muslim. So long as the temporal power of Islam is adequate and is always at the disposal of the Khalifa, it matters

little whether a Muslim is a subject of a Muslim or of a non-Muslim. All he needs is the fullest freedom to obey none but God in the matter of his religious duties and prohibitions. Even if a Muslim sovereign, nay, even if the Khalifa himself, commanded him to disobey God, he must refuse; and it is obvious that he could not render unto a non-Muslim Cæsar what he could not render unto a Muslim Cæsar because it was due only to God. This being so, I cannot understand why there need be any question of a Muslim's unflinching loyalty to a Swaraj and Swadharma government.

As for the bogey of His Majesty the Ameer of Afghanistan attacking India with the assistance of Indian Muslims, it is the creation of fear and cowardice, and can only be laid at rest by courage and self-confidence. I must say it did my heart good to hear my esteemed friend Pandit Jawaharlal say, "Let us win Swaraj and we shall see who comes" We shall certainly be ready to meet all comers, and it will be no easy matter to snatch away Freedom from the hands that have succeeded in winning it back after a century-and-a-half of slavery. As for myself, if India ever needs a humble soldier to resist an aggressor, be he the Muslim or non-Muslim, your comrade whom you have to-day called out of the ranks will gladly fill his place in the ranks. He certainly will be no deserter.

AFGHANISTAN.

I have heard that my Madras speech of 1921 which, had been considered in official circles to be highly treasonable, although it embodied nothing more or less than the sentiments my brother and I had expressed in a letter we had addressed from the Betul gaol to the Viceroy, had

not found much favour even in Afghanistan. And I do not wonder that our Afghan neighbours feel a little hurt when they are so often described as if they were harbouring designs on India. If only we knew how difficult His Majesty the Ameer must be finding the task of organising his kingdom and developing its resources without the assistance of foreign personnel, we would not talk of the possibility of Afghan aggression. Afghanistan is enough to keep him and his government fully occupied without the additional worry of the problem of how a Kabul pony can swallow an Indian elephant. If the Afghans are hurt merely because I explained my own position in the event of a hypothetical aggression from Afghanistan, what must be my own feelings in having to explain that position? Because I am a Muslim I have not ceased to be an Indian, and it is surely humiliating to any Indian's national pride to think that his fellow-countrymen regard his country and theirs as an easy prey for any foreign assailant no matter how weak.

"AND THE FOURTH WOULD KNOCK ME DOWN !"

Friends, you will forgive me if I relate a story here which seems so applicable to our own situation. I have to preface it with a special apology to my Banya friends because, whosoever may have been the author of the story, he had certainly lived in an age much anterior to ours when the most courageous leader that India has known in recent times happens to be no other than a Banya, and one of his chief lieutenants and lovers is "my brave Banya" as I call my dear friend Seth Jamnalal Bajaj. The story is that four travellers happened to meet each other on the road and agreed to travel together for safety's sake. It happened that after dusk they were met by some highwaymen who demanded the surrender of all their belongings. Then they discovered that their

assailants were also only four. One of the travellers who was a Rajput whispered to his companion who was a Pathan that he could successfully tackle the biggest of the highwaymen. Thereupon the Pathan assured the Rajput that, for his part, he too could manage to deal with the next biggest. Thus encouraged the third of the travellers who was a middle-aged Brahmin said : "And I could knock down the third". Then came the turn of the fourth who was a Banya, and equally promptly came his declaration : "And the fourth would knock *me* down!" This led the Brahmin to apprehend that in that case he might be required to tackle not one but two, and he decided to give in. The Pathan too gave it in for fear he might have to deal with three assailants, and, finally the Rajput also surrendered because obviously he was no match for all the four. And all this because one traveller out of the four had felt just as convinced that the fourth highwayman would knock him down as his three companions were convinced that they could knock down one highwayman apiece !

NEED OF COURAGE AND CONFIDENCE.

May I not ask you, friends, if it is not now time when we have a Banya for our brave leader for all of us to give up such conviction of defeat before the battle is joined? Why, only recently a Delhi paper published the remarkable discovery of its Secret Investigator that a Delegation consisting of two aged Arabs and one young one who have come from Palestine with the permission of the government to raise funds from Indian Musalmans for the repair of the Masjid-ul-Aqsa and the Qubbat-us-Sakhra at Jerusalem is the vanguard of an invading force of Arabs ! Not with such fears and suspicions and tremors can Freedom be won. This, friends, is the way to

lose even the little we have. It reminds me of the curse of the Lord on Israel which is recorded in Deuteronomy:

The Lord shall send upon thee cursing, vexation and rebuke, in all that thou settest thine hand unto for to do, until thou be destroyed, and thou perish quickly.

Thy Lord shall curse thee to be smitten before thine enemies, thou shalt go out one way against them, and flee seven ways before them; and shalt be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth.

And thy carcase shall be meat unto all the fowls of the air, and unto beasts of the earth and no man shall fray them away.

The Lord shall smite thee with madness, and blindness, and astonishment of heart:

And thou shalt grope at noonday as the blind gropeth in darkness, and thou shalt not prosper in thy ways; and thou shalt be only oppressed and spoiled evermore, and no man shall save thee.

Thou shalt build an house, and thou shalt not dwell therein; thou shalt plant a vineyard and thou shalt not gather the grapes thereof.

Thy sons and thy daughters shall be given unto another people, and thine eyes shalt look and fail with longing for them all the day long; and there shall be no might in thine hand.

The fruit of thine land and all thy labours, shall a nation which thou knowest not eat up; and thou shalt be only oppressed and crushed away;

So that thou shalt be mad for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see.

And thou shalt become an astonishment, a proverb, and a byword among all nations whither the Lord shall lead thee.

The stranger that is within thee shall get up above thee very high; and thou shalt come down very low.

He shall lend to thee and thou shalt not lend to him; he shall be the head and thou shalt be the tail.

Moreover all these curses shall come upon thee, and shall pursue thee and overtake thee, till thou be destroyed;

And they shall be upon thee for a sign and for a wonder, and upon thy seat for ever.

great weakness in harping on Hindu-Muslim unity when the Hindu show no desire to unite, I say, "You can never show too great weakness in your dealings with Hindus." Remember, it is only the weak who fear to appear too weak to others. With this observation I take my last leave of this question without a proper and a lasting settlement of which we can effect nothing.

COUNCIL-ENTRY.

This was the main question to be dealt with at Delhi even though the Special Session was held in order to arrive at a settlement of the Council-entry question. I have devoted so large a portion of my address to it not only because of its importance, but also because happily the other is no longer a live issue. At Delhi at my solicitation the Congress removed the ban and permitted those who had no religious or other conscientious objections against entering the Legislatures or voting at the then forthcoming elections to do so, and suspended the propaganda in favour of the boycott of Councils which had achieved such signal success three years previously. The elections have been held, and it can, in my humble judgment, serve no useful purpose to re-open a question which kept us occupied in much sterile activity for more than a year and sorely tried our tempers. I hold strong views on the subject of the triple boycott of Councils, law-courts and schools and colleges, and did not shrink from giving expression to them in strong, or, as my Swarajist friends complained, perhaps in too strong language in the course of the discussion in the Subjects Committee at Delhi. I hold the same views to-day, and would gladly give expression to them again in equally strong language if I could be convinced that it was necessary and in the

best interests of the Congress and the country. But of this I am as little convinced as of the soundness of the Swaraj Party views, and, on the contrary, I am fully convinced that no word should escape me which would estrange from the Indian National Congress a single Indian who has any national feeling. In fact, I desire to take a leaf out of the book of the late Lord Morley, whose recent death has removed from the world one who had shown both courage and resource in asking his fellow-countrymen also to do such justice to India as he himself was capable of doing. "Let us rally the Moderates."

THE MODERATES AND THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

I take no party view of the recent elections, and the franchise is far too restricted to read in them the judgment of the nation. But if one thing is more certain than another it is this, that India refuses to co-operate any longer with its foreign rulers. Many things have helped to disillusion those honest Nationalists who still held the opinions which many of us held as recently as four years ago. The discussions in the Imperial Council with regard to the status of Indians overseas have been so extensively advertised that it must be a very foolish fish that would still be deceived by the poor bait offered. South Africa where the Indian population still numbers 160,000 is adamant. The Imperial Government which cannot plead its impotence to interfere in the so-called "internal affairs" of the free Dominions when Kenya and other Crown Colonies are concerned, cannot hold out any hopes of reversing its palpably iniquitous decision, and has only consented to hear India's case once more. But the other Dominions are "sympathetic" since sympathy costs so little, and even here they are not

quite so optimistic where the Indians in British Columbia, of the "Komagata Maru" fame, still numbering some 11,00 are concerned, though the rest of Canada, which has only a bare hundred, is disposed to be generous. I am prepared to give the fullest credit to the impassioned advocacy and highly emotional appeals of Dr. Sapro, and his victory has been complete. But, alas, he had aimed so low from the very outset that his victory leaves such of us as could not like him feel the heat of the encounter uncomfortably cold.

It reminds me of a friend who had left a lucrative enough post, and, making a new departure for an up-country Muslim graduate, had started business as a commission agent in Bombay. One day he met me with every show of exultation, and announced that he had closed the day with cent per cent profit in the transaction that had kept him so fully engaged. But when I asked for more details I learnt that my friend had sold a few dozen Japanese paper serviettes, and that the cent per cent profit would hardly pay the day's rent of his office! After long and weary years of strife the Imperial Council passed in 1921 a Resolution recognising the desirability of conceding equal status to Indians overseas, but *Hamlet* was acted with the part of the Prince of Denmark carefully cut out by General Smuts, the Imperial Dramatic Censor. And yet India was asked to rejoice over her cent-per-cent profits. However, as it happened the profits remained unrealised, and two whole years later the battle had to be fought again over the Imperial counter. There were doubts about the nature of the bargain. Such as whether payment was only desirable or necessary, and here the slim Boer General wanted to rescind the entire transaction. But luck has favoured the travelling agents of India again, even though there was much disagreement among

them, and one of the two has made a discovery not less remarkable than that of Columbus inasmuch as he has discovered in the Boer General a skilfully disguised friend of India. We have secured cent-per-cent profits again, and a roving commission will go out to each of the partners in the other party's firm and by direct dealing ascertain what prospect there is of any payment. This, then, is the net gain. Dr. Sapru's travelling agents, no doubt some of the Great Unemployed, will have the great privilege of having direct dealings with the partners of John Bull, Sons & Co. Lest I may be suspected of belittling the results achieved, I quote the conclusion laboriously reached by the *Times* at the fag end of its leading article on "India and the Commonwealth." "The spirit of sympathy", concludes the *Times*, "and of good-will expressed by the representatives of the British Government and of the Dominions Overseas, the sincere appreciation of the share of India in the Commonwealth—these are hardly less important to her than the practical recognition of her right to negotiate for herself with the other partners." Yes, Dr. Sapru and his royal companion have indeed secured "the practical recognition of India's right to negotiate for herself with the other partners"; but when will the bargain be concluded and payment received, and—what will be its amount?

Imperial Conferences will no doubt continue to succeed each other with great regularity, and the success of the Indian dependency at each will be advertised more and more extensively. But it is too much for poor human nature to wait patiently and continue to hope while the Imperial stratification proceeds from the Archean or Pre-Cambrian stratum through all the Paleozoic Mesozoic, Cainozoic strata or divisions in their true order of antiquity, and the long list of

sub-divisions, such as the Eocene, Oligocene, Miocene, and Pliocene, before we come to the Pleistocene or Glacial and finally to the Post-Glacial or Human period. No honest Moderate would be so moderate as to be satisfied with this crawling pace of our Imperial progress and no honest Liberal could be so liberal as to give unlimited time to England to do us bare justice, especially when they recognise, as they must more and more clearly as each day passes, that a wrong system of education is fast paralysing us and robbing us of our youth and manhood.

When their disillusionment is just as complete as ours, the question will still have to be answered, "How far are they prepared to go?" Non-Co-operation has from the very outset required only the minimum sacrifice from the maximum number, though even the minimum in the Post-Gandhi era far exceeds the maximum in most cases of the Pre-Gandhi period. But Liberty can neither be won nor retained on the principle of Limited Liability. Dr. Sapru's advocacy may have been all that it could be, but what is there to follow it? Only "resolutions", petitions and protests, and at best a silly *hartal* to wind up with? If that is all, let us leave off this crazy pursuit of politics. Those whose ancestors have won freedom on the field of Runnymede or after the "crowning mercy" of Worcester or by razing the Bastille to the ground may play with politics. We have yet to win our Magna Carta and our Bill of Rights, and it is premature for us to treat politics as a Western pastime. For long we thought in terms of the Penal Code, and now we think we have advanced very far on the road of Reform if we think in terms of Dicey and of Erskine May. We forget that we have still to think in terms of History! I am prepared to admit that the Liberal gun is long enough. The

length of the barrel, however, counts for little. It is the charge behind that matters. Once every Liberal or Moderate makes up his mind that patriotism must be to him as it was to every patriot in the world's history who won freedom for his country from a foreign yoke—a matter of unlimited liability, then—all is well. The Congress is his proper place even though he may at first proceed at a slow pace from force of habit. And it is just because I know that the leaders of the Swaraj Party are prepared to go to any length that I refused to be a party to driving them out of the Congress.

BARDOLI AND THE SWARAJ PARTY.

It is true many of the Swarajists have retained to this day something of their laboriously acquired Western mentality and revel in parliamentary discussions and debates. Many more who have willingly relinquished all thought of the use of force even for purposes of self-defence want the spice of this wordy warfare to make the insipid fare prepared at Bardoli piquant enough for their jaded palates. Many more still have not fully understood the almost unlimited possibilities of the *charkha* which must revolutionise Indian life while it frees us from economic slavery. Above all, the Swaraj party is the embodiment of the depression experienced by all India when Mahatma Gandhi, after having brought the country to the very door of Swaraj, suddenly had to declare that it was unwise to force that door by resorting to mass Civil Disobedience, and that his plan of action must be changed from an offensive bold to the verge of audacity to a defensive which to those who did not know our generalissimo looked almost like a surrender. But, as I told the Mahatma when I was passing through Bardoli on my way from the Karachi

gaol to the Bijapur gaol, his change of plan was out of his strength and not out of his weakness and had he been left free for some weeks longer he would have changed the face of the whole situation. He was, however, arrested and imprisoned before the people had recovered from the first depressing shock of Bardoli, and although there were hundreds and thousands, nay, hundreds of thousands and millions, who loved him and felt the pang of separation, apparently there was none who could put a new life into the Bardoli programme, and make full use of the weapon of offence which the Government had placed in Indian hands by treating the Mahatma as a felon. I have not sufficient data at my disposal to enable me to say whether the Mahatma was justified in listening to the despairing counsel of those who hastened to inform him that mass Civil Disobedience free from grave danger of violence was impossible after the Chauri-Chaura affair. But I do think Civil Disobedience free from such danger was possible immediately on the imprisonment of Mahatma Gandhi, and I would have deliberately disobeyed my chief and fought the Government with the weapon it had placed in my hand. No physician, as my brother says, is permitted to prescribe anything for himself when he is ailing, and after Mahatma Gandhi was "buried alive" it was enough if we paid due regard to his creed of Non-Violence, without having to carry out his testamentary injunction with regard to the suspension of Civil Disobedience also. Had such a course been followed I doubt if the Swaraj party would have come into being.

FUTURE RELATIONS OF THE CONGRESS AND THE SWARAJ PARTY.

Be that as it may, the existence of the Swaraj party cannot be ignored, whatever view

we may have formed about its genesis. Its early beginnings were small enough, but the peregrinations of the Civil Disobedience Committee, which occupied the time, attention and energies of some of our best workers, also succeeded in diverting the attention of all from the work of construction, and drove many of the most zealous among our younger men into the group which sought to enter the Councils. It is an idle speculation now, except to the extent that it helps us to formulate a plan for future work, to estimate how the chances of this group would have been affected if the programme of constructive work had been pushed forward and the younger men had been kept busy. On the other hand, some of my Swarajist friends also want me to plunge into speculation and estimate how much greater would have been their success at the polls than it has already been if the Delhi self-denying ordinance suspending our boycott propaganda had been issued at Gaya. I might answer them by suggesting another line of speculation based on characteristic self-conceit, *viz.*, whether there would have been any Swaraj party in existence at all if I had been permitted to be with them at Gaya to dissuade them from following a course of such doubtful wisdom. But all this is idle talk now. The Swaraj party is there to-day, and even though it may be composed of some very dissimilar elements, it is undoubtedly strong enough in numbers to-day and has always been strong in the quality of its leadership. More than all else, it was permitted at Delhi to go to the polls on its own moral and religious responsibility. It has gone there, and has achieved great enough success considering what forces were arrayed against it, how short a time it had in which to organise its own forces, and how greatly it was handicapped by the fact that some of its best members were disqualified from contesting the

elections owing to their having undergone longer terms of imprisonment than those which do not affect eligibility. Then, too, electoral rolls were most defective, mainly perhaps because three years ago nobody but the Liberals cared for such things and until very recently even those who ultimately joined the Swaraj party had not finally made up their minds to contest the elections or to go to the polls: is true a very large number of votes have been given not to the individuals that sought them, but to the Congress, and,—“Tell it not in Gath; whisper it not in the streets of Ascalon”—to Mahatma Gandhi himself! There are friends of mine whose distress at such things is very deep, and who consider it a sacrilege thus to take the name of the Mahatma in vain. I greatly sympathise with them, and certainly cannot say that I approve of such political methods. But it must be remembered that those to whom the people offered such votes were immeasurably nearer to Mahatma Gandhi than those who were opposed to them. Moreover, there were some among them who were inclined to sneer in a superior sort of way at a Mahatma so little versed in the affairs of this world as to pin his faith to the silly *charkha*, which even our womenfolk had discarded in these advanced days. They thought that he was something of a bungler and a blunderer where finesse was required in dealing with the bureaucrats and with a Viceroy who was supposed to have out-Yankeed the Yankees during the War. Their election experiences must have convinced not a few of these men that the Mahatma's name is still one to conjure with, and that whatever skill in finessing they may possess, their strength even in the Councils lies in the backing which the people who loved and revered the Mahatma were prepared to give to them as his followers and associates. This experience is a valuable asset to them, and the good sense, restraint and dignity which their

leaders have shown in the hour of their victory in full conformity with our expectations from them, make them a valuable element in the Congress. It is true we have no such expectations from their programme as they have themselves ; but, while removing, where really necessary, any idea that may be lurking in the people's mind that it is not the constructive programme but the Councils that bring in Swaraj we must give to the Swarajists a perfectly free hand, and add to that our heartiest good wishes that they may succeed. We suspended at Delhi the exercise of our right to carry on a propaganda of Council-boycott; but we surrendered no principle. Nor are we prepared to do that to-day, as we shall no doubt be doing if we agree to accept any responsibility of guiding the Swarajists in the Councils. This we cannot do. Obviously, the Swarajists will not be able to spare as much time for the constructive work as those of us who have not to attend to Council duties; but I have satisfied myself that their responsible leaders intend to assist us to the best of their power and ability, and in this way strengthen their own hand also in the Councils. If they have to leave the Councils at any later stage, the work that will have by then been done outside in their constituencies through our joint efforts will ensure this much, that no bureaucratic Cromwell could say of their exit that not a dog barked when they took their departure. And if as a result of their labours in the Councils, Swaraj is achieved, I for one would certainly not refuse to accept it. If peace, harmony and good-will were needed at Delhi to preserve the great reputation of the Congress they are still needed to-day to enhance that reputation and to help us to carry out the constructive programme.

THE CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAMME.

It was in the interests of this programme that I interested myself in the settlement at which we arrived at Delhi, for a whole year had been all but wasted by the major portion of the provinces in mutual recriminations, and if Mahatma Gandhi's release was to be obtained not by appeals *ad misericordiam* but through our own efforts, it was necessary to resume the work to which the Mahatma had rightly pinned his faith. I did not at the time itself realise the full extent of the havoc wrought since his removal: but the few replies that I have received to my enquiries about the details of the work done are sufficient indication that through one cause or another little work has been done. It is true there are provinces like Gujrat the work of which does credit to my friend Srijut Vallabhai Patel and to the band of devoted workers that Mahatma Gandhi left to work under him. Few provinces could show anything like as good a record of educational work, and but for Gujrat, the Khadi produced in other provinces would have remained unsold too long. The great glory of the Mahatma, however, was not that he changed the face of Gujrat, but that he also changed the face of the whole of India. No province did he leave exactly where he had found it. Gujrat is even now preparing a surprise for those who think that no area could be fit for Civil Disobedience if the Mahatma's characteristically high standard of preparation was to be retained. But the example of Gujrat has not proved infectious enough, and we cannot afford to wrap ourselves up in self-sufficiency. The speed of the fleet is the speed of the slowest boat, and there are, alas, too many slow boats in our fleet, though, thank God, all are still sea-worthy. I could not place before my No-Change friends sounder canons of

criticism than "A No-Changer" writing in *Young India* after Delhi has done.

There is a limit (he writes) beyond which reason and argument cannot go. Some conclusions are in the nature of action, and they go beyond the pale of pure rationality. Where reason fails to persuade, experience becomes the hard task-master. We realised that we had arrived at such a crisis. One year of argument and paralysis was tending to harden men in their Pharisaism and self-complacency. The testing time had come not only on the Swarajists, not only on the Centrists, not only on Mohamed Ali, but on us also, the No-Changers. We have to submit ourselves to the discipline of facts. Since the days of the Calcutta Special Congress, Gandhism had won all along the line : and we, Gandhites, have been in continuous peril of loose thinking and draggled effort. It is good for everybody to be beaten. If there is truth in us, the very castigation of defeat will lead us to examine ourselves anew and find strength. If, on the contrary, Gandhism has become in our hands a plea for lethargy and refusal to re-think the implications of fast-developing reality, we are not the true followers of our Chief, we are not worthy to be the custodians of his message to the world. Reality—that is the ultimate touchstone.

Yes, Reality is the ultimate touch-stone, the truest and the surest that ever existed and Swarajists and Non-Changers, and you and I, all of us, friends, shall be tested and measured by Reality. That is why I preach to you the gospel of work. It is not as easy a gospel to practise as it is easy to preach, and that is why we have more critics than workers. But work well done furnishes an exhilarating experience which the sterile pleasures of criticism can never equal. As the Sanskrit poet, referring to the creative effort of poetry, says, "Little does the barren woman

know of the pain and anguish of a mother's labours and less still of the indescribable joy of motherhood at the sight and touch of the new-born babe" Through labour alone shall a free India be re-born.

THE BARDOLI PROGRAMME TO BE CARRIED OUT.

You will no doubt ask me what should be our work; and my reply after the most careful consideration is that we cannot better the much-maligned Bardoli programme. If we continue to give up each item of work on finding difficulties and obstacles in our way, we shall never accomplish anything. Many people tell you Non-Co-operation has failed when they only mean that they, or we, or both, have failed to rise to the height of our ideal. And yet, as I have already told you, the steps proposed by the Mahatma are easy. Remember what the commonest of common soldiers is prepared to sacrifice when you feel that you must re-start your practice as a lawyer, or file your law-suit, or send your boy to a better-equipped school.

KHADI WORK AND WOMEN.

As for the man who cannot even wear khadi, it is no use taking him into serious consideration. And yet he is not unpatriotic, nor hopelessly selfish, but only lazy and indolent. Well, he has got to be roused out of his indolence, and the best and the most unfailing agency for this is the womanhood of India. Whosoever may change and fall from the high ideal of our great chief, the women of India are true to him, true to the nation, and true to themselves. With a few expert men like Seth Jamnalal Bajaj and Maganlal Bhai and Chaganlal Bhai Gandhi to assist and advise them, and a full complement

of book-keepers and clerks, etc., our sisters should be able to take the entire charge of the Khadi work in every province and district. Men may go to gaol, and men may come back, but the women of India should go on working our Khadi department for ever.

The other departments must also be organised, and the next in importance to Khadi is the department of National Education. I feel sorry that I did not press sufficiently hard at Bezwada, in 1921, for the creation of a Central Board of Education. But now a Central Educational Board and Provincial Boards must be created, and the education of our boys and girls must be seriously taken in hand. I need not go through the whole list of departments for we cannot afford to neglect any item of the Bardoli programme. But we must follow the plan of 1921, and, while working all simultaneously, we must concentrate on particular departments during particular periods of the next year.

THE PROVISION OF FUNDS.

But all this is idle talk without funds, and the provision of funds is one item which requires concentration all through the year. When the country knows that it is only by carrying out the Mahatma's programme of work that we can manufacture the key of Yerrowda gaol, and that no work is possible without solvency, it will not fail to respond to our call. But apart from large donations to be appealed for at some fixed time, we must tap permanent, though small, sources of revenue, and enable the poor to go on contributing their mites to the National Chest. Fixed monthly contributions must be arranged for and other similar means of securing the poor man's assistance at intervals and in ways suited to his convenience

must be thought out in addition to a well-organised national 'drive' for securing at least as many members of the Congress as the number of Indians who have been enfranchised. If, however, we work with a will, a full crore should not prove too many.

PERMANENT SECRETARIATS AND DEPARTMENTAL ESTABLISHMENTS.

And yet much as money may be necessary for working the Mahatma's programme, a powerful organisation is just as necessary to secure money. This cannot be in the main an organisation run by unpaid men. It is astonishing how we got on so long with our national work covering the whole area of this sub-continent with a paid establishment hardly large enough for a single department in a single district. We are face to face with a strange situation. On the one side we need competent, zealous and thoroughly reliable workers to carry on the national work, and have not got them. On the other hand, we have an army of the unemployed, particularly the lawyers who have been so hard hit by the Non-Co-operation programme, and they are very far from being unemployable. It is time that we accepted the obvious and the only possible solution of this double difficulty. We may pay our workers only a living wage on the reduced scale of the era; but that living wage must be paid to those splendid workers who have made great sacrifices for the sake of the nation. Remember, a system that requires martyrs to work it gets worked in the next generation by cheats. And, in any case, even martyrs have to be fed and clothed before they quit this world. India is witnessing to-day the spectacle of greedy foreign servants clamouring like so many Oliver Twists for more when they have already had much more than even

gluttony as a rule demands. The Indian Civil Servant, who is seldom Indian, or civil, or a servant, already gets paid more than any class of public servant of similar merit anywhere else in the world. It is he who always sets the pace to members of other services and thus continues to drain the resources of one of the poorest countries in the world. And he is doing this again so soon after the last increase in his emoluments. And yet it is he who accuses Indians engaged in the service of the nation of dishonest practices. I have no doubt that the moment he learns that the Congress is asked to pay the poorest of poor wages to such national workers he and his supporters in the Press will commence their old game of vilifying men who are the truest servants of India. Those who receive their wages in hundreds will be assailed by those who receive them in thousands and yet serve India so poorly. But this is part of the day's work and we must not mind it.

This, to my mind, is the most urgent need of the Congress, and I trust you will take steps to create an efficient organisation which will carry on the work of the Congress year in and year out. A proper National Secretariat, if possible located in some central place like Delhi, similar Provincial Secretariats and District Offices must be organised, and work in these secretariats and offices must be properly differentiated into the various departments which we need to maintain. The Working Committee itself should be composed of men who are able to attend frequent meetings either at a central place, or wherever required by the exigencies of the moment.

Of course, we must see that all organisations are doing practical work which is capable of being checked and estimated, and, that expendi-

ture is not allowed, after the initial month or thereabouts, to exceed revenue. I understand that the Salvation Army in England when it sends out workers to new centres pays them for a week's board and lodging in advance, and during that week they have to earn enough to pay their way in the following week. Later on, they are required to send a definite contribution to the Central Organisation. We shall have to follow some such system with regard to those of our workers who are engaged in enrolling Congress members. Once this machinery is set up, I feel confident the country can be roused again, and we shall be able to beat in 1924 the record of 1921. Remember, there is one great difference between now and 1921. Then, the Mahatma was free to organise and control the work, but to-day, although we shall miss him greatly, his very absence from our midst should stimulate us to work with redoubled energy. What would Christianity be without the Cross and Islam without the Tragedy of Kerbala ? As I have said before we have not yet made full use of our Cross. Friends, let us do it now if we bear any love towards our absent leader, and, calling upon the nation to give us its full backing, free the country and break open the great Bastille which keeps Mahatma Gandhi and thousands of his disciples in chains.

THE SIKHS AND THE MAHARAJA SAHEB OF NABHA.

We have before us the example of our Sikh brothers whose courage, fortitude, and, above all perfect non-violence excite my envy. The Maharaja Saheb of Nabha has been deposed, and the words in which the head of this foreign Government proclaims to us his firm resolve to keep him out of his State are only so much

veiled blasphemy.

The Moving Finger writes ; and, having writ,
 Moves on ; nor all your Piety nor Wit

Shall lure it back to cancel half a Line,
 Nor all your Tears wash out a Word of it.

We hold no brief for the Maharaja Saheb; but this much is certain, that even if all that his detractors say of him be true, he was not deposed for any such shortcomings, but for his virtues. I am myself the subject of an Indian Ruler and have had fairly intimate experience of several Indian States. I used to be approached very frequently by those friends who desired to see political reforms carried out in Indian States. But I used to put them off with the observation that the Indian States are our own, even though to-day they may prove far more unsafe for patriotic men than the rest of India. I used to add that once the rest of India had won Swaraj, Indian States would undergo a sea-change with astonishing rapidity. In the meantime it should be our policy not to rouse the suspicions of the rulers of these States, and to avail ourselves of every opportunity to prove to them that we are not unmindful of their difficulties nor indifferent to what they, too, have to suffer from this foreign bureaucracy. I did not know at the time that the Government would provide such an opportunity so soon. But now that it has been provided let us avail ourselves of it, for in doing so we shall also be safeguarding the interests of religion. The Maharaja Saheb of Nabha has suffered, at least partly, because he strongly sympathised with his co-religionists in their efforts to free themselves from the foreign bureaucratic incubus, and to reform their sacred Gurudwaras. And the Sikhs in their turn are suffering because they have had the courage to stand up for one of our Indian Rulers whom the bureaucracy desires to keep in perpetual dependence upon itself.

But, as I have said before, the recent action of Government in declaring the Shiromani Gurudwara Prabandhak Committee and the Akali Dal to be unlawful assemblies is a blow aimed not only at those bodies, or at the entire Sikh community; it is a challenge to the entire nation. Each community that dares to live will be similarly dealt with if we shrink from accepting the challenge to-day, and it will only be a question, of whose turn at the tumbrils will come next ?

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE.

We have already resolved to offer some assistance to our Sikh brethren so that we may not be guilty of indulging in lip-sympathy only. But something more than that is required. A better opportunity for Civil Disobedience at least on a provincial scale never presented itself since the arrest of the Mahatma ; but it is no use disguising from ourselves the fact that to organise Civil Disobedience is no easy matter. We must be sure of our capacity to undergo unlimited sufferings, and since constructive work has not been done this year even as well as it was done in 1921, there is little to indicate how much suffering the nation is prepared to endure. If, however, we resume our constructive work with redoubled energy, Civil Disobedience will not remain a mere possibility, and the Civil Disobedience Committee appointed at Delhi will then be able to do much more fruitful work. For it must also be recognised that Civil Disobedience must be resorted to before Swaraj can be won. Let there be no mistake about this. There must be no shrinking from sacrifice, and this observation I would like to address in particular to such of my friends as have already undergone imprisonment for courageously stand-

ing up for their rights. If that experience makes them shrink from doing such work as may lead to a second period of imprisonment, then, I say, they are not the men for us. The first imprisonment is obviously wasted upon them, for they should never have undertaken to do any national work, or should, at least, have made apologies to their foreign masters as soon as they were punished. To have undergone all this suffering and then to repent is the height of folly. As I wrote in the Bijapur gaol :

بی گناہی سی بھی بڑھکر می اگر کوئی گناہ
 تو مزاسے جرم پا کر، نجلت قصیدی

(If there is a sin even greater than sinlessness it is repentance over sin after the award of punishment.)

THE SHORT CUT TO LIBERTY.

Friends, I have given you a long enough programme of work, and I cannot help it if it is a little too insipid for your tastes. There is no royal road to Liberty. But there is one short cut, and that is the readiness to follow the road to the grave. Death for a great cause provides the most piquant sauce for the most tasteless dish, and I make bold to say that if our Working Committee took it into its head one day to resolve that all its members should prepare themselves to die and that the resolution was not only a "resolution" merely according to conventional phraseology, but embodied the members' firm determination, I could guarantee them Swaraj within a year. And if it was the All-India Congress Committee that made such a resolve for itself, Swaraj could be won within a month. But, friends, Swaraj is in

your hands and can be won *to-day* if each of you resolves to be ready to die at the country's call. If, however, we are not prepared to do this, and object to the Bardoli programme because it is dull and drab, then it is useless to talk of changing the Congress creed. Let us resolve to work, and, if need be, to die for the sake of our nation's freedom, and if at the end of a year's honest work this Government does not send for our absent leader to witness its heartfelt repentance for the past, and to receive the great charter of Swaraj for the future, let us in God's name unfurl without a moment's hesitation the flag of the Indian Republic, India's Independent Federation of Faiths. Then, friends, you will not find your retiring President so unwilling to break the link that joins him to Great Britain as he is in some quarters suspected to be. In 1921 we gave a year to ourselves and the same period to the Government; but our part of the contract was not fulfilled, and we could not demand Swaraj as the price of our unfinished work. Let us go back to Nagpur, and with trust in our Maker and a prayer addressed to Him to give us courage, fortitude, perseverance and wisdom, begin the great work once more that our great leader has outlined for us. If only we do not prove unworthy of him we shall win back our lost liberty and it will not be as a prayer for success, but as the declaration of victory won, that we shall then raise the old, old cry:

MAHATMA GANDHI KI JAI !

