

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_216940

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No.

Accession No.

Author

Title

This book should be returned on or before the date
last marked below.

WAR AND INDIA'S FREEDOM

Compiled and Edited

By P. R. LELE,
B. A., LL. B.

Author of "THE FEDERATION OF INDIA"

FOREWORD

By S. BHULABHAI DESAI,

Advocate, M. L. A. (Central)

Member, CONGRESS WORKING COMMITTEE.

rights are with the editor

POPULAR BOOK DEPOT
194D

United by the bonds of willing service, let us prove ourselves both strong to endure and resolute to overcome."

-KING GEORGE V.

"We desire that the people that have been deprived of their independence should recover their liberties"^M

—VISCOUNT HALIFAX.

EFFECTS OF VERSAILLES

Dec. 31

Premier Stanning of Denmark in his New Year Message said:—

" The causes of this war are partly the effects of the Versailles Treaty which dictated some decisions leading to further disturbances."

Printed by G. G. PATHARE, at the Popular Printing Press,
103, Tardeo Road, Bombay 7, and
Published by G. R. BHATKAL, for the Popular Book Depot,
Lainington Road, Bombay 7.

FOREWORD

On 23rd August 1939, Germany signed a non-aggression Pact with Russia. On the 31st of August, the Soviet Parliament ratified the Russo-German Pact. On September 1st, Herr Hitler, Chancellor and Fuehrer of Germany, ordered German forces to march into Poland. He also announced the return of the Danzig Free City to Germany. The British Government sent an ultimatum to Germany supported by France in defence of Poland and as a result of a final ultimatum given on September 3rd Mr. Chamberlain the Prime Minister of England declared that England was at war with Germany. Immediately after Mr. Chamberlain's declaration of war, His Excellency the Marquis of Lintlithgow Governor-General of India proclaimed that India was at war with Germany. In his message, the Governor-General said "it is clear beyond any question from what has happened that Poland has had to face the same fate that Czechoslovakia had to face a year ago. *Confronted with the demand that she should accept the dictation of a foreign power in relation to her own territory and her own subjects, Poland has yet stood firm!*¹ (Italics mine.)

Before the declaration of war, on September 1st Parliament passed the Government of India Act in a few minutes. The amended Act added a section after section 126 called section 126 (a), by which practically the entire power of the Executive authority in India became vested in the Governor-General in Council. In exercise of the power vested by this additional provision the Governor-General forthwith promulgated the Defence of India Ordinance and under that Ordinance the Governor-General in Council made and published rules.

Ireland declared her neutrality. The Union of South Africa did not declare war till September 7th and Canada till September 10th, India had already been committed to War with Germany by the declaration of the Governor-General! without any consultation with the representatives of the Indian people who had no voice in the matter of war or peace

Irrespective of whether the war against Germany was right or wrong, the true issue emerges from these events for what India has now commenced her struggle viz. the complete right to determine her future as a free and independent people.

On September 14th the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress issued an unanimous statement and in it laid down that the issue of war and peace for India must be decided by the Indian people and no outside authority can impose this decision upon them: nor can the Indian people permit the resources to be exploited for Imperialist aims. Any imposed decision or attempt to use Indian resources for purposes not approved of by them will necessarily have to be opposed by them. India cannot associate herself in war said to be for democratic freedom when that very freedom is denied to her, and such limited freedom as she possesses is taken away from her. If Great Britain fights for the maintenance and extension of democracy, then she must necessarily end Imperialism in her own possessions and establish democracy in India, and the Indian people must have the right of self-determination in framing their own constitution through a Constituent Assembly, without external interference and must guide their own policy. *A free democratic India* will gladly associate herself with other *free Nations* for mutual defence against aggression and for economic co-operation.

The Working Committee declined to allow India and her resources to be used for the war except of her own free choice, and called upon Britain to declare what their war aims were in regard to democracy and Imperialism and the new order that is envisaged, in particular how their aims are going to be applied to India and given effect to at present.

In the month of August 1939, the Congress had enunciated its policy in regard to war and declared its intention to oppose a war imposed upon India. The British Government sent Indian troops to Egypt and Singapore against the declared will of the Indian people. As a step towards the end of completely disassociating themselves from an imposed war the Working Committee called upon all the Congress members of **the** Central Assembly to refrain from attending the then next

session of the Assembly. The Governor-General of India has thereafter had interviews with many leading Indian politicians and on September 26, Lord Zetland declared in reference to the statement of the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress that he was unable to decide what course the British Government would take until after the conversations between the Governor-General and the several invitees had been completed. After the British Government had had enough time to make a decision on the declaration demanded by the Congress, on October 16th Mahatma Gandhi stated as follows:—

" It is painful to find the British Press and Britishers advancing the minority claim to prevent the declaration suggested by the Congress, if I may say so, in the common interest. If the force of Congress suggestion has not been overwhelmingly felt, the declaration will not come. There need be no dejection among Congressmen if it does not. We shall get our independence when it is deserved. But it would be well for the British Government and the Allied cause, if the minority argument were not flung in the face of a credulous world. It would be honest to say that the British desire to hold India yet awhile. There will be nothing wrong in such a desire. India is a conquest. Conquests are not surrendered except when the conquered successfully rebel, or under an awakened conscience the conqueror repents of the conquest, or when the conquered territory ceases to be a profitable concern."

On October 17th, the Governor-General issued a statement setting forth Britain's war aims regarding India. That statement only offered that at the end of the war, the Government of India Act would be revised in consultation with all the leading parties in India, and indicated that no substantial political advance would be made without the consent of the minorities. It has further proposed that a consultative committee would be formed during the war on which all parties would be represented.

.. On October 22nd the Working Committee issued its Resolution on the Viceregal statement and declared it be

wholly unsatisfactory and calculated to rouse resentment among those who were anxious to gain and intent upon gaining India's independence. The Working Committee further decided that it could not possibly give any help to Britain for it would amount to an endorsement of the Imperialist policy which the Congress had already sought to end. As a first step in this direction, the Congress called upon its ministries to tender their resignations. Pursuant to the said direction the Congress Ministries resigned in U.V., Bihar and Bombay, and on Nov. 3rd the Governors of U. P. and Bihar and on Nov. 4th the Governor of Bombay assumed the government of their respective provinces under Sec. 93 of the Government of India Act. Subsequently similar assumptions have been proclaimed by the Governors in Orissa, C. P and North-West Frontier-Province.

The Congress has now taken vital steps as an earnest of her determination to resist the exploitation of India for any imposed or Imperialist war which is likely to leave India as a subject race at the end of it. The next step India would be obliged to take depends on the integrity and sincerity of Great Britain. If Great Britain pursues the present policy of maintaining the subjection of India by the policy of divide and rule, India is bound to struggle to regain her freedom by the path and the method which she has hitherto employed the way of non-cooperation and a struggle based on Satyagraha. The Indian National Congress has exercised forbearance, been guilty of no impatience and now awaits the near future with keen determination.

This is the moral of the book which is now offered to the public by Mr. P. R. Lele, an experienced political thinker and a tried Satyagrahi Congressman. I commend the publication to all those who wish to understand India's attitude towards this war and to study the background of India's near future.

89, Warden Road,
Bombay:
1st January 1940.J

BHULABHAI J. DESAI.

CONTENTS

				PAGE
Foreword	...			1
Preface	...	...	..."	6
Part I.	Versailles to Moscow 1919 to 1939			7
Part II.	British Empire Declares War 23 Aug. 1939 to Sept. 13, 1939			15
Part III.	Imperialism, Fascism and Exploitation Must End Sept. 14 to Oct. 16			50
Part IV.	Britain's Response Oct. 17 to Oct. 31			103
Part Y.	Tripartite Talks	...	...	155
	Nov. 1 to Nov 5			
Part VI. .	U. S. A. Lifts Embargo	...		175
	Nov. 4 and 5			
Part VII.	The Game of Seasaw Nov. 6 to Dec. 29			178
Part VIII	War and Peace Aims			215
Index	...	...	...	227

P R E F A C E

This book is an attempt to unfold the problem of India's place in the world and also in relation to Great Britain, in the words of British Statesmen and Indian leaders. The book opens with the historic event of 23rd August 1939, viz. the Russo-German Non-Aggression Pact. This Pact was followed by a War, of which the extent, nature, duration or after-effects are all uncertain. What is certain is that this war is going to lead to great changes. India wants to benefit by the changes and also to contribute to the changes. Therefore India claims the right to frame her own constitution.

In a non-violent campaign for freedom impact of mutually opposing ideas plays a very helpful part. The impact of such ideas during the last four months has brought out the unity which exists in this country. Not only does the Congress stand for a free India, but the Muslim League also takes the same stand. The Liberal Federation on Dec. 29 resolved that "The Federation is strongly of opinion that the future constitution of India should be framed by Indians themselves" and the Muslim League fortifies the same view when it demands that the voice of the Indian Muslims must be heard in framing the constitution. Even the Chief Justice of India, who may *lie* called the Indian Keeper of the King's Conscience, declared that it was "a natural and reasonable desire" that "an Indian constitution should receive an imprimatur from Indians themselves."

This evolution, of thought will be read in this book in original words. Views of all political schools in India have been impartially included in this book.

I express my profound gratitude to Sjt. Bhulabhai Desai for writing the Foreword.

TARABAG, GIRGAUM,
BOMBAY, 2-1-40.

P. R. L E L E

PART I

VERSAILLES TO MOSCOW

A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF 20 YEARS

August 23, 1939, the day on which the Russo-German Non-Aggression Pact was signed, is to be regarded according* to M. Molotov, "as a date of great historic importance." The terms of the Pact will be found at the commencement of Part II. Nobody can question the truth of M. Molotov's proposition. But it was much more than that. This Pact and its precursor, viz. the Russo-German Trade Agreement signed on August 19, were events which stunned the world. When the Trade Agreement was announced and it was made known that negotiations were going on for an improvement of political relations between Russian and German Governments, people were shocked, they were rubbing their eyes, some felt betrayed, etc. etc. An account is proposed to be given here, which will enable the reader to judge for himself whether it was such a shocking or stunning or eye-rubbing event.

The editor has depended on authentic records. The only book he has referred to is "Light on Moscow" by IX N. T'ritt, K.C., M.P., whose hatred of Herr Hitler is immaculate.

Mr. Pritt observes:

"On balance, both before and after the advent of Hitler Germany is entitled to more good marks for friendly conduct towards the U. S. S. R. than we are. If we include the very early days, when we were financing one semipirical inva

"Article 1. The basis of the relations between Germany and the U. S. S. R. remains the Treaty of Rapallo. The German Government and the Government of the U. S. S. R. will remain in friendly contact with each other in order to bring about an understanding in the problems of political and economic nature that are of mutual interest.

Art. 2.-If one of the contracting parties were, despite its peaceful behaviour, attacked by a third Power or several Powers, the other contracting party must observe neutrality during the whole duration of the conflict.

Art. 3.—If, as a result of a conflict whose nature is indicated in Art. 2, or else at a time when neither of the contracting parties is involved in military complications, a coalition were to be formed by third Powers for the purpose of conducting an economic or financial boycott of one of the contracting Powers, the other contracting Power shall not join such a coalition."

This Treaty was, according to M. Molotov, in force all the time between 1933 and 1939 and even on 31st August 1939.

Herr Hitler made a programmatic speech on Jan. 30, 1934 in the Reichstag in the course of which he said :

"Despite the great difference between the two respective outlooks on life, the German Reich has endeavoured to look after its friendly relations with Russia also this year."

To quote Mr. Pritt ;

: "Throughout the year 1934, whilst the U. S. S. E. was not only greatly increasing her armaments but also making a public parade of the fact, Hitler in his repeated pleas and

it

arguments for German rearmament never even hinted at the idea of a 'Soviet Menace'. Neither Soviet Russia nor the Red Army were mentioned in any of the official documents relating to German rearmament."

In April 1934, Herr Hitler issued a statement, in the course of which he said regarding Russo-German relations :

"The German Government believes that the Treaty of Berlin, which it ratified the previous year, contains all the elements for the preservation and shaping of their mutual relations."

In the autumn of 1933 Germany left the League of Nations. In 1934 the U. S. S. R. at the suggestion of France joined the League. To quote Mr. Pritt again ;

"Until after the Soviet Union began a policy of collaboration with the western democracies and joined the League of Nations in 1934, Germany was friendly and even cordial towards the new state (U. S. S. R.) to a degree which few people now recall."

On March 10, 1939, was held the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the U. S. S. R. when Comrade Stalin made a very important and what is more enlightening speech. The following excerpts will repay repeated perusal, more especially because M. Molotov (Foreign Commissar) based his speeches of 31st May and 31st August on the precept laid down by M. Jos. Stalin, who said :

"The hullabaloo raised by the British, French and American Press over the Soviet Ukraine is characteristic. The gentry of the Press there shouted until they were hoarse that the Germans were marching on Soviet Ukraine, that they now had

"what is called the Carpathian Ukraine with a population of some 700,000, and that not later than this spring the Germans would annex the Soviet Ukraine, which has a population of over 30,000,000, to this so-called Carpathian Ukraine. It looks as if the object of this suspicious hullabaloo was to incense the Soviet Union against Germany, to poison the atmosphere and to provoke a conflict with Germany without any visible grounds.

The tasks of the Party in the sphere of foreign policy are:

1. To continue the policy of peace and of strengthening business relations with *all* countries;
2. To be cautious and not allow our country to be drawn into conflicts by warmongers who are accustomed to have others pull the chestnuts out of the fire for them."

This was before Hitler marched into Prague and frightened Mr. Chamberlain out of his wits. England gave a guarantee to Poland against aggression and, after Italy marched into Albania, also to Greece and Rumania. England gave up her traditional policy regarding the Army and Mr. Chamberlain announced conscription of all males of 20 and 21.

On April 15 the British Ambassador in Moscow asked the Soviet Government if Russia would make a declaration of unilateral guarantee to Poland and Rumania. To this proposal the Russian reply dated April 17 was a positive counterproposal of a Triple Pact of Britain, France and V. S. S. R. On 27th May 1939, the British and French Ambassadors in Moscow were instructed to agree to discuss a triple pact. In between, M. Litvinov, Russia's Foreign Commissar, was relieved of his duties and was succeeded by

M. Molotov. On 31st May was held the third session of the Supreme Soviet of V. S. S. R., when M. Molotov said: -

"But we must remember comrade Stalin's precept to be cautious and not allow our country to be drawn into conflicts by warmongers who are accustomed to have others' pull the chestnuts out of the fire for them ! Only thus shall we be able to defend to the end the interests of our country and the interests of universal peace.

"While conducting negotiations with Great Britain and France, we by no means consider it necessary to renounce business relations with countries like Germany and Italy. At the beginning of last year, on the initiative of the German Government, negotiations were started for a trade agreement and new credits. Germany offered to grant us a new credit of 200 million marks. As at that time we did not reach unanimity on the terms of this new economic agreement, the matter was dropped. At the end of 1938 the German Government again proposed economic negotiations and a credit of 200 million marks, the German side expressing readiness to make a number of concessions. At the beginning of 1939 the People's Commissariat of Foreign Trade was informed that a special German representative, Herr Schnure, was leaving for Moscow for the purpose of these negotiations. Subsequently the negotiations were entrusted to Herr Schulenburg the German Ambassador in Moscow, instead of Herr Schnure, but they were discontinued on account of disagreement. To judge by certain signs, it is not precluded that the negotiations may be resumed."

The Anglo-Franco-Soviet Negotiations begun on May 27 dragged on and on, but brought forth no result, while the

Russo-German Trade Agreement was signed on Aug. 19 and was followed by the 'shocking' 'stunning' event viz. the Russo-German Non-Aggression Pact. A special Session of the supreme Soviet was held in Moscow from August 28 to August 31. On Aug. 31 :M. Molotov made a speech recommending to the Supreme Soviet that they should ratify the Non-Aggression fact. The following excerpts from that speech complete this account. Said *M. Mo.'otcv* :—

"In the spring of this year the German Government made a pioposal for the resumption of commercial and credit negotiations. Soon after the negotiations were resumed. By making *mutual* concessions, we succeeded in reaching an agreement. As you know, this agreement was signed on Aug. 19. This was not the first commercial and credit agreement concluded with Germany under her *present* Government.

"Coimade Stalin hit the nail on the head when he exposed the machinations of the Western European politicians who were trying to set Germain- and the Soviet Union at logger-heads..We must be on our guard against those who see an advantage to themselves in bad relations between the U.S.S.R. and Germany, in enmity between them, and who do not want peace and good-neighbourly relations between Germany and the Soviet. Union."

PART II

BRITISH EMPIRE DECLARES WAR

RUSSO-GERMAN PACT

Aug. 24.

Late at night on 23rd August 1939, the Russo-German Pact of Non-Aggression was signed at Moscow by Herr von Ribbentrop (German Minister) and M. Molotov (Russian Minister) in the presence of M. Stalin and the German Ambassador in Moscow. The text of the agreement, as released by the official German News Agency, translated into English, reads:—

"Guided by the desire to strengthen the cause of peace between Germany and the Soviet Republics, based on the fundamental stipulations of the neutrality agreement concluded in April, 1926, the German and Soviet Governments have come to the following agreement:—

1. The two contracting Powers undertake to refrain from any act of force, any aggressive act and any attack against each other either singly or in conjunction with any other Powers.

2. If one of the contracting Powers should become an object of warlike action on the part of a third Power, the other contracting Power will in no way support the third Power.

3. The Governments of the two contracting Powers will in future remain in consultation with each other in order to inform themselves about questions which touch their common interests.

4. Neither of the two contracting parties will join any other group of Powers which, directly or indirectly, is directed against one of the two.

5. In case differences or conflict should arise between the two contracting Powers on questions of any kind, the two partners will solve these disputes or conflicts exclusively by a friendly exchange of views, or, if necessary, by arbitration commissions.

6. The agreement has been concluded for a duration of ten years, with the stipulation that unless one of the contracting Powers gives notice to terminate a year before expiration, it will automatically be prolonged by five years.

7. The present agreement shall be ratified in the shortest possible time and the ratification documents will be exchanged in Berlin. The treaty comes into force immediately after it is signed."

The agreement is drawn up in the German and Russian languages, and is dated August 23.

Herr von Ribbentrop communicated the news of the signing of the Pact to Herr Hitler at 1 a. m. Herr von Ribbentrop's interview with M. Molotov lasted over three and a half hours.

Satisfaction in Berlin

'Unconditional mutual neutrality is the theme of Berlin newspaper headlines. No Moscow news has been so prominently displayed since the establishment of the Third Reich. The fact that the Treaty eliminates any aid by the Soviet to a Power involved in hostilities with Germany is regarded as extremely important at present."

"The clear establishment of peaceful relations of such mighty Powers as the Soviet and Germany is bound to pacify the extremely tense international situation and contribute to the consolidation of peace, says the *Izvestia* of Moscow. The Pact will prevent disputes arising between the two States. Ideological differences cannot stand in the way of the establishment of neighbourly relations".

ANGLO-POLISH PACT

August 25.

On Aug. 25 the British Foreign Office issued a statement announcing an agreement for mutual assistance between Britain and Poland replacing and giving formal effect to the provisional agreement reached between the United Kingdom and Poland during Col. Beck's visit to London in spring and announced in the House of Commons on April 6. The following are the provisions of the Anglo Polish Pact:—

Article I: Should one of the contracting parties become engaged in hostilities with a European Power in consequence of aggression by the latter, the other contracting party will immediately give the party engaged in hostilities all support and assistance in its power.

Article II: (1) The provisions of Article I will also apply in the event of any action by a European Power which clearly threatened, directly or indirectly, the independence of one of the contracting parties and was of such a nature that the party in question considered it vital to resist it with armed forces.

(2) Should one of the contracting parties become engaged in hostilities with a European Power in consequence of action by that Power which threatened the independence or neutrality of another European State in such a way as to constitute a clear menace to the security of that contracting party, the provisions of Article I will apply without prejudice, however, to the rights of the other European State concerned.

Article III: Should a European Power attempt to undermine the independence of one of the contracting parties by processes of economic penetration or any other way, the contracting parties will support each other in resistance of such attempts. Should the European Power concerned thereupon embark on hostilities against one of the contracting parties, the provisions of Article I will apply.

Article IV: Methods of applying the undertakings of mutual assistance are established between competent naval, military and air authorities of the contracting parties.

Article V provides for the exchange of complete and speedy information concerning any development, which might threaten the independence of the contracting parties.

Article VI lays down that the contracting parties should communicate to each other any undertaking of assistance against aggression which they have already given or may in future give to other States.

Article VII: Should the contracting parties be engaged' in hostilities in consequence of the application of the present agreement, they will not conclude an armistice or treaty of peace, except by mutual agreement.

Article VIII provides that the agreement will remain in force for five years, subject to six months' notice of denunciation.

On August 31 the Soviet Parliament ratified the Russo-German Pact.

On September 1, Herr Hitler, Chancellor and Fuhrer of Germany, ordered German military forces to march into Poland. He also announced the return of the Danzig Free City State to Germany.

Parliament met in a special Session. Before the meeting of Parliament, King George VI drove to No. 10, Downing Street, to give audience to the Premier, a thing that had never happened before. His Majesty did so to avoid waste of time on the part of the Premier in going to the Buckingham Palace and back. To a tense House of Commons Mr. Chamberlain announced that an ultimatum had been sent to Germany that unless all aggressive action against Poland was suspended and all German forces withdrawn from Polish territory, British Government would, without hesitation, fulfil their obligations under the Anglo-Polish Pact.

It was officially announced in Paris that the French Council of Ministers was unanimous in maintaining firmly France's engagements towards Poland.

Herr Hitler did not freed the ultimatum of September and another was addressed on September 3.

The British ultimatum of Sept. 3 could not have been communicated to the German Foreign Office until after 9 A.M. The German reply was handed to the British

Ambassador at 11-20 A.M. The first and the last paragraphs ran as follows:—

1. The German Government and the German people refuse to receive, accept, let alone to fulfil, demands in the nature of ultimata made by the British Government.

x x x

6. The German Government, therefore, reject the attempts to force Germany, by means of a demand having the character of an ultimatum, to recall its forces which are lined up for the defence of the Reich, and thereby to accept the old unrest and the old injustice. The threat that, failing this, they will fight Germany in the war corresponds to the intention proclaimed for years past by numerous British politicians. The German Government and the German people have assured the English people countless times how much they desire an understanding, indeed close friendship, with them. If the British Government hitherto always refused these offers and now answer them with an open threat of war, it is not the fault of the German people and of their Government, but exclusively the fault of the British Cabinet or of those men who for years have been preaching the destruction and extermination of the German people. The German people and their Government do not, like Great Britain, intend to dominate the world, but they are determined to defend their own liberty, their independence and above all their life. The intention, communicated to us, by order of the British Government, by Mr. King-Hall, of carrying the destruction of the German people even further than was done through the Versailles Treaty is taken note of by us, and we shall, therefore, answer any aggressive action on the part of England with the same weapons and in the same form.

WAR DECLARED

On Sunday Sept. 3, Mr. Chamberlain broadcast to the Nation at 11-15 A.M.:—

"This country is at war with Germany,"

In the House of Commons Mr. Chamberlain said :~

"This country is now at war with Germany. It is a sad day for all of us, but for none is it sadder than for me. Everything I have done, worked for, hoped for and believed in, during my public life has crashed in ruins. The only thing left to me is to devote what powers I have for victory. I cannot tell what part I may be allowed to play, but I trust I will live to see the day when Hitlerism is destroyed and a restored and liberated EUROPE has been reestablished."

On Sunday night His Majesty, King-Emperor, broadcast to the Empire:

H. M. KING'S WAR BROADCAST

"In this grave hour, perhaps the most fateful hour in our history, I send every household of my peoples', both at home and overseas, this message spoken with the same depth of feeling for each one of you as if I were able to cross your threshold and speak to you myself.

"For the second time in the lives of most of us we are at war. Over and over again, we have tried to find a peaceful way out of the differences between ourselves and those who are now our enemies, but it has been in vain.

"We have been forced into a conflict, for we are called with our allies to meet a challenge of a principle

which, if it were to prevail, would be fatal to any civilised order in the world. It is a principle which permits a State, in selfish pursuit of power, to disregard its treaties and solemn pledges, which sanctions the use of force or threat of force against the sovereignty and independence of other States.

"Such a principle, stripped of all disguise, is surely a mere primitive doctrine that might is right and if this principle is established throughout the world, the freedom of our own country and the whole British Commonwealth of Nations would be in danger.

"But far more than this, the peoples of the world would be kept in bondage of fear and all hopes of settled peace and of security of justice and liberty among nations would be ended. This is the ultimate issue confronting us. For the sake of all that we ourselves hold dear and of the world's order and peace, it is unthinkable that we should refuse to meet the challenge.

"It is to this high purpose that I now call my people at home and my peoples across the seas who will make our cause their own. I ask them to stand calm, firm and united in this time of trial.

"The task will be hard and, there may be dark days ahead and war can no longer be on a confined battlefield: but we can only do the right as we see the right and reverently commit our cause to God. If, one and all, we keep resolutely faithful to it, ready for whatever service or sacrifice it may demand, then with God's help we shall prevail. May He bless and keep us all."

The 3rd of September is a significant day in the history of the progress of democracy in England. It was on the 3rd of September that Oliver Cromwell routed the troops of King Charles I at Dunbar and the fight against tyranny in the Seventeenth Century was decided in favour of democracy.

France also declared hostilities against Germany on 3rd September.

After Mr. Chamberlain, spoke Mr. Churchill whose following remark combined pith and prophecy:—

"This is no question of fighting for Poland or Danzig. We are fighting to save the whole world from the pestilence of Nazi tyranny and in defence of all that is sacred to mail."

India at War

Immediately following Mr. Chamberlain's declaration of War in Britain, His Excellency the Marquis of Linlithgow, Governor-General of India, proclaimed that India was at war with Germany. His Excellency issued a message to the people of India, in which he expounded the issues at stake and expressed confidence that India would fight for human freedom as against the rule of force.

MARQUIS OF LINLITHGOW

"You have all heard that early on Friday morning the German armed forces invaded Polish territory. The German Government presented no ultimatum. They gave the Polish Government no warning.

"It is clear beyond any question from what has happened that Poland has had to face the same threat that Czechoslovakia had to face a year ago. Confronted with the

demand that she should accept the dictation of a foreign Power in relation to her own territory and her own subjects, Poland has elected to stand firm. At this moment her troops are bravely defending the frontiers against the ruthless Power that seeks to overwhelm her. His Majesty's Government and the Government of France have made it clear that they stand behind the former pledges against aggression which they had given to Poland. It is in these circumstances that we find ourselves at war with Germany to-day.

"The issues that emerge are clear. Acceptance of the policy and the methods which Germany has adopted would make life in the world impossible. It would represent the triumph of aggression and the supremacy of the rule of force. In circumstances such as these there could be no security in the world and no peace of mind for any of us. The ruthless onslaught of Germany on Poland without a declaration of war is in keeping with the rest of her conduct in this matter. What faces us is the safeguarding of principles vital to the future of humanity, principles of international justice and international morality, the principle that civilised men must agree to settle disputes between nations by reason and not by force, the principle that in the affairs of men the law of the jungle, the will of the strongest, irrespective of right and justice, cannot be allowed to prevail. To fail to take up this challenge would be to destroy for mankind any hope of true progress and true development; so long as this cruel and ruthless thing is in the world there can be no freedom of spirit for humanity.

"Nowhere do these great principles mean more than in India. There is no country that values them more highly

than India, and none that has at all times been more concerned to safeguard them. His Majesty's Government, in entering the war, have done so with no selfish aims. They have done so to safeguard vital principles affecting all humanity; to ensure the orderly progress of civilisation ; to see that disputes between nations are settled not by the arbitrament of force but by equitable and peaceful means. They have spared no effort to avoid the calamity that now threatens the world.

"I do not propose to speak to you at length this evening-Far more important than anything that I can say to you must be the response of each one of you to this tremendous issued With me, I am certain, you will feel that in the stern and testing days that lie before us victory-the triumph of Right-will not be secured by arms alone. We shall all of us have to depend upon⁴ those innerand spiritual forces which, in all* great emergencies of life bear the true and unfailing source of strength and fortitude.

"In a cause such as this the wholehearted sympathy and the support of all in this great country, whether in British India or in the Indian States, will, I am certain, be forthcoming without distinction of class, of creed, of race, or of political party. I am confident that on a day on which all that is most precious and most significant in the civilisation of the modern world stands in peril, India will make her contribution on the side of human freedom as against the rule of force and play a part worthy of her place among the great nations and the historic civilisations of the world."

Government of India Act Amended

On September 1, that is to say, before war was declared, Parliament passed the Government of India Act Amendment

Act in a few minutes. The Amendment Act added a section after sec. 126. The new section (sec. 126A) provides that on the declaration of war, the executive authority of the Federation (which for the time being means the Governor-General in Council) shall extend to the giving of directions to a Province as to the manner in which the executive authority thereof is to be exercised and that the Federal Legislature (for the time being, the Indian Legislature) shall have power to make laws conferring powers and imposing duties, or authorising the conferring of powers and the imposition of duties upon the Federation or officers and authorities of the Federation, although, in the absence of the emergency, the power belongs to the Province. This additional provision has been given retrospective effect as from 1st April 1937. In exercise of the power vested by this additional provision in the Central Legislature, the Governor-General forthwith promulgated the Defence of India Ordinance and under that Ordinance the Governor-General in Council made and published Rules. The Ordinance was promulgated and the Rules made without consulting Provincial Governments in spite of the fact that the normal field of the Provincial Legislature was thereby affected.

Eire declared her neutrality. The Union of South Africa did not declare War till Sep. 7 and Canada till Sep. 10.

On the very day of the declaration of war the Hon. Sir Sikandar Hyat Khan, Premier of Punjab, issued the following statement from Simla:

"The worst has happened. The efforts of the peace-makers have failed, and once again Germany has, for selfish

aggression, imposed a world war with all the horrors it involves for humanity. At this juncture words cannot avail, the time for academic discussion is over, and the moment for action has arrived. As such, trusting in Providence, I appeal to my fellow citizens in the Punjab to get ready for the; call of duty. We must be prepared for all sacrifices to defend our motherland, civilisation, justice and fair play and all the rest for which self-respecting people may live and die.

"The drain on our men, money and materials is likely to be severe, ever severer than in the last war. I would, therefore, appeal that from today Punjabis must themselves Voluntarily impose all possible restrictions on their food and drink and other resources, so that every ounce thus saved could be conserved for the common cause.

"Moreover, as the first earnest of our patriotic effort. I would appeal to all concerned to place their services and resources at the disposal of their King and Country. I have faith in the guidance of a merciful Providence, I have faith in the righteousness of our cause and I have faith in the valiant traditions of my province.

"As such, I feel confident that the Punjab will rise to its highest traditions and once again establish its proud claim to be the sword-arm of India. The Punjab expects every Punjabi to do his duty by his King and Country."

BROADCAST TO THE GERMAN PEOPLE

Sept. 4,

Mr. Chamberlain broadcast to the German people in their own language the following message :

"Your country and mine are now at war. Your country bombed and invaded free and independent Poland which this country is bound to defend. Because your troops were not withdrawn in response to the British Note, war has followed."

After giving facts in regard to Her Hitler's offer to "Poland, Mr. Chamberlain proceeded:

"Why did we feel it necessary to defend an Eastern Power when our interests should be in the West? The answer, I regret to say, is that nobody in this country trusts your leader's word. We are not fighting against the German people, but against a tyrannous and foresworn regime which betrayed their own people and the whole of Western civilisation, and all you and we hold dear.

"Your leader gave his word that he would respect the Locarno Treaty, but he broke it. He gave his word that he neither wished nor intended to annex Austria, but he broke it. He declared he would not incorporate the Czechs in the Reich, but he did so. He gave his word after Munich that he had no further territorial designs in Europe, but he broke it. He gave his word that he wanted no Polish provinces, but he broke it. He has sworn for years that he was a mortal enemy of Bolshevism, but he is now their ally. Can you wonder that his word is not worth the paper on which it is written? The German-Soviet Pact was a cynical *volte face* to shatter the Peace Front, but the gamble failed and the Peace Front stands firm. Your leader is now sacrificing you in a still more monstrous gamble of war to extricate himself from the impossible position into which he has led himself And you."

RESPONSE IN INDIA

After declaring that India as a part of the British Empire was at war with Germany, Lord Linlithgow got into touch with the spokesmen of the two principal political Organisations in India. Mahatma Gandhi and Mr. M. A. Jinnah were granted interviews at Simla on September 4.

Several organisations and several leaders issued statements supporting Britain and placing their services and resources at the disposal of His Majesty, King-Emperor, unreservedly.

Indian Catholics

Principal A. Soares, President of the All-India Catholic Congress, in a public statement said :

"Conscious that the war, into which Britain and France have entered, is not a war of their seeking, but has been forced upon them by an insane nationalism, built upon pseudo-scientific theories of 'blood and soil; conscious that such nationalism and theories are destructive to the foundations on which a Christian civilisation and the international fellowship of nations are based; conscious, moreover, of the heroic stand that Poland, the Catholic bastion in Central Europe, has made and is making against the new barbarism which would trample the weaker nations which stand in the way of its ambition and expansion; the Catholics of India, I am confident, will rally round Britain in this hour of peril and need, and pledge their unconditional support in a war which obviously is not imperialistic in its inception or in its end."

Punjab Christians

An emergent General meeting of the Punjab Indian Christian Association (Lahore) ratified the pledge of loyal support

to the British Government given by their President in the name of the community.

Parsis

Sept. 5.

A meeting of Parsis convened by the Trustees of the Parsi Punchayet was held in Wadiaji's fire temple in Bombay. Prayers were offered to *Ahura Mazda* invoking His blessings for the King. It was resolved, on the motion of Mr. M. P. Kharegat, President of the Punchayet, seconded by Sir Shapoorji Bilimoria and supported by Sir Cowasji Jehangir, to send a telegram to the Secretary of State for India requesting him to tender to His Majesty the community's heartfelt loyalty and all its services and to pray for "full and speedy success of their beloved Emperor in the present war."

Big Landlords

The British India Association of Lucknow, representing the landed interests, passed a resolution placing its resources both in men and money at the disposal of the Viceroy.

The Bihar Landlords' Association, under the presidentship of the Maharaja of Darbhanga, resolved to make every possible sacrifice for the success of Britain in the war.

Mr. C. P. N. Sinha, Leader of the Opposition in the Bihar Assembly, who represents zamindars, wired to the Viceroy, placing his resources and those of the people he represented at the disposal of His Majesty's Government.

"The resources of India should be unreservedly placed at the disposal of Great Britain," said Kumararajah M. A. Muthia Chettiar, Leader of the Opposition in the Madras Legislative Assembly, in a statement,

SIR SARVEPALLI RADHAKRISHNAN

Madras, September 5

The Working Committee of the Congress will soon review the question of India's part in the war. Those of us, who believe that war as such is an evil and that it is of no use to employ violence to put down violence, will not have much trouble of mind. A large majority of us still think that we are not living in a perfect world but only in an improving world.

Great Britain has entered this war not in defence of possessions, but in defence of principles. She has the conscience of the world on her side in attempting to resist Nazi tyranny and the rule of force. Thinking men in India are deeply in sympathy with the Polish cause and the British attitude in the matter. Britain will make a tremendous appeal to political India if the substance of self-government is immediately granted in the Centre.

By temperament Mahatma Gandhi is a man of peace, and he will not be anxious to press for an advantage at a time when Britain is faced by serious troubles. But his serious difficulty will be to satisfy the members of the Working Committee and other leaders so long as effective responsibility in the Centre is not envisaged in the present Government of India Act. There ought not to be any haggling or bargaining in this matter. But wise statesmen like the present Viceroy should size up the state of feeling in the country and do the right thing, not because it is a state of war but because self-government for India is the right thing.

SYMPATHY FOR DEMOCRACIES

Mahatma Gandhi's first statement after the declaration of war

Simla, September 5.

Mahatma Gandhi left Simla for Wardha in the afternoon, and prior to his departure issued the following statement:—

At Delhi as I was entraining for Kalka, a big crowd sang in perfect good humour to the worn out refrain of 'Mahatma Gandhi-ki Jai' 'We do not want any understanding'. I had then my weekly silence. Therefore, I merely smiled. And those who were standing on the footboard returned the smile with their smile, whilst they were admonishing me not to have any understanding with the Viceroy. I had also a letter from a Congress Committee, giving me similar warning. Neither of these counsellors knew me. I did not need the warning to know my limitations.

. Apart from the Delhi demonstration and a Congress Committee's warning, it is my duty to tell the public what happened at the interview with H. E. the Viceroy.

I knew that I had no instructions whatsoever from the Working Committee in the matter. I had answered a telegraphic invitation and taken the first train I could catch. And what is more, with my irrepressible and out and out non-violence, I knew that I could not represent the national mind, and I should cut a sorry figure if I tried to do so. I told His Excellency as much. Therefore, there could be no question of any understanding or negotiation, with me. Nor, I saw, had he sent for me to negotiate. I have returned from Viceregal Lodge emptyhanded and without any understanding, open or

secret. If there is to be any understandings it would be between the Congress and the Government. „

Having therefore made my position *vis-a-vis* the Congress quite clear, I told His Excellency that my own sympathies were with England and France from the purely-humanitarian standpoint. I told him that I could not contemplate, without being stirred to the very depth, the destruction of London, which has hitherto been regarded as impregnable. And as I was picturing before me the Houses of Parliament and Westminster Abbey and their possible destruction; I broke down. I have become disconsolate. In the secret of my heart, I am in perpetual quarrel with God that He should allow such things to go on. My non-violence seems almost impotent. But the answer comes at the end of the daily quarrel that neither God nor non-violence is impotent. Impotence is in men. I must try on without losing faith, even though I may break in the attempt.

Letter to Hitler

And so, as though in anticipation of the agony that was awaiting me, I sent on July 23 from Abbottabad the following letter to Herr Hitler :

"Friends have been urging me to write to you for the sake of humanity. But I, have resisted their request because of the feeling that any letter from me would be an impertinence. Something tells me that I must not calculate and that I must make an appeal for whatever it may be worth.

"It is quite clear that you are today the one person in the world who can prevent a war, which may reduce humanity to the savage state. Must you pay that price for an object;

however worthy it may appear to you to be ? Will you listen to the appeal of one who has deliberately shunned the method of war not without considerable success ?

"Anyway I anticipate your forgiveness, if I have erred in writing to you."

How I wish that even now he would listen to reason, and the appeal from almost the whole of thinking mankind, not excluding the German people themselves. I must refuse to believe that Germans contemplate with equanimity the evacuation of big cities like London for fear of destruction to be wrought by man's inhuman ingenuity. They cannot contemplate with equanimity such destruction of themselves and their own monuments. I am not, therefore, just now thinking of India's deliverance. It will come, but what will it be worth, if England and France fall, or *if they come cut victorious over Germany ruined and humbled ?*

Yet it almost seems as if Herr Hitler knows no God but brute force, and, as Mr. Chamberlain says, he will listen to nothing else. It is in the midst of this catastrophe without parallel that Congressmen and *all other responsible Indians* individually and collectively, have to decide what part India is to play in this terrible drama.

SIR TEJ BAHADUR SAPRU

September, 6.

In an interview with the pressmen at Allahabad Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru said : "We must absolutely stand by the British and it would be most disastrous if we were to offer help subject to conditions. Never before has a graver situation arisen in our history, Any question of controversy with

the British in regard to the future of India must stand over until the common peril is over. In my opinion it would be a short-sighted policy to say or do anything, which might encourage Germany, Russia or any member of the Axis Powers, Quite apart from the fact that associations going back to 150 years cannot be terminated in the twinkling of an eye by resolutions howsoever strongly-worded, our self-interest alone demands that we must do everything to secure the safety of the country and that I am clear cannot be done without full and unreserved co-operation with the British. This is no occasion in my opinion for a mere theoretical fight on the basis of ideological differences."

MUSLIM OPINION

September 6.

LT.-COL. SIR S. HUSSAN-UD-DIN

Member, Council of State.

The disastrous war brings it home to the Muslims of India that they are more concerned with its outcome than the other peoples of this country, for the Muslims* vital interests are not limited to this country alone, but are intimately concerned with the destinies of all Muslim nations, whether they are Already involved in the struggle or may become so later. The time has arrived to compose all our internal differences and to stand united by the British Empire with all our resources of life and possessions, sincerely and with determination.

The independence and welfare of British India and the Indian States stand and fall with Britain. This is not merely my personal view, but also that of other thinking and far-

sighted people. I appeal, therefore, to you and the other leaders of Muslim India to face this problem courageously and with a clear realisation of the dark days that may come and reach your decision : and it is obvious in which direction that decision might lie. As far as I myself and my family are concerned, we have already offered ourselves and all our resources to His Majesty's Government.

SIR SHAFAT AHMAD KHAN

Muslims to a man would support the British Empire wholeheartedly. They have one King and one cause of righteousness and justice, and they know how to fight for a good cause.

MRr M. A, JINNAH

Simla,

September 7.

As already announced, I had an interview with His Excellency the Viceroy on September 4, when . His Excellency explained to me the situation as much as he was able to do,

One cannot help deploring and condemning the resort to arms and brute force. It is quite obvious that we are facing now the gravest situation, which is bound to result in horrible destruction of life and property and will mean the greatest disaster all the world over. This is not the time for me to disapprove or approve of the policy of His Majesty's Government. The crisis has coriie, and we have to face and beat-it as best as we can.

Naturally my sympathies are with the peoples of Poland, France arid Britain, as we are at present a part of the British 'Commonwealth of Natibns. If,'however, Britain wants to

prosecute this war successfully, it must take Muslim India into its confidence through its accredited organisation—the All-India Muslim League—and so shape its policy as to apply the principles enunciated by His Excellency the Viceroy in his recent broadcast soon after the declaration of war on Sunday last. Muslims want justice and fair play.

I will place the views of His Excellency the Viceroy before the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League, which is going to meet in Delhi on September 17, and, in the meantime, I appeal to the Muslims to stand solidly and unitedly under the flag of the All-India Muslim League. Let us pray that in this grave hour we shall be guided by Providence to arrive at the right decision in the best interests of Muslim India.

SIR SULTAN AHMED

Patna, September 7.

The goodwill of the world is with great Britain and France in the stand they have taken up. Our attitude in India, in my opinion, will be clear as crystal. We must declare with one voice, without any mental reservation or qualifications whatsoever, that we stand by Britain in her fight for the destruction of Hitlerism. We must welcome the clear lead given by the Premier of the Punjab, the Hon. Sir Sikandar Hyat Khan, and I hope the Working Committee of the Muslim League will endorse his views. Ifs and buts should not be allowed to mar the unanimity or the true value of our Attitude:

HIS HIGHNESS THE AGA KHAN

London, September 7.

His Highness the Aga Khan in a message to the President of the Ismailian Executive Council, Zanzibar, said:

"Heartfelt, loyal and unstinted service must now be given to the cause of the Empire, which is the protector of our faith and our people. This message should be read after prayers every day and published."—*Renter*.

SIR WAZIR HASSAN

Sir Wazir Hassan (whose sympathies with the Indian National Congress are wellknown) issued the following:—

Lucknow, September 7.

Our claim for freedom has not arisen from this crisis. It is an old claim. It is our birthright. It is neither just nor consistent with our national honour and dignity that it should be necessary for India to be commandeered into cooperation with the British in the present war with Germany. It is true that today we are not a free people, but it is equally true, as observed by Mahatma Gandhi, that India's deliverance will come and, I may add that it will soon come. At the present juncture, therefore, the Congress must decide the issue of co-operation with Britain in this war on the assumption that India is a free country, as also on the basis of the message broadcast by His Majesty the King-Emperor on the morning of the fateful Sunday (September 3) and in response to the invitation of the Viceroy of India, which has been extended to the Congress Working Committee through Mahatma Gandhi*

If we examine the merits of the issue involved in the war, and the antecedent circumstances disclosed in the speech of Mr. Chamberlain in the House of Commons, we cannot but come to the conclusion that there **is no** question either of territorial extension or national aggrandisement.

Mr. Chamberlain also made it clear that His Majesty's 'Government had continuously endeavoured to settle all disputes, real or imaginary, between the Nazi Government and the Polish people by the peaceful method of negotiation, but the former had paid no heed to them. The question facing us today is the safeguarding of principles vital to the future of humanity, namely, international justice and morality.

Apart from these principles, which we should all endeavour to restore to their highest pedestal, India's own security is at stake, as is made clear by the Commander-in-Chief's broadcast speech on September 6. The Congress Working Committee has banned the methods of satyagraha and civil disobedience. It follows, therefore, that the only method for settling this issue of co-operation with the British in this war must be decided on the basis of negotiation, and the way to a settlement on those lines has been opened by the Viceroy. The greatest virtue of this method lies, in my opinion, in the undeniable inference that the Congress is conceded the right of self-determination.

British Appeal To Germans

London, September 7.

The ten million leaflets dropped in Germany said *inter alia*, that "the Reich has forced a war upon Britain knowing it would involve mankind in a worse calamity than that of

1914. Never has a Government ordered subjects to death with less excuse. Germany was in no way threatened or deprived of justice. President Roosevelt offered you peace with honour and prospect of prosperity.

"Your rulers have condemned you to massacre, misery and privations of war. They cannot hope to win. A year's iron censorship has kept from you the truths imprisoned in your minds and has also concealed the fact that you have no means of a sustained and protracted warfare. . You are on the verge of bankruptcy. Our resources are immense. We are too strong to break and could wear you down inexorably. You can insist upon peace at any lime. We are prepared to couclude it with any peace-loving German Government."

NO DESIRE TO TAKE ADVANTAGE. OF BRITAIN'S DIFFICULTY

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru

Rangoon, September 8,

In an interview with the Press, Pandit Jawaharlal, who had been to China and who returned at the call of the Congress President, said:—

We have repeatedly stated that we are not out to bargain. We do not approach the problem with a view to taking advantage of Britain's difficulties. In a conflict between Democracy and freedom :on the one side, and Fascism and aggression on the other out synapathies must inevitably lie on the side of Democracy, and we cannot tolerate with pleasure

ideas of victory for Fascist and Imperialist aggressors. But mere repetition of phrases about Democracy and freedom does not mean that the struggle is for Democracy. The last war showed that and the past year or more demonstrated still more how Democracy can be betrayed in the name of peace and freedom.

The real test as to whether this struggle is for Democracy and freedom does not lie in loud enunciation of principles, but in practice. If England stands for self-determination, the proof of that should be India. • ,. .

I realise fully that this war, is going to change the face of things utterly in England and the world, both politically and economically. The old order is dead and it cannot be revived. If we are making for a new order, let us all do so consciously, defining it clearly and acting up to it from now onwards as far as possible. That new order can have nothing to do with Fascism or Imperialism.

I should like India to play her full part and throw all her resources into the struggle for the new order. I hope that my country will look at this problem not from a narrow national view but from the widest international viewpoint and seek to foster further good of the world because our good is involved in it. I hope that all Indians will be wise enough and strong enough to forget petty rivalries and conflicts and rise to the height of the occasion, thinking only of the freedom of India and the evolution of a new world order

**"INDIA DESERVES NOW TO BE TREATED
AS A FULL EQUAL."**

September 9.

"The attitude of India towards the European war, in which Britain is involved, is necessarily more complicated than for this country. From great many Indians in British India and from virtually all Princes have come offers of every kind of assistance which have been spontaneous, ungrudging and generous.

"In many parts of British India, particularly the Punjab, there is the same unconditional readiness to help. Spokesmen from all parties have added their individual appeals, but India is only involved in this war because of her connection with this country and those who are opposed to British connection cannot necessarily grant their support without much heart-searching. It must not be assumed that the Congress is willing to swallow its words about 'Imperialist war*' without more ado. Like the United States its sympathies may be definite and deep but its grievances persist. Not only because of possible Congress objections but because of our own welfare, India deserves now to be treated as a full equal. It is widely recognised in India what India would suffer if Britain and France were defeated: she must understand that she will gain from their victory."—*Manchester Guardian*.

Poet Tagore on check to the conscience of the world.

Calcutta, September 10.

At the request of his friends in Europe and England, Dr. Rabindranath Tagore issued the following statement:—

The conscience of the world has been profoundly shocked at the latest manifestation of the arrogant unrighteousness

of the present Ruler of Germany; this is but the culminations of a long series of intimidation of the weak, from the suppression of the Jewish people in the Reich to the rape of that gallant and truly liberal state of Czecho-Slovakia.

Through the mouth of Mahatma Gandhi, the voice of my country has already been raised in moral condemnation of the inhumanity which has plunged the world into this insensate carnage, to satisfy the vainglorious whims of an individual and his associates. Our voice may not perhaps reach the ears of the faction in power in Germany, for it is not borne on the wings of high explosive shells. I can only hope* that humanity may emerge triumphant and that decencies of life and freedom of the oppressed peoples may be firmly established for all time to come in a world purified through this terrible bath of blood.

THE INDIAN LIBERAL PARTY ATTITUDE

Sept. 10,

The Working Committee of the Indian National Liberal Federation met in Bombay and adopted several Resolutions on the International Crisis. In the main Resolution the* Committed stated that it viewed with serious apprehension the international situation which had necessitated a declaration of war on the part of Britain and France to meet Nazi aggression against Poland. The Liberal Party had always stood for democracy and freedom and had repeatedly expressed its opposition to Nazi and Fascist policies and methods of settling differences between nations by force instead of by peaceful negotiation. Such methods and

policies were entirely repugnant to liberal principles. The Committee deemed it its duty to express its considered view that in the present crisis India should unhesitatingly "and unconditionally support the democratic powers by every possible means so that they might come out victorious in the struggle. This was not the time for bargaining though India's grievances were grave and many. The Committee appealed to other political parties to take a broad view of the situation so that the country should be left in no doubt as to its duty in the present crisis, which was definitely to range itself on the side of Britain.

The second resolution passed by the Committee ran as follows:—

"While the Committee is emphatically of the opinion that the support to be given to Britain at the present juncture must be ungrudging and unconditional, the Committee appeals to His Majesty's Government and the Government of India to create such psychological conditions in the country as will lead to a general political appeasement and ensure complete co-operation on the part of the people of India by cementing friendly relations.

"In particular the Committee appeals to Government to hasten the replacement of the present form of Central Government by a Government responsible to the public."

The Committee urged a revision of the present military policy and the creation of a modern and efficient Indian Defence Force, so as to enable India effectively to defend herself against foreign aggression.

THE KING ON SUPPORT FROM INDIA

Simla, Sept. 11.

The Governor-General addressed a Joint Session of the Central Legislature. At the very commencement His Excellency read the following message from His Majesty, the King-Emperor :—

" In these days, when the whole of civilisation is threatened, the widespread attachment of India to the cause, in which we have taken up arms, has been a source of deep satisfaction to me. I also value most highly the many generous offers of assistance made to me by the Princes and people of India. I am confident that in the struggle, upon which I and my people have now entered, we can count upon sympathy and support from every quarter of the Indian continent in the face of a common danger. Britain is fighting for no selfish ends, but for the maintenance of a principle vital to the future of mankind—the principle that relations between civilised states be regulated, not by force, but by reason and law, so that nations may live free from the terror of war, to pursue the happiness and well-being which should be the destiny of mankind." (Sd.) George R. I.

SUSPENSION OF THE FEDERATION OF INDIA

At the close of his address His Excellency announced:

¹ "I will add only one word more, in regard to our federal preparations. Those preparations, as you are aware, are well advanced, and great labour has been lavished on them in the last three years. Federation remains, as before, the objective of His Majesty's Government; but you will understand, with*

out any elaborate exposition on my part, the compulsion of the present international situation, and the fact that, given the necessity for concentrating on the emergency that confronts us, we have no choice but to hold in suspense the work in connection with preparations for Federation, while retaining Federation as our objective. I feel certain that, at a time when the struggle which is raging elsewhere is uppermost in our thoughts, this is a moment in which that emergency, and matters directly associated with that emergency, must be of predominant and, in a sense, almost exclusive importance.

"Our trust must be that, under Providence the forces of right and of justice will triumph, and that we may be able to take up again those interrupted activities on which we have been engaged for the furtherance of the constructive work of peace and of the progress and the prosperity of India"

BRITISH PRESS ON INDIA'S SUPPORT

The Press in England was jubilant over what it considered to be the unconditional and united support of India, *The Tunes*, the leading Journal, wrote :—

With so much at stake, minor grievances over which parties have quarreled in different parts of the Empire are seen* to be of secondary importance, and all are uniting to defend the common cause. In Canada and everywhere throughout the Empire the challenge of Hitlerism is being met with unanimity and determination even more impressive than in 1914. Perhaps the most striking example comes from India, where offers of service have been received from all communities in such volume that Government are finding difficulty in handling them.

INDIA'S SYMPATHY FOR POLAND

Simla, Sept. 12.

The Council of State passed the following Resolution :—

That the House do send to Poland an unanimous expression of its profound admiration at their heroic struggle against wanton German aggression and its complete confidence that the undaunted spirit of their people and the unflinching determination of their allies will ultimately lead them to victory.

Sir C. Y. Chintamani:—

I trust and believe that India will do all she can in the struggle against Hitlerism to bring about success to England, France and Poland.

DR. AMBEDKAR'S UNCONDITIONAL SUPPORT

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar on behalf of the Independent Labour Party, issued a statement, from which the following are the most relevant paragraphs :—

There is one defect in the situation which the Independent Labour Party thinks is responsible for this attitude of hesitancy on the part of Indians to help Great Britain. As the position stands to-day India is tied to the chariot-wheels of the British Cabinet. The British Statesmen are free to pursue any kind of foreign policy and make any kind of international commitments. They are free to declare or not to declare war as they please and they are free to make any kind of peace they like. India has no voice in their foreign policy, in declaring war, or in the making of peace. If a particular foreign policy succeeds, very little of its advantage comes to India. But if the policy leads to war, then Indians are called

upon to help in men and money. India has no 'locus standi' in the making of events that bring on war. She has no 'locus standi' in the making of terms which often instead of ending war only adjourn war. Her duty is to be present only when war is on.. Such a position is, to say the least, anomalous and unfair to a country like India.

The Independent Labour Party believes that as far as One can visualize the near future, keeping one's feet on the firm ground of practical politics, the best thing for India is to remain within the British Commonwealth of nations and strive to achieve the status of equal partnership therein.

While it is in the interest of the Indian people to co-operate with Great Britain in this war with Germany, the British also must recognise that they owe certain duties to India, the fulfilment of which cannot long be postponed.

The first and foremost duty of the British towards India is to take steps to prepare Indians to defend their country.

The second duty of the British towards India is to reassure her of the status she is to occupy in the British Empire. The reluctance of the British Parliament to embody in the preamble to the Government of India Act that India is ultimately to occupy the status of a Dominion has caused much heart-burning. The faith of many in the British has received a rude shock by realization of the fact that Parliament should have refused in 1935 to give formal sanction to the declaration in favour of Dominion Status, which was made informally but authoritatively by Lord Irwin in 1929. The British must see that the doubts of India on this point are removed as early as possible. India cannot willingly and heartily fight

for principles if she is not assured that the benefit of these principles would be extended to her when the war is won.

The Independent Labour party supports the appeal made by His Excellency the Viceroy to India to help Britain in this war. The Independent Labour Party agrees that this is no time for making conditions. At the same time the Independent Labour Party believes that the British as well as the Indians should know and understand what they are fighting for and what they expect of each other,

PART III

IMPERIALISM, FASCISM AND EXPLOITATION
MUST END

CONGRESS ATTITUDE

INDIAN PEOPLE TO DECIDE

The Working Committee of the All India Congress Committee deliberated for nearly five days at Wardha and issued the following unanimous statement on the attitude of the Indian National Congress :—

Sept. 14.

The Working Committee have given their earnest consideration to the grave crisis that has developed owing to the declaration of war in Europe. The principles, which should guide the nation in the event of war, have been repeatedly laid down by the Congress, and only a month ago this Committee reiterated them and expressed their displeasure at the flouting of Indian opinion by the British Government in India. As a first step to dissociate themselves from the policy of the British Government, the Committee called upon the Congress members of the Central Legislative Assembly to refrain from attending the next session. Since then, the British Government have declared India as a belligerent country, promulgated ordinances, passed the Government of India Act Amending **Bill** and taken other far-reaching measures which affect the Indian people vitally and circumscribe and limit the powers and activities of the Provincial Governments. This has been done without the consent of the Indian people, whose declared

wishes in such matters have been deliberately ignored by the British Government. The Working Committee must take the gravest view of these developments.

The Congress has repeatedly declared its entire disapproval of the ideology and practice of Fascism and Nazism and their glorification of war and violence and the suppression of the human spirit. It has condemned aggression in which they have repeatedly indulged and their sweeping away of well-established principles and recognised standards of civilised behaviour. It has seen in Fascism and Nazism the intensification of the principles of Imperialism, against which the Indian people have struggled for many years. The Working Committee must, therefore, unhesitatingly condemn the latest aggression of the Nazi Government in Germany against Poland and sympathise with those who resist it.

The Congress has further laid down that the issue of war and peace for India must be decided by the Indian people and no outside authority can impose this decision upon them, nor can the Indian people permit their resources to be exploited for Imperialist ends. Any imposed decision or attempt to use Indian resources for purposes not approved by them will necessarily have to be opposed by them. If co-operation is desired in a worthy cause, this cannot be obtained by compulsion and imposition, and the Committee cannot agree to the carrying out by the Indian people of orders issued by external authority. Co-operation must be between equals by mutual consent, for a Cause which both consider to be worthy. The people of India have in the recent past faced great risks and willingly made great sacrifices to secure their own freedom and establish a free democratic State in India, and their

sympathy is entirely on the side of democracy and freedom. But India cannot associate herself in a war said to be for democratic freedom when that very freedom is denied to her and such limited freedom as she possesses taken away from her.

The Committee are aware that the Governments of Great Britain and France have declared that they are fighting for democracy and freedom and to put an end to aggression ; but the history of the recent past is full of examples showing the constant divergence between the spoken word, the ideals proclaimed, and the real motives and objectives. During the war of 1914-18, the declared war aims were the preservation of democracy, self-determination and freedom of small nations, and yet the very Governments which solemnly proclaimed these aims entered into secret treaties embodying Imperialist designs for the carving up of the Ottoman Empire. While stating that they did not want any acquisition of territory, the victorious Powers added largely to their Colonial domains. *The present European war itself signifies the abject failure of the Treaty of Versailles* and of its makers, who broke their pledged word and imposed an Imperialist peace on the defeated nations. The one hopeful outcome of that Treaty, the League of Nations, was muzzled and strangled at the outset and later killed by its parent States.

Subsequent history has demonstrated afresh how even a seemingly fervent' declaration of faith may be followed by an ignoble desertion. In Manchuria, the British Government connived at aggression; in Abyssinia, they acquiesced in it; in Czecho-Slovakia and Spain, democracy was in peril, and it was deliberately betrayed, and the whole system of collective

security was sabotaged by the very Powers who had previously declared their firm faith in it.

Again, it is asserted that democracy is in danger and must be defended, and with this statement the Committee are in entire agreement. The Committee believe that the peoples of the West are moved by this ideal and objective, and for these they are prepared to make sacrifices, but again and again, the ideals and sentiments of the people arid of those who have sacrificed themselves in the struggle have been ignored, and faith has not been kept with them.

If the war is to defend the *status quo*, Imperialist possessions, Colonies, vested interests and privileges, then India can have nothing to do with it. If, however, the issue is democracy and a world order based on democracy, then India is intensely interested in it. The Committee are convinced that the interests of Indian democracy do not conflict with the interests of British democracy or of world democracy. But, there is an inherent and ineradicable conflict between democracy for India or elsewhere and Imperialism and Fascism. *If Great Britain fights for the maintenance and extention of democracy, then she must necessarily end Imperialism in her own possessions, and establish full democracy in India and the Indian people must have the right of self-determination*

framing their own constitution through a Constituent Assembly, without external interference and must guide their own policy. A free democratic India will gladly associate herself with other free nations for mutual defence against aggression and for economic co-operation. She will work, for the establishment of a real world order based on freedom and democracy, utilising the world's knowledge and resources for the progress and advancement of humanity.

The crisis that has overtaken Europe is not of Europe only, but of humanity and will not pass like other crises or wars, leaving the essential structure of the present-day world intact. It is likely to refashion the world for good or ill, politically, socially and economically. This crisis is the inevitable consequence of the social and political conflicts and contradictions which have grown alarmingly since the last Great War, and it will not be finally resolved till these conflicts and contradictions are removed and a new equilibrium established. That equilibrium can only be based on the ending of the domination and exploitation of one country by another and on a reorganisation of economic relations on a juster basis for the common good of all. *India is the crux of the problem, for India has been the outstanding example of modern Imperialism, and no re-fashioning of the world . can succeed which ignores this vital problem. With her vast resources she must play an important part in any scheme of world reorganisation.* But she can only do so as a free nation whose energies have been released to work for this great end. Freedom today is indivisible and every attempt to retain Imperialist domination in any part of the world will lead inevitably to fresh disaster.

The Working Committee have noted that many Rulers of Indian States have offered their services and resources and expressed their desire to support the cause of democracy in Europe. If they must make their professions in favour of democracy abroad, the Committee would suggest that their first concern should be the introduction of democracy within their own States, in which, today, undiluted autocracy reigns supreme. The British Government in India is more responsible for this autocracy than even the Rulers themselves, as

has been made painfully evident during the past year. This policy is the very negation of democracy and of the new world order for which Great Britain claims to be fighting in Europe.

As the Working Committee view past events in Europe, Africa and Asia, and, more particularly, past and present occurrences in India, they fail to find any attempt to advance the cause of democracy or self-determination, or any evidence that the present war declarations of the British Government are being, or are going to be, acted upon. The true measure of democracy is the ending of Imperialism and Fascism alike and the aggression that has accompanied them in the past and the present. Only on that basis can a new order be built up. In the struggle for that new world order the Committee are eager and desirous to help in every way. But the Committee cannot associate themselves or offer any co-operation in a war which is conducted on Imperialist lines, and which is meant to consolidate Imperialism in India and elsewhere.

In view, however, of the gravity of the occasion and the fact that the pace of events during the last few days has often been swifter than the working of men's minds, the Committee desire to take no final decision at this stage, so as to allow for the full elucidation of the issues at stake, the real objectives aimed at, and the position of India in the present and in the future. But the decision cannot long be delayed as India is being committed from day to day to a policy to which she is not a party and of which she disapproves.

The Working Committee, therefore, invite the British Government to declare in unequivocal terms what their war aims are in regard to democracy and Imperialism and the new order that is envisaged, in particular going to apply to India and to

present. Do they include the elimination of Imperialism and the treatment of India as a free nation whose policy will be guided in accordance with the wishes of her people ? A clear declaration about the future, pledging the Government to the ending of Imperialism and Fascism alike, will be welcomed by the people of all countries, but it is far more important to give immediate effect to it to the largest possible extent, for only this will convince the people that the declaration is meant to be honoured. The real test of any declaration is its application in the present, for it is the present that will govern action today and give shape to the future.

War has broken out in Europe and the prospect is terrible to contemplate, but war has been taking its heavy toll of human life during recent years in Abyssinia, Spain and China. Innumerable innocent men, women and children have been bombed to death from the air in open cities. Cold-blooded massacres, torture and the utmost humiliation have followed each other in quick succession during these years of horror. That horror grows, and violence and the threat of violence shadow the world, and unless checked and ended will destroy the precious inheritance of past ages. That horror has to be checked in Europe and China, but it will not end till its root causes of Fascism and Imperialism are removed. To that end the Working Committee are prepared to give their co-operation. But it will be infinite tragedy if even this terrible war is carried on in the spirit of Imperialism and for the purpose of retaining this structure which is itself the cause of war and human degradation.

The Working Committee wish to declare that the Indian people have no quarrel with the German people or the Japanese people or any other people, but they have a deeprooted quarrel

with systems which deny freedom and are based on violence and aggression. *They do not look forward to a victory of **one** people over another or to a dictated peace, but to a victory of real democracy for all the people of all countries and a world freed from the nightmare of violence and Imperialist oppression.*

The Committee earnestly appeal to the Indian people to end all internal conflict and controversy and, in this hour of peril, to keep in readiness and hold together as a united nation, - calm of purpose and determined to achieve the freedom of India within the larger freedom of the world.

THE EARLIER CONGRESS RESOLUTIONS

Haripura Congress —February 1938

In view of the grave danger of wide-spread and devastating war which overshadows the world, the Congress desires to state afresh the policy of the Indian people in regard to foreign relations and war.

The people of India desire to live in peace and friendship with their neighbours and with all other countries, and" for this purpose wish to remove all cause of conflict between them. Striving for their own freedom and independence as a nation, they desire to respect the freedom of others, and to build up their strength on the basis of international co-operation and goodwill. Such co-operation must be founded on a world order and a free India will gladly associate itself with such an order, and stand for disarmament and collective security. But world co-operation is impossible of achievement-so long as the roots of international conflict remained **and** oner

nation dominates over another and imperialism holds sway. In order, therefore, to establish world peace on an enduring basis, imperialism and the exploitation of one people by another must end.

India can be no party to an imperialist war and will not permit her man-power and resources to be exploited in the interest of British Imperialism. Nor can India join any war without the express consent of her people. The Congress, therefore, entirely disapproves of war preparations being made in India and large-scale manoeuvres and air-raid precautions by which it has been sought to spread an atmosphere of approaching war in India. In the event of an attempt being made to involve India in a war, this will be resisted.

Tripuri Congress — March 1939.

The Congress is opposed to Imperialism and Fascism alike and is convinced that world peace and progress requires the ending of both of these. In the opinion of the Congress, it is urgently necessary for India to direct her own foreign policy as an independent nation, thereby keeping aloof from both Imperialism and Fascism, and pursuing her path of peace and freedom.

A. I. C. C. — Calcutta, May 1, 1939

In view of the imminent danger of international war, the A. I. C. C. reminds the country and all others concerned of the national policy in regard to war which the Congress has often proclaimed. This policy will be strictly adhered to and the Congress is determined to oppose all attempts to impose a war on India and use Indian resources in a war without the consent of the Indian people.

The Committee has noted with disapproval the despatch* of a small body of Indian troops towards Aden as this can only mean their employment for British imperialist purposes.

The Committee, in particular, records its complete disapproval of the attempt being made by the British Government to amend the*Government of India Act with a view to concentrating all power, in the event of a war emergency, in the hands of the Central Government which functions completely as an agent of British Imperialism. While the Congress is not interested as a rule in amendments to the India Act and has worked for the whole Act to be ended, it cannot tolerate an amendment which strikes at the very basis of Provincial Autonomy and reduces it to a farce in case of war; which in effect creates a war dictatorship of the Central Government in India, and which makes Provincial Governments helpless agents of Imperialism. Any attempt to impose such an amendment on India must and will be resisted in every way open to the Congress. Provincial Governments are warned to be ready to carry out the policy in this respect as may be determined by the A. I. C. C. or the Working Committee, as the case may be.

WITHDRAWAL OF CENTRAL M.L.A.'S OF THE CONGRESS PARTY

The Congress Working Committee, Aug. 1939.

The Congress has clearly enunciated its policy in the event of war and declared its determination to oppose all attempts to impose a war on India. The Committee are bound by this policy of the Congress and will give effect to it so as to prevent the exploitation of Indian resources for imperialist ends. The past policy of the British Government as well

as the recent developments demonstrate abundantly that this Government does not stand for freedom and democracy and may at any time betray these ideals. India cannot associate herself with such a Government or be asked to give her resources for democratic freedom which is denied to her and which is likely to be betrayed.

At its meeting held in Calcutta on May 1, 1939, the AH India Congress Committee reiterated this policy of the Congress and expressed its disapproval of the despatch of Indian troops to foreign countries. In spite of this clear expression of opinion, the British Government has sent, or is sending, Indian troops to Egypt and Singapore against the declared will of the Indian people. Even apart from the War situation, the Central Legislative Assembly has previously declared that no Indian troops should be sent abroad without the consent of the Legislature. The British Government has thus flouted the declarations of the Congress and the Assembly and has taken steps which might inevitably lead to India's entanglement in a war. It has further prolonged the life of the Central Assembly by another year. The Working Committee cannot accept these decisions of the British Government and must not only dissociate themselves from them but also take such steps as may be necessary to give effect to the Congress policy. As a first step to this end the Committee call upon all Congress members of the Central Legislative Assembly to refrain from attending the next session of the Assembly.

The Committee further remind Provincial Governments: to assist in no way the war preparations of the British Government and to keep in mind the policy laid down by the Congress to which they must adhere. If the carrying out of this policy

loads to the resignations or removal of the Congress Ministries, they must be prepared for this contingency:

In the event of a war crisis leading to danger to any part of India from the air or otherwise it may be necessary for protective measures to be taken. The Committee will be prepared to encourage such measures if they are within the control of popular Ministries in the provinces. The Committee are however, not agreeable to such protective measures being used as a cloak for war preparations under the control of the Imperial Government.

THE GREATEST MORAL ASSET

Mahatma Gandhi issued the following statement from Segaoon :—

September, 15

The Working Committee's statement on the world crisis took four days before it received final shape. Every member expressed his opinion freely on the draft that was, at the Committee's invitation, prepared by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. I was sorry to find myself alone in thinking that whatever support was to be given to the British should be given unconditionally. This could only be done, on a purely non-violent basis. But the Committee had a tremendous responsibility to discharge. It could not take the purely non-violent attitude, It felt that the nation had not imbibed the non-violent spirit requisite for the possession of the strength which disdains to take advantage of the difficulty of the opponent. But in stating the reasons for its conclusion the Committee desired to show the greatest consideration for the English

The author of the statement is an artist. Though he* cannot be surpassed in his implacable opposition to Imperialism in any shape or form, he is a friend of the English people. Indeed he is more English than Indian in his thoughts and make-up. He is often more at home with Englishmen than with his own countrymen. And he is a humanitarian in the sense that he reacts to every wrong, no matter where perpetrated. Though, therefore, he is an ardent nationalist his nationalism is enriched by his fine internationalism. Hence the statement is a manifesto addressed not only to his own countrymen, but only to the British Government and the British people, but it is addressed also to the nations of the world including those that are exploited like India. He has compelled India, through the Working Committee, to think not merely of her own freedom, but of the freedom of all the exploited nations of the world.

The same time that the Committee passed the statement it appointed a Board of his choice with himself as Chairman to deal with the situation as it may develop from time to time.

I hope that the statement will receive the unanimous support of all the parties among Congressmen. The strongest among them will not find any lack of strength in it. And at this supreme hour in the history of the nation the Congress should believe that there will be no lack of strength in action, if action becomes necessary. It will be a pity if Congressmen engage in petty squabbles and party strife. If anything big or worthy is to come out of the Committee's action, the undivided and unquestioned loyalty of every Congressman is absolutely necessary. I hope too that all other political parties and all

communities will join the Committee's demand for a clear declaration of their policy from the British Government with such corresponding action as is possible amidst martial conditions. Recognition of India, and for that matter of all those who are under the British Crown, as free and independent nations seems to me to be the natural corollary of British professions about democracy. If the war means anything less, the cooperation of dependent nations can never be honestly voluntary, unless it were based on non-violence.

All that is required is a mental revolution on the part of British statesmen. To put it still more plainly, all that is required is honest action to implement the declaration of faith in democracy made on the eve of the war, and still being repeated from British platforms. Will Britain have an unwilling India dragged into the war or a willing ally cooperating with her in the prosecution of a defence of true democracy? The Congress support will mean the greatest moral asset in favour of England and France. For the Congress has no soldiers to offer. The Congress fights not with violent but with non-violent means, however imperfect, however crude the non-violence may be.

REASONS FOR GANDHIJI'S SYMPATHY

For England and France

(From the 'Harijan' of September 16)

By M. K. Gandhi

The statement made by me just after my interview with H. B. the Viceroy has had a mixed reception. It has been described as sentimental twaddle by one critic and as a states-

manlike pronouncement by another. There are variations between the two extremes. I suppose all the critics are right from their own standpoint and all are wrong from the absolute standpoint which in this instance is that of the author. He wrote for nobody's satisfaction but his own.

I abide by every word I have said in it. It has no political value, except what every humanitarian opinion may possess. Interrelation of ideas cannot be prevented.

I have a spirited protest from a correspondent. It calls for a reply. I do not reproduce the letter as parts of it I do not understand myself. But there is no difficulty in catching its drift. The main argument is this :

"If you shed tears over the possible destruction of the English Houses of Parliament and Westminster Abbey, have you no tears for the possible destruction of the monuments of Germany? And why do you sympathise with England and France and not with Germany?"

Is not Hitler an answer to the ravishing of Germany by the Allied powers during the last War. If you were a German, had the resourcefulness of Hitler, and were a believer in the doctrine of retaliation as the whole world is you would have done what Hitler is doing. Nazism may be bad- We do not know what it really is. The literature we get is onesided. But I suggest to you that there is no difference between Chamberlain and Hitler. In Hitler's place Chamberlain would not have acted otherwise. You have done an injustice to Hitler by comparing him with Chamberlain to the former's disadvantage. Is England's record in India any better than Hitler's in another part of the world in similar circumstances? Hitler but an infant pupil of the old imperialist England and France.*'

No one perhaps, has described English misdeeds more forcibly, subject to truth, than I have. No one has resisted England more effectively, perhaps, than I have. And my desire for and power of resistance remain unabated. But there are seasons for speech and action as there are seasons for silence and inaction. In the dictionary of Satyagraha there is no enemy. But as I have no desire to prepare a new diction-

ary for Satyagrahis, I use the old words giving them a new meaning. A Satyagrahi loves, his so-called enemy even as his friend. He owns no enemy. As a Satyagrahi, i. e., votary of ahimsa, I must wish well to England. My wishes regarding Germany were, and they still are, irrelevant for the moment. But I have said in a few words in my statement that I would not care to erect the freedom of my country on the remains of despoiled Germany. I should be as much moved by a contemplation of the possible destruction of Germany's monuments. Herr Hitler stands in no need of my sympathy. In assessing the present merits, the past misdeeds of England and the good deeds of Germany are irrelevant. Rightly or wrongly, and irrespective of what the other Powers have done before under similar circumstances, I have come to the conclusion that Herr Hitler is responsible for the war. I do not judge his claim. It is highly probable that his right to incorporate Danzig in Germany is beyond question, if the Danzig Germans desire to give up their independent status. It may be that his claim to appropriate the Polish corridor is a just claim. My complaint is that he will not let the claim be examined by an independent tribunal. It is no answer to the rejection of the appeal for submission to arbitration that it came from interested quarters. Even a thief may conceivably make a correct appeal to his fellow thief. I think I am right in saying that the whole world was anxious that Herr Hitler should allow his demand to be examined by an impartial tribunal.

If he succeeds in his design, his success will be no proof of the justness of his claim. It will be proof that the Law of the Jungle is still a great force in human affairs. It will be one more proof that though we humans have changed the form, we have not changed the manners of the beast.

I hope it is now clear to my critics that my sympathy for England and France is not a result of momentary emotion or, in cruder language, of hysteria. It is derived from the never-drying fountain of non-violence which my breast has nursed for fifty years. I claim no infallibility for my judgment. All I claim is that my sympathy for England and France is reasoned. I invite those who accept the premises on which my sympathy is based to join me. What shape it should take is* another'matter.

Alone I can but pray. And so I told His Excellency that my sympathy had no concrete value in the face of the concrete destruction that is facing those who are directly engaged in the war.

UNCONDITIONAL SUPPORT

BHOPAL, September 16.

Addressing a large gathering of State officials, jagirdars and prominent non-officials, His Highness the Nawab of Bhopal made an earnest appeal to all Muslims to stand solid at this hour of grave anxiety and show their solidarity by taking a unanimous decision. His Highness said :—"No one can dispute that it is the right of the 90 million Muslims in India to demand that no constitution should be forced on them without their free consent and that in any constitution which may in future be evolved, due provision shall be made for the protection of their legitimate and just rights. Britain in the prosecution of large policies may have at times in the past failed to satisfy Muslim opinion in India. The Muslims in India may have other grievances but England today is fighting *for* ideals and principles which are so near and dear to the heart of every Muslim, We should, therefore, sink our politi-

cal differences, lay aside our domestic quarrels, forget and forgive, and stand by the side of Britain without bargaining or laying down conditions as the price of our help and co-operation. I am confident that this magnanimous attitude of Muslims is bound to win for them the friendship and support of the British Nation and due recognition of their legitimate claims by His Majesty's Government."

RUSSIAN INVASION OF POLAND

On September 17 a very significant development took place in the European war situation. Like the day on which England and France declared war, the day on which the Russian army invaded Poland from the east was a Sunday. For some time prior to September 17 ominous statements were being published in Soviet papers. The *Pravda*, the official Communist organ published on Sept. 14, allegations of oppression of Russian minorities in Poland, who numbered eleven million. The journal added:—

"The Poles are only 60 percent of the population and the remainder include 8,000,000 Ukrainians and 3,000,000 White Russians without administrative autonomy, national schools etc."

On the 15th one million conscripts were called up under the new military service law passed on August 31. At 6 O'clock on Sunday morning (September 17) M. Molotov, Russia's Foreign Minister, announced over the wireless that the Soviet Army had begun the invasion of Eastern Poland. The Soviet Army marched into Poland over a 500 mile-front. There was a Polish-Russian Pact of non-aggression concluded in Moscow on July 25, 1932, which by the

Protocol signed in Moscow on May 5, 1934, was prolonged until December 31, 1945. M. Molotov in his broadcast and also in the Soviet note to Poland explained that according to the view-point of the Soviet Government former treaties were no longer valid as within a fortnight of the Polish-German War the Polish Government had broken up. The Soviet Note added:—

"They (the Polish Government) no longer show any signs of life, and this means that the Polish State and its Government actually no longer exist. In consequence the agreements signed between the Soviet Union and Poland have become invalid. The Soviet Government intend to take all measures to free the Polish people from the War in which they had been dragged by their misguided leaders and to give them the opportunity of beginning a peaceful life."

The Russian invasion was condemned as an act of wanton aggression by the Polish Embassy in London and also by Mr. Arthur Greenwood, Deputy Leader of the Labour Opposition in the House of Commons.

The Russian invasion expedited the total disappearance of Poland as an independent State (at least for the time being.) By the end of September Poland was occupied either by German or by Soviet Forces.

NO EXPLOITATION OF THE PEOPLE OF INDIA, MUSLIM LEAGUE ATTITUDE

Conditional support to Britain

New Delhi, September 18.

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League unanimously passed the following resolution:

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League appreciate the course adopted by His Excellency the Viceroy in inviting Mr. M. A. Jinnah, President of the All-India Muslim League, and apprising him regarding the international situation resulting in war, and of the present position and his own views, to be conveyed to the Muslim League. The Working Committee have given their most earnest consideration to His Excellency the Viceroy's views conveyed to them by the President, and also to the pronouncement made by the Viceroy since the declaration of war by Great Britain, and also His Excellency's address to the members of the Central Legislature on September 11, 1939.

The Committee are of the opinion that the views expressed by the Council of the All-India Muslim League by its resolution No.8 of August 27, 1939, are the true sentiments and opinions of the Mussalmans of India.

The Working Committee appreciate the declaration of His Excellency the Viceroy, which is in the interest of India and particularly the Mussalmans, that the federal scheme embodied in the Government of India Act, 1935, has been suspended. They wish that, instead of its being suspended, it had been abandoned completely, and desire to convey to His Majesty's Government that they should do so without further delay. The Committee desire to make it clear that they do not endorse the "federal objective" of His Majesty's Government referred to by His Excellency in his address to the members of the Central Legislature, and strongly urge upon the British Government to review and revise the entire problem of India's future constitution *de novo* in the light of the experience gained by the working of the present provincial constitution.

of India and developments that have taken place since 1935 or may take place hereafter.

The Committee in this connection wish to point out that Muslim India occupies a special and peculiar position in the polity of India, and for several decades it had hoped to occupy an honourable place in the national life, Government and administration of the country, and had worked for a free India with free and independent Islam, in which they could play an equal part with the major community with a complete sense of security for their religious, political, cultural, social and economic rights and interests. But the developments that have taken place, especially since the inauguration of the provincial constitution based on the so-called democratic parliamentary system of Government and the recent experiences of over two years, have established beyond any doubt that it has resulted wholly in a permanent communal majority and the domination by the Hindus over the Muslim minorities, whose life and liberty, property and honour are in danger, and even their religious rights and culture are being assailed and annihilated every day under the Congress Governments in various provinces. That while Muslim India stands against exploitation of the people of India and has repeatedly declared in favour of a 'free India', it is equally opposed to domination by the Hindu majority over the Mussalmans and other minorities and vasalisation of Muslim India, and is irrevocably opposed to any federal objective which must necessarily result in a majority community rule under the guise of democracy and parliamentary system of government. Such a constitution is totally unsuited to the genius of the peoples of the country, which is composed of various nationalities and does not constitute a national state.

The Muslim League condemns unprovoked aggression and the doctrine that might is right, and upholds the principles of freedom of humanity and that the will of the strongest, irrespective of right and justice, cannot be allowed to prevail. The Committee express their deep sympathy for Poland, England and France. The Committee, however, feel that real and solid Muslim co-operation and support to Great Britain in this hour of her trial cannot be secured successfully if His Majesty's Government and the Viceroy are unable to secure to the Mussalmans justice and fairplay in the Congress governed provinces, where today their liberty, person, property and honour are in danger and even their elementary rights are most callously trampled upon. The Committee strongly urge upon His Majesty's Government and the Viceroy and Governor-General to direct the Governors to exercise their special powers where any provincial Ministry fails to secure justice and fairplay to the Mussalmans, or where they resort to oppression or interference with their political, economic, social and cultural rights in accordance with the sacred promises, assurances and declarations repeatedly made by Great Britain, in consequence of which these special powers were expressly embodied in the statute. The Committee regret to say that so far these special powers have remained dormant and obsolete, and the Governors have failed to protect the rights of the Mussalmans.

While the Muslim *League* stands for the freedom of India, the Committee further urge upon His Majesty's Government and ask for an assurance that no declaration regarding the question of constitutional advance for India should be made without the consent and approval of the All-India Muslim League nor any constitution be framed and finally

adopted by. His Majesty's Government and the British Parliament without such consent and approval.

The Committee urge his Majesty's Government to satisfy the Arab national demands.

If full, effective and honourable co-operation of the Mussalmans is desired by the British Government in the grave crisis which is facing the world today, and if it is desired to bring it to a successful termination, it must create a sense of security and satisfaction amongst the Mussalmans and to take in its confidence the Muslim League, which is the only organisation that can speak on behalf of Muslim India.

At this critical and difficult juncture the Committee appeal to every Mussalman to stand solidly under the flag of the All-India Muslim League with a solemn and sacred determination to make every sacrifice, for on it depend the future destiny and the honour of 90,000,000 of Mussalmans in India,

PANDIT JAWAHARLAL NEHRU

September, 21

The basic decision has been taken already, and the application Of this to existing circumstances has yet to be made. That application depends now on how far those basic principles are accepted and applied in the present situation by the British Government. Briefly put, India can no longer consent to be treated as a part of an Empire. Whether in peace or in war, she must function as a free nation.

England is facing this crisis with courage and determination, but she has to carry the heavy burden of her past policy, and, in the light of that policy, her present declare-

tions in favour of democracy and freedom carry little weight. Even now the chance is offered her to throw this burden and rid herself of her Imperialist tradition, and thus, unhampered, march with equal partners to the goal of freedom for all. There is no other way. Is she wise enough or great enough to follow this path willingly and with faith in it? So far she has shown a singular lack of wisdom, and has taken various steps in relation to India which have been completely at variance with the declared will of the Indian people. Does she think that a proud people, conscious of their strength, can accept such treatment? India can no longer be dragged or pushed or compelled to follow the dictates of an external authority. The time has come to put an end to the idea of Empire and to seek the friendship and co-operation of free nations. India must be accepted and treated as a free country on terms of equality. Any other course will lead to conflict and misfortune for all concerned.

Signed article in the "*National Herald*."

BENGAL PREMIER'S COMMENT ON MUSLIM LEAGUE MANIFESTO

Calcutta, September, 21

The Hon'ble Mr. A. K. Fazlul Huq said in a statement to the Press:—

While the Congress by its deeds and professions has* practically refused support to the British Government at this time of grave crisis in the history of England, the Muslim League has not confronted Great Britain with any such demand which on the face of it must be impossible for the British Government to meet immediately, preoccupied as they

are with the conduct of this war. The Congress has condemned British policy in pursuance of which India has been declared a belligerent country and has called upon the British Government to establish what it describes as "a free democratic State in India." The Congress has also laid down that unless Great Britain is ready immediately to grant the Indian people the right of self-determination by framing their own constitution through a constituent assembly, the Congress will withhold its support from Great Britain at this crisis. And to crown all, only recently the Congress gave an open exhibition of its "loyalty and devotion" by calling upon its members of the Central Assembly to boycott the Assembly as a protest against the Government policy of sending troops outside India without consulting the "military authorities" of the Congress.

As against this, the Muslim League statement merely states that with a view to enabling the Muslim League to marshal the Muslim fighting resources unreservedly for the service of the British, it is of the utmost importance that the Muslims should be assured that in any changes of the constitution such as demanded by the Congress, the Muslim League shall be consulted and that genuine safeguards should be assured in place of the visionary and illusory safeguards for minorities embodied in the Government of India Act. The Muslim League has definitely refrained from bargaining with England at this time of her crisis and has only urged that the Muslim League should be taken into confidence if there is any change in the constitution of the Government of India.

A comparison between the two statements will make it abundantly clear that the Muslims have been more reasonable in their attitude and far more modest in the statement of their case *than* the Congress.

INDIA IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS

On September 26, Mahatma Gandhi had an interview with the Viceroy for 3i hours. The talk was with reference to the Congress demand for a declaration of England's war aims and peace aims.

On the same day, in London, Marquis of Zetland, Secretary of State for India, made the first statement regarding the* position of India *visavis* the War in reply to a private motion by Lord Snell. Lord Zetland said :—

I gladly respond to the invitation to make a statement and do so with all the more readiness in that it provides *mer* with an opportunity for giving expression to the high appreciation of his Majesty's Government of the support which has been accorded to them by all classes in India. From the Princes have come the most generous offers of money and¹ personal service. From individuals in all parts of the country there have poured in messages of sympathy and support-

His Majesty's Government have noted with special gratification the statements made by the Prime Ministers of the Punjab and Bengal pledging their aid unconditionally in the Struggle upon which we have entered, and they have also observed with very real appreciation the support which the Governors have received from Ministries in all the Indian Provinces in putting into operation such measures as had been necessary to meet the abnormal circumstances resulting irony the outbreak of war. Resort to force following upon a succession of breaches of faith by the German Government, unparalleled surely in the history of mankind, which cornpelted us to take up arms, has been unequivocally condemned by alt political parties in India, whose leaders have expressed their

unqualified sympathy with the victims of aggression. It is indeed abundantly clear that the triumph of the principles for which the Nazi Government stands would be regarded as a calamity of the utmost magnitude by all sections of the Indian people.

I am bound to add, however, that in the course of a statement recently issued, those who have been authorised to speak for the Indian National Congress have indicated that they would find it difficult to co-operate with Great Britain in the prosecution of the war except upon conditions affecting the political relations between the two countries. The conditions have so far been expressed in abstract terms, and I am not at present prepared to comment upon them. I can, however, assure you that the Viceroy is in close personal contact with leaders of Indian opinion, including representatives of the Congress and the All-India Muslim League, who, likewise, within the last few days, defined their general attitude toward the war, and that he hopes to discuss with them the various issues arising out of the situation. I should like to add that a tribute is due to the Viceroy himself and his colleagues in the Government for the efficiency with which their preparation for meeting the emergency have been made and for the smoothness with which such preparations have been carried into effect.

TIME ILL-CHOSEN

On the following day (Sept. 27) Lord Snell called attention in the House of Lords to the statement of Marquis of Zetland and said that his first word was that it was necessary that **they** should not overestimate the seriousness of the attitude which the Congress Party had, thought it right to

assume. It was natural that they should wish to take advantage of this crisis to further their own political claims. These claims were not new. They were part of a very old programme and were now being merely restated. Lord Snell added:

"We shall not forget them when the time comes; but first things have to be put forward first, and so the first thing now before us all, in every part of the world where free men exist, is to deal with lawless aggression, that free men everywhere may feel that they can continue to live in a free world. India will share in these great benefits, and I am sure that the Indian people will know in these circumstances what to do. I cannot help feeling that a very great opportunity is presented at the present time to send articulate envoys to India to interpret the present situation, and to explain to them and reassure them of our interest and belief in their future."

Replying, Lord Zetland agreed that it was natural, though rather ill-timed, that the leaders of the Congress should take this opportunity of reasserting their aims towards a fuller form of self-government than they at present possessed and said :

I quite appreciate the fact that it is natural. I know many of the leaders of the Congress movement. They are men -who are animated by burning patriotism; and they do, I think, sometimes, a little lose sight, while lifting the eyes to the stars, of the practical difficulties which stand in the way on the ground at their feet. But while I am ready to admit that it may be natural that they should take this occasion to emphasise their claims, I cannot help expressing a feeling that it is somewhat unfortunate that they should have chosen this time to reassert their claims. I say that for more reasons than one. I think the British people are very susceptible to treatment which they regard as honourable and appropriate to a particular

occasion. They would be very much more willing, when the* time comes, to listen to the claims made to them, than if they were animated by a spirit of resentment at the choosing of such an occasion for taking action, which may be calculated to be embarrassing to them in a life-and-death struggle.

I am sorry for a further reason. I agreed with Lord Snelt when he pointed out that it was a tremendous advantage to India that there are now a number of ardent Indian nationalists who have had experience in the actual work of administration. It would be a calamity if such men at this time were withdrawn from Government in the provinces. They have shown that they are capable of dealing with the problems which face them in their country, and they have co-operated in an admirable spirit with the Governors with whom they have been associated. I have nothing but praise for the manner in which, up to now they have co-operated in carrying, through measures, which have been necessitated by the outbreak of war. So, I say, I think that the time has bee* ill-chosen by the leaders of the Congress for reiteration of their claims. I am not for the moment in a position to give any further information with regard to the discussion taking place between the Governor-General and the Indian leaders. The Governor-General had a long talk, yesterday, with Mr. Gandhi, and he is proposing to see, indeed he may actually be engaging in discussion at this moment with the leader of the All-India Muslim League. It is his intention to discuss matters-with other leaders in the course of the next few days, and we can only hope that as a result of a frank and free exchange of views between the Governor-General and the leaders of political parties in India, we may find that they will co-operate with us in the task, the aim of which they

entirely approve. There is not the smallest doubt that from one end of India to the other there is a growing appreciation of the necessity for up-rooting and destroying once and for all the form of government which has been responsible for bringing upon mankind this great calamity."

MAHATMA GANDHI ASKS ENGLISH STATESMEN TO OPEN A NEW CHAPTER

Wardha, September 28

Mahatma Gandhi issued the following statement :—

An advance copy of *Reuters* summary of the debate in the House of Lords on Indian affairs has been shown to me. Perhaps silence on my part at this juncture would be a distinct disservice both to India and England. I was unprepared for the old familiar flavour in the debate in the shape of drawing comparisons unflattering to the Congress. I maintain that the Congress is an all-inclusive body. Without offence to anybody it can be said of it that it is the one body that has represented for over half a century, without a rival, the vast masses of India, irrespective of class or creed. It has not a single interest opposed to that of the Muslims or that of the people of the States. Recent years have shown unmistakably that the Congress represents, beyond doubt, the interests of the people of the States.

It is that organisation which has asked for a clear dilution of British intentions. If the British are fighting for the freedom of all, then their representatives have to state in the clearest possible terms that the freedom of India is necessarily

included in the war aims. The content of such freedom can only *he* decided by Indians and by them alone. Surely it is wrong for Lord Zetland to complain, as he does, though in gentle terms, that the Congress should at this juncture, when Britain is engaged in a life-and-death struggle, ask for a clear declaration of British intentions. I suggest that the Congress has done nothing strange or less than honourable in asking for such a declaration. Only a free India's help is of value. And the Congress has every right to know that it can go to the people and tell that at the end of the war India's status as an independent country is as much assured as that of Great Britain.

As a friend of the British, I, therefore, appeal to English statesmen that they will *forget the old language of Imperialists and open a new chapter* for those, who have been held under imperial bondage.

H. H. AGA KHAN'S CALL TO MUSLIMS

Simla, September 28

An appeal to Muslims in India and the British possessions to co-operate whole-heartedly for Britain's success was made by His Highness the Aga Khan who said:

"Such sincere and complete co-operation will also be the best service to Islam. I beg my brothers in Islam to realise that alike our way to serve secular duty and our best Muslim interest are by completely loyal co-operation with His Majesty's Government. Both my only grown-up son and myself have placed all our personal services at the Viceroy's disposal."

INDIA NOT OUT TO BARGAIN

Allahabad, September 29.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Chairman of the War Sub-Committee of the Congress Working Committee, issued the following statement on Lord Zetland's speeches in the House of Lords:—

It was made perfectly clear by the Congress Working Committee as well as by Congress leaders that we were not out to bargain or to take advantage of England's difficulty. It was essential in our opinion, both from the point of view of India and the world, that these war aims should be clarified¹ and the people made to believe in their *reality* and their *bona fides*. It is astonishing that a request of this kind should be called inopportune and ill-timed. Are we to wait till the end of this devastating war, in which we are asked to take part, before we know what the war aims are? Must vast numbers of human beings suffer unto death without even knowing definitely what they die for?

Whatever may be said about the statement of the Working Committee no one can accusethem of vagueness. They have framed clear questions which demand an answer. Why does not Lord Zetland give us an answer to those questions? No one should tali in terms of petty bargaining when the issues at stake are so mighty and overwhelming. No one also can consider these issues in terms of 20 years ago, because the world has changed and India has changed, and for anyoiiie to forget this overwhelming fact is to exhibit his total want of understanding of things as they are. That way lies peril not **only** for India and for England but for the world at large.

I want to repeat with all the emphasis that I possess that we have not put forward any demand in the spirit of the market-place. It is our duty as responsible Indians to consider the freedom and prosperity of India. That is the essential function of the Congress and it can never forget that. We must be convinced of world freedom and we must see India in the picture of world freedom. Then only will the war have? meaning for us and move our minds and hearts, for then we shall be struggling and suffering for a cause that is worthwhile not only for us, but also for all the peoples of the world. Because we feel that large numbers of British people have the same world ideals as many of us possess in India, we have offered them our co-operation in the realisation of these ideals. But if these ideals are not theirs, what do we fight for?

Only a free and consenting India can throw her weight for ideals that are openly proclaimed and acted upon.

DISSOLUTION OF POLAND

September 29>

An Official German News Agency Communique stated:—

"The German and Soviet Governments, having signed a definite settlement of questions arising from the dissolution of Poland and created a sure base for durable peace in Eastern Europe, declare it to be their unanimous opinion that it will be in the real interests of all nations to end the war between Germany! and Britain and France. Both the Governments will direct common efforts, if necessary in accord with other friendly Powers, to attain this aim as early as possible. If, however, the efforts of both the Governments remain futile, it.

will be established thereby that Britain and France bear the responsibility for the continuation of the war, and in the event of its continuation, the Governments of Germany and U. S. S. R. will consult with each other on the necessary measures. The German and Soviet Governments, after the dissolution of Poland, consider it their exclusive task to reestablish peace and order.

The two Governments have agreed to five articles fixing their frontier, the map showing which will be published later, and refusing all interference by third Powers in the settlement, the ratification of which will take place as soon as possible."

POLISH GOVERNMENT IN FRANCE

The position summarised.

September 30.

M. Moscicki, President of Poland, has resigned the Presidentship of the Polish Republic and handed over his powers to M. Raczewicz, the former Governor of Pomorze. M. Raczewicz will reside in France and has nominated a Cabinet, with General Sikorski as Prime Minister and Minister of War, M. Zaleski as Foreign Minister, and M. Adam Koc as Minister of Finance. General Sikorski, who is a former Prime Minister of Poland, has been appointed Commander of the Polish Army in France. He played an important part in organising the Polish Army during the last war, and was responsible for the Polish victory over the Russians at the river Wkra in 1920. The Polish Government in France is described as a 'Government of national unity and national defence.'

Need For Recognition

London, September 30.

Without exception the leaders of Indian thought and affairs have accepted the cause for which this country is engaged in war as their own. Mr. Gandhi's personal decision—'what will India's deliverance be worth if England and France fall'—has, perhaps, been the most moving of many signs of Indian generosity. That spirit calls for a clear recognition on this side that the leaders of India find themselves in an honest dilemma. There are few patriotic Indians who do not heartily dislike the slowness of "deliverance" even if they accept the need for prudence. In making common cause with England in a war against naked Imperialism and for the preservation of democracy, it is only natural that Indians should wish to see more clearly the course of vanishing Imperialism and expanding democracy whereon their country has embarked.

—*The Manchester Guardian*,

. *Postpone Demand Till After War*

Karachi, September 30

Mr. Jamshed N. R. Mehta, great Parsi leader, whose nationalism is sincere and whose admiration for Mahatma Gandhi is profound, said:—

"My countrymen can get what they want for the country by their own capacity *lot* non-violent struggle when the time comes and I respectfully urge that the time for action for getting what we want be postponed to immediately after the war. I feel: that Britain will be" more reasonable than in the past and that India's demand will have more grace and the dignity of righteousness if made after the war."

BRITISH DEMOCRACY

Secunderabad, September 30

Britain had applied their own parliamentary democratic form of Government to India although it was utterly unsuited to the genius of the Indian peoples, who, unlike those of the United Kingdom, were unhomogeneous in religious, social, educational and other aspects of life. They had done this because they were unable to devise any other more suitable form of Government. In actual practice democracy, as interpreted by the Congress, meant Government of the majority by the majority for the majority. This view was expressed by Mr. Jinnah addressing students at the Osmania University.

CONGRESS OBSESSION

Statement of Mr. M. A. Jinnah

Hyderabad (Dn.) October 1

"I regret to say that Mr. Gandhi, who is the sole interpreter and dictator of the Congress, has couched his statement in a language which once more creates the impression that the Congress is suffering in the first instance from inability to face realities and is obsessed with the belief that it alone represents India. Secondly, that while it is championing the cause of Democracy in India and desires to do away with the Democratic Imperialism of Great Britain, it has in the last two and a half years not only declared itself as a Fascist and authoritarian body but has actually translated this principle into practice. And, thirdly, that it is reviving throughout India the Hindu renaissance and the domination and supremacy of Hinduism over the entire sub-continent. Unless the High Command of the Congress is thoroughly cured of these maladies they will not be able to advance the progress of India Which we all have at heart."

CONGRESS DEMOCRACY SUSPECTED

By SEVEN LEADERS

Bombay, October 2.

After five days' confabulations Sir Cowasji Jehangir, Sir Chimanlal Setalwad, Mr. V. N. Chandavarkar, on behalf of the Indian Liberals, Mr. V. D. Savarkar, President of the Hindu Mahasabha, Mr. N.,C. Kelkar and Jamnadas M. Mehta representing the Democratic; Swaraj Party and Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, leader of the Scheduled castes and of the Independent Labour Party, issued the following joint statement:—

The step taken by His Excellency the Governor-General to take the people of India into his confidence by means of consultations with Indian leaders and thus to secure the willing co-operation of India in fighting the war is welcomed. It is believed that these consultations are being held for the purpose of arriving at some agreement as regards the future political status of India as an equal partner of the British Commonwealth. While feeling the necessity of consultations for such purpose, we urge that in the solution of that question all parties and interests are vitally concerned and therefore entitled to be consulted. So far it is learnt that the Governor-General had consultations with Mr. Gandhi and Mr. Jinnah as representing the Congress and the Muslim League respectively and that further consultations with those gentlemen are to follow.

Mr. Gandhi in the statement issued by him as reported in the papers of September 29, says : 'I maintain that the Congress is an all-inclusive body. Without offence to anybody it can be said of it that it is the only body that has represented for over half a century without a rival the vast masses of

India, irrespective of class or creed. Whatever might have been the position of the Congress as representing all India till it came under the control of its present leaders, such claim can not now be maintained. It is obvious from the fact that Mr. Candhi and the Congress President have carried on negotiations with Mr. Jinnah for a Congress-League settlement that Mr. Gandhi and his supporters do not themselves believe the claim put forward for the Congress that it is an all-inclusive body and that it represents the masses of India, irrespective of class or creed. The Muslim League, at any rate, repudiates entirely the claim of the Congress to represent the Muslims.

Leaving aside the Muslims, we venture to assert that the Congress cannot claim to represent all classes of people of all shades of political opinion in the country. The members of the Hindu Mahasabha, the Depressed Classes, the Democratic Swaraj Party, the Liberals, the land-holding and the labouring classes are all outside the Congress and do not recognise the Congress as their mouthpiece.

That all Hindus are not at the back of the Congress is apparent from the fact that a large majority of the people composing the Hindu Mahasabha are not in the Congress fold and the Working Committee of the Hindu Mahasabha has only recently re-affirmed, in a special resolution, that the Congress cannot, and does not, represent the Hindus, and any understanding arrived at between the Congress and the Government, to which the Hindu Mahasabha is no party, cannot bind the Hindus.

It is true that the Congress obtained at the last elections majorities in the seven provinces which enabled it to form Congress Ministries in those provinces. This does not, how-

ever, indicate that the Congress had behind it a majority of voters. In the Presidency of Bombay for example, the number of votes cast for non-Congress candidates in the general constituencies totalled 1,053,509 against 1,483,189 for Congress candidates. If the votes cast in special constituencies were added to the non-Congress votes the Congress had only a minority of voters behind it.

Moreover, the votes that the Congress candidates succeeded in obtaining in the various constituencies were obtained, we venture to say, by false pretences. The general feeling in the country was against the new Constitution as being 'illiberal' and not going far enough. The slogan of the Congress candidates was that they were going into legislatures to wreck the Constitution. This naturally brought the Congress candidates considerable accession of voting strength* The non-Congress candidates had the honesty to express the view that though the Constitution was unsatisfactory, it should be worked so as to get the best out of it in the interests of the country.

The Congress members of the legislatures as soon as they took office bade good-bye to their pretensions of wrecking the Constitution. Not only that, but they began using with a vengeance all laws that they called repressive and which they had pledged themselves to repeal. It can therefore be rightly asserted, that a very appreciable proportion of the voters that sent the Congress to office, feel that they were misled and are not now the supporters of the Congress. Further, those in charge of the Congress institution have not retained the confidence of even those who are within the Congress as it is apparent by the formation of what is called the Forward Bloc and the Royist Group.

The attitude of the Congress in the matter of the present-war is on the face of it insincere and unreliable. Only a few days before the last resolution of the Congress Working Committee, its prominent leader sang a totally different tune. Mr. Gandhi advised against any bargaining for Indian support. Mr. Vallabhbhai Patel, when he spoke at Meerut, favoured unconditional support and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru also spoke in the same strain. The resolution of the Working Committee was apparently dictated by the Forward* Bloc of Mr. Subhas Bose. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has come forward with a statement to gloss over the Working Committee's statement and says that it is not a bargaining, resolution.

The reiterated cry of the Congress leaders to secure a definite promise of a free Democracy for India as the price of India's cooperation is again not sincere. The way in which they are exercising the limited democratic powers that have been available to them under the present Constitution belies the hope that the present Congress leaders want to establish real Democracy in India. The Congress Government resent any opposition and wish, like autocrats, that no opposition should exist. By the experience that people have of Congress Governments in eight provinces for over two years, it is felt that the idea of Democracy in the minds of the Congress Governments—means suppression of the liberty of the Press, curtailment of the civil liberty of the people and ruthlessly silencing all opposition. Minority opinion in the legislatures is ignored and thrust aside with callous indifference. The Congress and the Congress Governments believe in annihilating all parties and making the Congress the only party in the land, as is the case in 'Fascist and Nazi regimes—a result which would be a deathblow to

Democracy. If the Congress really believed in Democracy it would not slight other parties or insist upon their dissolution. 'Congressmen cannot bear rivals and cannot bear sharing credit.

It is strange that Mr. Gandhi does not realise that supporting the fight for Democracy abroad, and insisting in India that the Congress is the only all-inclusive body is contradiction in terms. To insist that the Congress is the one and only political organisation to represent the whole country is to destroy the foundations of Indian Democracy.

We only wish to raise our voice to warn His Excellency the Governor-General not to be misled into accepting the position enunciated by Mr. Gandhi or to regard the Congress and the Muslim League as representing the whole or evert the bulk of India and thereby prevent the establishment of true and healthy Democracy in this country. We, therefore, beg to point out that any constitutional or administrative arrangement arrived at between the Government and the Congress and Muslim League only cannot and will not bind the Indian people.

INDIANS AS FREE AND EQUAL PARTNERS

October 3

In the House of Commons Mr. Attlee, Leader of the Labour Opposition said that this war began long before there was any formal declaration of war, and deeds and not merely words would be required before we could get any substantial peace. He therefore welcomed the Prime

Minister's statement that this country and France stood where they did because they were standing for real peace and not sham peace, for the safety of all peoples and not merely of our people. Mr. Attlee declared.' —

"It is very vital in this struggle, that we should make clear by deeds as well as words that we are standing for democracy and liberty, and not just for Imperial interests. We" have to consider all those peoples who are standing together with us in this war. We must not think that because there is war on, the development of self-government in the Colonial Empire should stop. The amazing unity of the British Commonwealth of Nations has been due to the fact that it is a free association of free peoples. The Indian people are with us in our fight for democracy, but they wish to come in not as dependents but as free and equal partners. I do not think that the Indian people have been handled tactfully in this matter, I welcome, of course, the news that the Viceroy has seen Mr. Gandhi and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. I think it should" have been done earlier. I think that the Congress Party, which controls government in a large majority of Indian provinces, should have been brought into the closest consultation with Government right from the start. Government should have shown a more imaginative insight in dealing with these peoples. There is an immense fund of goodwill among' them. The declaration by the Congress shows the feeling of the Indian people to be that they want to do their share. The declaration made by Lord Halifax on India's place in the British Commonwealth of Nations still stands. I hope that we shall get statements also in this House to show the Indian people that in this matter, they are coming in on a level with us and not in any kind of dependency whatever."

BRITISH PRESS ON INDIA'S CLAIM

London, October 3

In the struggle which lies before us, the whole-hearted support of the people of India may well be of vital assistance both materially, through men, money and materials, and morally, by proving to the world that England is not fighting oppression with bondage in her own house. The spontaneous expressions of sympathy for the British cause that have' come from Indian leaders of every persuasion must not mislead us into taking India's support for granted before India's support has been sought and won.....But, if the messages of sympathy that have so far been available only in summaries are read in the full text, it will be found in every case that Indians have not come further than to offer Britain an opportunity of gaining their support.....If Britain is fighting to save Democracy and establish a new world order, India would gladly join in the struggle, but, if the war should turn out to be aimed at the defence of Imperialist possessions, India could take no part in it. Thus, the Congress invites the British Government to declare their war aims regarding Democracy and Imperialism, and state how these aims will be applied to India now.

The few curt remarks by Lord Zetland in the House of Lords have been the only public response so far to an offer that is nothing less" than a historic opportunity. It is impossible to believe that Government, for all their urgent preoccupations, can mean to leave un-answered the frank appeal of a body that is able to make or mar India's contribution to the world.

—*The Manchester Guardian*

We want to know whether Britain is fighting a genuine battle for democracy or a mere war of rival Imperialisms once again. If Britain can convince the Congress leaders that our allegiance to Democracy is genuine, then the free and enthusiastic support of 300,000,000 people will be given us throughout the war. Let the British Government, therefore, agree to grant straightaway the fullest possible measure of responsibility at the Centre to India's elected leaders. We have never yet repaid in full the sacrifices made by Indians in the Allied cause between 1914 and 1918.

—*The Daily Herald*

VICEROY INTERVIEWS LEADERS

October 3, the Viceroy had talks with Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Congress President and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. The talks commenced at 10-45 A.M. and lasted upto one P. M. The talks related to the Congress Working Committee's statement of September 14.

October 4, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel had an interview with the Viceroy.

TEST OF SINCERITY

October 4

In a message to the British people through the *Manchester Guardian*, Mahatma Gandhi said:

"It will be a very serious tragedy in this tragic war if Britain is found to fail in the very first test of sincerity of her professions about democracy. Do the declarations,

or do they not, include the full freedom of India according" to the wishes of her people? This is a very simple and elementary question asked by the Congress. The Congress has the right to ask that question. I hope that the answer will be as it is expected by the Congress and, let me say, all those who wish well by Great Britain."

Oct. 5

The Viceroy gave two long interviews, to Mr. Jinnah in the morning, and to Mahatma Gandhi after lunch.

INDIA READY TO FORGET THE PAST

Oct. 7

Pandit Jawaharlal's message to the *"News Chronicle"*: —

If this war is for democracy and self-determination and against Nazi aggression, it cannot be fought for territorial annexations, indemnities or reparations, for keeping colonial peoples' in subjection and for maintaining the Imperialist system, India can take no part in degrading Imperialism, but she will join in a struggle for freedom. India's resources are vast but even of greater value is her goodwill and her moral support for a worthy cause. This is no small offer that India makes for it means the ending of 100 years of hostility between India and England. Only a free and equal India can co-operate of her free will in this task. Till that vital change is made none of us have the power to make the people of India enthusiastic for a war which is not theirs.

This historic opportunity must be seized by recognising India as a free nation with the right to draw up her constitution and her charter of independence. Anything short of

that will mean losing this opportunity and keeping alive the spirit of friction and hostility between India and England; The first step must therefore be a declaration of India's full freedom. *This has to be followed by its application now, in so far as is possible*, in order to give the people effective control of the governance of India and the prosecution of war on India's behalf. Then only is it possible to create the psychological conditions which can lead to popular support. India wants to forget the past of conflict and grants to stretch out her hand in comradeship. She must be convinced that that past is over and we are all striving for a new order not only in Europe but also in Asia and the world.

SAFEGUARD ALL INTERESTS

The erstwhile pro-Congress Leader of the scheduled castes, Rao Bahadur M. C. Rajah, M. L. A., President, All-India, Depressed Classes Association, said :—

Lord Zetland was quite correct in regarding the Congress as one exponent of Indian opinion and recognising the existence of other bodies whose voice though less loud is equally relevant. Among these bodies the Depressed Classes is not the least important. It is, therefore, necessary, that, any further power devolved upon the people should not be placed in the hands of one body like the Congress or the Muslim League, but should be so devolved that the interests of all classes, however small numerically or however lacking in loudness, should be studied and safeguarded and their aspirations nourished and not smothered.

October 9

The Viceroy granted interviews to several leaders including Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, each interview lasting 45 minutes.

October 10

Sjt. Subash Chandra Bose had an interview with the Viceroy. Several other leaders had similar interviews.

INDIA'S INDEPENDENT STATUS

A. I.C.C. SUPPORTS WORKING COMMITTEE

Oct. 10

The following resolution was passed by the All India Congress Committee at Wardha :—

The declaration of war in Europe has created an international situation of the gravest import to the world and to India, and the All-India Congress Committee, charged with the heavy responsibility of guiding the people of India in this moment of world crisis, has sought guidance from the principles and declarations of the Congress in considering *this* grave situation. The Congress has been guided throughout by its objective of achieving the independence of the Indian people and the establishment of a free democratic State in India wherein the rights and interests of all minorities are preserved and safeguarded. The means it has adopted in its struggles and activities have been peaceful and legitimate, and it has looked upon war and violence with horror and as opposed to progress and civilisation. In particular, the Congress has declared itself opposed to all imperialist wars and to the domination of one country over another.

In spite of the repeated declarations of the Congress in regard to war, the British Government have declared India la

belligerent country without the consent of the Indian people, and various, far-reaching measures have been hurried through the legislatures and promulgated in the form of ordinances vitally affecting them and circumscribing and limiting the powers of the Provincial Governments.

The All-India Congress Committee, however, does not wish to take any final decision precipitately and without giving every opportunity for the war and peace aims of the British Government to be clarified, with particular reference to India. The Committee approves of and endorses the statement issued by the Working Committee on September 14", 1939, on the war crisis, and repeats the invitation contained therein to the British Government to state their war aims and peace aims.

While the Committee condemns Fascism and Nazi aggression, it is convinced that peace and freedom can only be established and preserved by an extension of democracy to all colonial countries and by the application of the principle of self-determination to them so as to eliminate imperialist control. In particular, India must be declared an independent nation, and *present application should be given to this status to the largest possible extent*. The All-India Congress Committee earnestly trusts that this declaration will be made by the British Government in any statement that it may make in regard to its war and peace aims.

The Committee desire to declare afresh that Indian freedom must be based on democracy and unity and the full recognition and protection of the rights of all minorities, to which the Congress has always pledged itself.

The Committee approves of the formation by the Working Committee of the War Emergency Sub-Committee, and authorises the Working Committee to take such steps as may be necessary to give effect to this resolution and to their statement on the war crisis.

REPRESENTATION OF PARSIS

The Trustees of the Parsi Panchayet sent the following telegram to His Excellency the Viceroy :—

"The Trustees of the Parsi Panchayet desire to draw His Excellency's attention to the fact that the oft-repeated statement of the Congress, lately reiterated by Mr. Gandhi, that the Congress represents all classes and communities, including the minorities, is not correct. We are firmly convinced that the Congress does not represent the Parsi community, and that it has no right or authority to speak on behalf of the Parsi community. We feel sure the community will be heard at the right time with regard to their rights and interests."

CONGRESS NOT ALL-INCLUSIVE

Madras, October 11

A statement repudiating the claim of the Congress to speak and act on behalf of all the classes and communities has been issued to the Press, signed by Mr. E. V. Ramaswami Naicker, the Kumararajah of Chettinad, Sir A. P. Patro, Sir A. T. Pannirselvam, Mr. A. Doraswami Mudaliar, Sir K. V. Reddy, Mr. R. Srinivasan, Mr. M. C. Rajah and Mr. N. Sivaraj. The statement says that so far as the Southern

Presidency is concerned a large majority of people among the various communities have always dissociated themselves from the policy and programme of the Congress. Their experience of the last two and a half years has also demonstrated that the Indian National Congress is in no sense a democratic body. Its conception of stern discipline under dictatorial leadership is really a Fascist conception. Everyone who does not belong to the Congress organisation is decried as a reactionary and as a traitor to his country. The opposition in the legislatures is treated with scant courtesy. All this experience had made it necessary that the non-Brahmin communities of South India should again press for adequate statutory safeguards in the Constitution. "We must sound a note of warning to His Majesty's Government and the Viceroy that any political settlement made with the Congress without the consent of other important interests in the country will not only be not binding on us, but will be stoutly resisted," concludes the statement.

Labour M. P. s on Indids Claims to Democracy

London, October 12

The Indian question was mentioned incidentally by one or two Labour members in the course of the debate in the House of Commons following Mr. Chamberlain's pronouncement.

Sir Stafford Cripps said: "Hitler's offer we cannot for one moment accept, but it is folly to turn it down without putting forward our own objective. If we are fighting for democracy, freedom and a new world, our care for India must be as great as for Poland."

Mr. Campbell Stephen, supporting Sir Stafford Cripps, observed : "If we are believers in democracy, we should believe in democracy in India as much as in Germany."

Mr. Sorensen said : "We should try to reach the minds of the German people and must put our own house in order. If we could say to the Indian people at present that we were prepared to implement democracy in India, that would do more to establish democracy than all the arms."—*Renter*

New Delhi, Oct. 13

The Hon'ble Mr. C. Rajagopalachariar, Premier of Madras, had an interview with the Viceroy this afternoon. The Viceroy had interviews with some other leaders.

Do Not Minimise Muslim Rights

London, October 14

"If we demand that existing dissensions between Indian communities and groups shall not be used as an excuse for delaying action, Indian patriots must not use any such tendency that they may have detected as an excuse for denying that serious dissensions exist. The time of war is particularly unsuitable for minimising the right of organised Moslems to adequate representation. In short, trust must be mutual. Given courage to break with conventions, we may yet together achieve Indian unity as well as the unity of Britain and India within the Commonwealth." —*Manchester Guardian*

THE FICTION OF MAJORITY

By Mahatma Gandhi

Segaon, Oct. 16

It is painful to, find the British Press and Britishers advancing the minority claim to prevent the declaratip.

suggested .by the Congress, if I may say so, in the common interest If the force of the Congress suggestion has not been overwhelmingly felt, the declaration will not come. There need be no dejection among Congressmen if it does not. We shall get our independence when it is deserved. But it would be well for the British Government and the Allied cause, if the minority argument were not flung in the face of a credulous world. It would be honest to say that the British desire to hold India yet awhile. There will be nothing wrong in such a desire. India is a conquest. Conquests are not surrendered except when the conquered successfully rebel, or under an awakened conscience the conqueror repents of the conquest, or when the conquered territory ceases to be a profitable concern* I had hoped and still hope that the British, having become war-weary and sickened over the mad slaughter involved in the present war, would want to close it at the earliest possible moment by being above board in every respect and therefore in respect of India. This they can never be, so long as they hold India in bondage.

I know that many have been angry with me for claiming an exclusive right for the Congress to speak for the people of India as a whole. It is not an arrogant pretention. It is explicit in the first article of the Congress. It wants and works for independence for the whole of India. It speaks neither for majority nor minority. It seeks to represent all Indians without any distinction. Therefore those who oppose it should not count, if the claim for independence is admitted. Those who support the claim simply give added strength to the Congress claim.

Britain has hitherto held India by producing before the world Indians who want Britain to remain in India as ruler

and arbiter between rival claimants. These will always exist. The question is whether it is right for Britain to plead these rivalries in defence of holding India under subjection, or whether she should now recognize the mistake and leave India to decide upon the method of her own government.

x

x

x

x

If anybody has cause to keep the British rule for protection from the stronger element, it is Congressmen and those Hindus and others who are represented by the Congress. The question, therefore, resolves itself into not who is numerically superior but who is stronger. Surely there is only one answer. Those, who raise the cry of minority in danger, have nothing to fear from the so-called majority which is merely a paper majority and which in any event is ineffective because it is weak in the military sense. Paradoxical as it may appear, it is literally true that the so-called minorities' fear has some bottom only so long as the *weak majority has the backing of the British bayonets to enable it to play at democracy*. But the British power will, so long as it so chooses, successfully play one against the other calling the parties by whatever names it pleases. And this process need not be dishonest. They may honestly believe that so long as there are rival claims put up, they must remain in India in response to a call from God to hold the balance evenly between them. Only, that way lies not Democracy but Fascism, Nazism, Bolshevism and Imperialism, all facets of the doctrine of 'Might is Right'. I would fain hope that this war will change values. It can do so, if India is recognized as independent and if that India represents unadulterated non-violence on the political field.

PART IV

BRITAIN'S RESPONSE

BRITAIN'S WAR AIMS REGARDING INDIA

Expounded by the Viceroy

Lord Linlithgow, Governor-General, issued the following statement:—

New Delhi, October 17

Since the outbreak of the war, and more particularly during the last four weeks, I have been in the closest touch with the leaders of political opinion in British India and with representatives of* the Princely Order ; and I have spared no effort to acquaint myself by personal discussion with the trend of feeling ; to ascertain the views of the different sections of public opinion in this country on the great questions of the day, and in particular on the question of the basis on which and the extent to which, India could best co-operate in the prosecution of the war; and to satisfy myself as to the extent to which a basis of common agreement exists, and as to the manner in which the position, so far as it may still remain obscure, can best be clarified. Matters have now reached a point at which, in my judgment, it would be well that I should make a statement designed, in the light of the discussions which I have had during these past few weeks, to clear the position on the main questions which emerge at the present moment.

I would make a preliminary observation. I have had the advantage of a full and frank discussion with no fewer than 52 people—with Mr. Gandhi, with the President and

members of the Congress Waking Committee, with Mr, Jinnah and with representative members of the Muslim League organization, with the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes, and with a great variety of persons prominent in the political life of British India. As was only to be expected, conversations with representatives of so many different points of view revealed marked differences of outlook, markedly different demands and markedly different solutions for the problems that lie before us.

Again, and that too was what might have been expected at a time such as the present, reservations or demands for special protection on one side have tended to be balanced by proposals for still more marked constitutional changes on another. I would ask that these differences of view, deeply and sincerely held, I have not the least doubt, by those who have advanced them to me, should be borne in mind when we consider our present problems, for they have a very direct and obvious relevance to them.

I trust most earnestly that I shall be able to dispel certain misapprehensions which are, I am clear, widely and genuinely held, and that, even if to a degree more limited than has been urged upon me from many quarters, I may be able to clarify the position as regards our hopes and our objectives for India and to make some little contribution to the removal of the obstacles which existing doubts on that point have caused to that full, generous and ready cooperation, which it is, I am certain, her anxiety and that of her peoples to give today to a good cause.

The essential matters on which; a clarification of the position is beyond any question desired are :—

First, what are the objectives of His Majesty's Government in the war? To what extent are they of such a character that India with her long history and great traditions can, with a clear conscience, associate herself with them?

Second, what is the future that is contemplated in the constitutional sphere for the Indian Continent? What are the intentions of His Majesty's Government? Is it possible to define these intentions more precisely and in such a manner as to leave the world in no doubt as to the ultimate status envisaged for India as far as the British Commonwealth is concerned?

Third, in what way can the desire of India and of Indian public opinion for a closer association, and an effective association, with the prosecution of the war best be satisfied?

Let me deal with these questions in the order in which I have stated them. Let me in the first place consider to what extent, in existing conditions and at this stage in the development of the campaign in which we are engaged, any positive and satisfactory answer admits of being given to the demand for a more precise definition of our objectives. In endeavouring to answer that question I do not propose to touch on the question of our objectives for India. That is a matter which I will deal with separately in answering the second question which I have mentioned above. His Majesty's Government have not themselves yet defined with any ultimate precision their detailed objectives in the prosecution of the war. It is obvious that such a definition can come only at a later stage in the campaign, and that when it does come, it cannot be a statement of the aims of any single ally. There may be many changes in the world position and in the situa--

tion that confronts us before the war comes to an end, and much must depend on the circumstances in which it does come to an end and on the intervening course of the campaign.

The experience of all history shows in these circumstances the unwisdom and the impracticability of precise definition at so early a stage as that which we have now reached. But the fact that, for the reasons I have given, precise definition is not practicable does not mean, as I see it, that there is any real doubt, or any uncertainty, in the minds of the public, whether in India or in the United Kingdom or in any Allied country, as to the motives which have actuated us in entering into the war, and consequently the broad general objectives which we have before us in the campaign which is now being waged. We are fighting to resist aggression whether directed against ourselves or others. Our general aims have been stated by the Prime Minister within the last few days as follows :—

"We are seeking no material advantage for ourselves. We are not aiming only at victory, but looking beyond it to the laying of a foundation of a better international system which will mean that war is not the inevitable lot of every succeeding generation.

"We, like all the peoples of Europe, long for peace; but it must be a real and settled peace, not an uneasy truce interrupted by constant alarms and threats."

This statement, I think, clearly establishes the nature of *the* cause for which we are fighting, and justifies, if justification is needed, the extension by India of her moral support and ther goodwill to the prosecution of that cause.

Let me turn now to the second question put to me—the* question of India's future and of the lines of her constitutional development. That is a question, I am certain in *the* light of my conversations, which is of the greatest and most acute interest to all parties and all sections of opinion in this country. As matters stand today, the constitutional position of India and the policy of His Majesty's Government are governed by the provisions of the Government of India Act, 1935.

Part III of that Act, which provides for the conferment of provincial autonomy on the provinces of British India, has been implemented. For nearly two and a half years now the provinces have been, conducting their own affairs under the scheme of the Act. That they have done so, on the whole, with great success, even if now and then difficulties have arisen, no one can question. Whatever the political party in power in those provinces, all can look with satisfaction on a distinguished record of public achievement during the last two and a half years. The experience they have had has shown beyond any question that whatever minor problems the application of the scheme or the Act may have presented, whatever difficulties may have confronted us in the operation of the Act from time to time in the provincial sphere, the scheme of the Act is essentially sound, and that it transfers great power and gives great opportunities to popularly elected Governments dependent on the support of a majority in their legislatures.

The second stage contemplated by the Act was the reconstitution of the Central Government on such a basis as to achieve the essential goal of Indian unity. The method contemplated for that purpose was the achievement of a federation of all India, in which the Representatives of all political parties in British India would, together with the

Rulers of the Indian States, form a unified Government of India as a whole. I am only too conscious of the severity of the criticisms that have been advanced from many different points of view against the federal scheme and against the arrangements embodied in Part II of the Act. I will say today no more than that, having myself had so close a familiarity not only with the framing of the provisions, but also with the preliminary work which has been done with a view to putting them into force, I have throughout believed that the federal scheme in its operation would have turned out as satisfactorily as, broadly speaking, we can all of us regard the Scheme of provincial autonomy as having turned out. I will not dilate on that subject today, for our work in connection with the federal scheme has been suspended. But in reaffirming, as I do, my belief in the essential soundness of the federal aspects of the Act of 1935, I do so with the greater emphasis because of the evidence which the federal provisions of the Act constitute of the anxiety of His Majesty's Government to achieve, with the minimum of delay, and on the basis which appears to represent the greatest amount of agreement between the various parties and interests affected, the unity of India, and to advance beyond a further and a most important milestone on the road to India's goal.

Such being the background against which we are working what are the intentions and aims of His Majesty's Government in relation to India? I cannot do better in reply to that question than to refer to the statement made on behalf of His Majesty's Government, and with their full authority, by the late Secretary of State for India in the House of Commons on February 6, 1935. That statement makes the position clear beyond the shadow of a doubt; It refers to the pledge given

in the preamble of the Act of 1919, and it makes it clear that it was no part of the plan of His Majesty's Government to repeal that pledge. It confirms equally the interpretation placed in 1929 by Lord Irwin as Viceroy, again on the authority of the Government of the day, on that preamble, that,

"the natural issue of India's progress as there contemplated is the attainment of Dominion Status."

I need not dilate on the words of that statement. They are clear and positive. They are enshrined in the parliamentary record. They stand as a definite and categorical exposition of the policy of His Majesty's Government and of their intentions today in this end for the future constitutional development and position of India. I would add only that the Instrument of Instructions issued to me as Governor-General by His Majesty the King-Emperor in May, 1937, lays upon me as Governor-General a direction so to exercise the trust which His Majesty has reposed in me "that the partnership between India and the United Kingdom within our Empire may be furthered to the end that India may attain its due place among our Dominions." That is the policy, and that is the position. Those are the intentions of His Majesty's Government.

Let me go on to say another word about the Act of 1935. That Act was based on the greatest measure of common agreement which it was possible to obtain at the time when it was framed. It was based, as is well known to all of us, on the common labours of British and Indian statesmen, and of representatives of British India as well as of the Indian States over a long period of years. All parties were at one stage or other closely associated with those deliberations, And I can

speak from personal experience when I bear tribute to the extreme anxiety of all those of us on whom in the Joint Select Committee fell the more particular responsibility for devising proposals for the consideration of Parliament, to ensure that the fullest account had been taken of all interests; of the views of all political parties and; that nothing had been left undone to ensure that the outcome of our labours reflected the greatest measure of agreement practicable in the conditions that confronted us.

Be that as it may, His Majesty's Government recognise that when the time comes to resume consideration of the plan for the future federal Government of India, and of the plan destined to give effect to the assurances given in Parliament by the late Secretary of State, to which I have just referred, it will be necessary to reconsider in the light of the then circumstances to what extent the details of the plan embodied in the Act of 1935 remain appropriate. And I am authorised now by His Majesty's Government to say that at the end of the war they will be very willing to enter into consultation with representatives of the several communities, parties and interests, in India, and with the Indian Princes, with a view to securing their aid and co-operation in the framing of such modifications as may seem desirable.

I have, I trust, in what I have just said, made clear that the intention and the anxiety of His Majesty's Government is as stated in the Instrument of Instructions to the Governor-General, to further the partnership between India and the United Kingdom within the Empire to the end that India may attain her due place among the great Dominions. The scheme of government embodied in the Act of 1935 was designed as

an essential stage in that process; but I have made clear in what I have just said that His Majesty's Government will, at the end of the war, be prepared to regard the scheme of the Act as open to modification in the light of Indian views. And I would make it clear, too, that it will be their object, as at all times in the past it has been, to spare no pains to further agreement by any means in their power in the hope of contributing to the ordered and harmonious progress of India towards her goal. Let me in that connection add that in the conversations I have had, representatives of the minorities have urged most strongly on me the necessity of a clear assurance that full weight would be given to their views and their interests in any modification that may be contemplated. On that I need say no more than that, over more than a decade at the three Round Table Conferences, and at the Joint Select Committee, His Majesty's Government consulted with, and had the assistance of the advice of, representatives of all parties and all interests in this country. It is unthinkable that we should now proceed to plan afresh or to modify in any respect any important part of India's future constitution without again taking counsel with those who have in the recent past been so closely associated in a like task with His Majesty's Government and with Parliament.

That some even more extensive scheme than I have mentioned, some even more widely phrased indication of the intentions of His Majesty's Government, is desired in certain quarters in this country I am fully aware from the conversations I have had during these last few weeks. That that is a desire held with sincerity and that those who hold it are convinced that it is in the manner in question that the future progress and development of India and

the expressed intentions of His Majesty's Government can best be fulfilled, I fully and readily accept.

I would utter one word only of caution. And if I say that the situation must be faced in terms of world politics and of political realities in this country, I do so from no lack of sympathy and no lack 'of appreciation of the motives that weigh with the people of India and the ideals that appeal to them. But I would urge that it is essential in matters of this nature, affecting the future of tens of millions of people, affecting the relations of the great communities, affecting the Princes of India, affecting the immense commercial and industrial enterprises, whether Indian or European in this country, that the largest measure of agreement practicable should be achieved. With the best will in the world, progress must be conditioned by practical considerations. I am convinced myself, if I may say so with the utmost emphasis, that having regard to the extent of agreement which in fact exists in the constitutional field, and on this most difficult and important question of the nature of the arrangements to be made for expediting and facilitating the attainment by India of her full status, there is nothing to be gained by phrases which widely and generally expressed contemplate a state of things which is unlikely to stand at the present point of political development the test of practical application, or to result in that unified effort by all parties and all communities in India, on the basis of which alone India can hope to go forward as one and to occupy that place to which her history and her destinies entitle her. I would ask that these words of caution be not taken as indicating any lack of sympathy on the part of His Majesty's Government for the aspirations of India, or any indifference to the pace of her

advance and I would repeat that His Majesty's Government are but concerned to use their best endeavours, now as in the past, to bring about that measure of agreement and understanding between all parties and all interests in this country which is so essential a condition of progress towards India's goal.

I turn now to the arrangements to be made to secure the association of public opinion in India with the conduct of the war. India's contribution has already been great, great to a degree which has impressed the imagination of the world. At the head of the list I would put the contribution which India had made in spiritual, and not in material, terms—the support of her peoples for a cause which they can regard as a good and a righteous cause. In the material field equally her contribution is already most significant and may be greater still. And in the circumstances the desire, the anxiety of public opinion in India to be associated with the conduct of the war is naturally one with which I personally have throughout felt the greatest sympathy. In the circumstances I have described, the desirability of steps to ensure that leaders of public opinion should be in the closest touch with developments is of the first importance.

I have discussed with the utmost frankness with the leaders of the various parties who have been good enough to come to see me in connection with the constitutional position by what machinery we could best give effect to this desire. We have examined a variety of expedients, and there has been no hesitation on the part of any of us in assessing the advantages and the disadvantages presented by each of them. I do not propose today to examine those various alternatives in particular detail. I will only say that in the light of my

conversations and of the views (by no means always in accord) of representatives of the great parties and of the Princes, I am of the opinion that the right solution would be the establishment of a consultative group, representative of all major political parties in British India and of the Indian Princes, over which the Governor-General would himself preside, which would be summoned at his invitation, and which would have as its object the association of public opinion in India with the conduct of the war and with questions relating to war activities.

This group, for practical reasons, would inevitably be limited in size; but His Majesty's Government contemplate that it should be fully representative, and, in particular, that its personnel should be drawn by the Governor-General from panels prepared by the various major political parties, from which a selection of individuals to attend meetings of the group would be made by the Governor-General. I hope in the very near future to enter into consultation with political leaders and with the Princes on this question. I have no doubt whatever that an arrangement of this nature will most materially contribute to associating the Indian States and British India with the steps which are being taken for the prosecution of the war and with the arrangements that are being made in that connection. And I am confident, too, that in an association of this nature of representatives of all parties, and all interests there lies the germ of that fuller and broader association of all points of view in this country which contain in it the seeds of much advantage for the future of India as a whole.

When I spoke to the Central Legislature a month ago, I made an appeal for unity. I would repeat that appeal

to-day. It is my earnest hope that the explanations I have given will have contributed materially to the removal of misunderstandings. Even if on certain points I have not, to my knowledge, been able to give assurances so comprehensive as those which would, I know, have been welcomed in certain political quarters in India, I would urge insistently that this is not a moment at which to risk the splitting of the unity of India on the rock of particular phrases. And I would press that we should continue to aim at the unity of India even if differences of greater or less significance continue to exist. We live in difficult and anxious days. Great ideals are in issue. Dangers real and imminent face our civilisation. Those dangers are as imminent in the case of India as of any other member of the British Commonwealth of Nations. Those ideals are as precious to India as to any country in the Empire or in the world.^r At this grave moment in the destinies of nations my prayer to all parties would be not to dissociate themselves from the common effort, but to lend their co-operation, and their assistance in the prosecution of the war. There could be no more decisive proof of India's fidelity to her best traditions than the full use of the opportunities afforded to her by the war for concerted endeavour. The ideals we have set before us, the objects to secure which we are engaged in the present struggle, are such as to command widespread sympathy and widespread support in India. They fire in harmony with her past history and her highest traditions. It is my hope that in the grave juncture, which we face, India will go forward, as a united country, in support of a common cause.

THE BRITISH PRESS ON VICEROY'S STATEMENT

Oct. 18

Lord Linlithgow has now met the demands of the Congress Party, which were couched in somewhat vague and abstract terms, with the constructive proposals laid before Parliament yesterday. In its original resolution the Congress Working Committee seemed to assume that the purposes of the British Government and their allies include some sort of forcible extension of the frontiers of democracy. No responsible British statesman has committed himself to that. The Allied Governments are not at war to impose a system of Government upon enemies or neutrals. They are fighting to save themselves and other nations of the Old World (and ultimately of the New) from the constant fear and danger of aggression.

It remains to be seen how far the Viceroy's statement will satisfy the Congress Party. The leaders of that Party, including Mr. Gandhi, have advanced its claim to be an all-inclusive body representing all communities and parties in British India and the Indian States. The resolution of the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League makes it abundantly clear that this claim is indignantly opposed by that powerful minority. Apart from the Muslims, another important group of minorities has entered a caveat against any official acceptance of Mr. Gandhi's thesis. Representatives of Indian Liberals, the Hindu Mahasabha, the Democratic Swarajists and the Depressed Classes have all telegraphed to the Governor-General protesting against it, and their protest contains vigorous and skilful criticism of Mr. Gandhi's claims. To fight for democracy abroad and to insist that the Congress Party shall alone represent

India is, they say, a contradiction in terms. In these circumstances it is clear, that nothing whatever could! have been gained by accepting the Congress Party's-almost totalitarian claim or by yielding to its demand that India should here and now be declared an independent nation. Government have wisely taken the views of other elements into account. They have made it plain that it is not their intention to sacrifice the interests of the numerous minorities and to endanger Indian unity by deferring solely to the views of one party; and their attitude appears to be fully justified by the fact that most Congress leaders were originally in favour of giving unconditional support to Government during the war and only modified their attitude under pressure from Mr. Bose and the left wing. Broadly speaking, the great majority of the Congress Party are with Britain in the fight against aggression; here indeed, and here alone, there is an united India.

—*The Times*,

The White Paper goes a long way to repair the sins of omission committed by the Government since the outbreak of the war. It is clear, conciliatory and constructive. But it must be said at once that its value in meeting the legitimate aspirations of Indian opinion will entirely depend upon the degree to which the assurances given will be carried out and the manner in which the machinery proposed will be worked. Let us admit, that the decisions contained in the statement were arrived at by a method that is a great advance on the attitude of stern detachment so often assumed by the Government of India in the past. Lord Linlithgow has personally consulted all leading spokesmen on the Indian political scene. That it should have needed a war to bring the chief representative of Britain in India in close touch with many of these

men may be deplored, but at any rate the ice is now broken... Let all parties remember the practical working during the recent past of the Provincial Governments. While the Government must beware of frustrating the work of the new council if it should prove capable of exerting larger powers, the Congress would be wise not to refuse the instalment now offered, lest by insisting on larger demands, it lose what is precious beyond constitutional forms—namely the national unity of India.

—*The Manchester Guardian*

OPINION IN INDIA ON VICEROYS STATEMENT

Mahatma Gandhi

Oct. 18

The Viceregal declaration is profoundly disappointing. It would have been better if the British Government had declined to make any declaration whatsoever. The long statement made by the Viceroy simply shows that the old policy of divide and rule is to continue. So far as I can see, the Congress will be no party to it, nor can the India of the Congress conception be a partner with Britain in her war with Herr Hitler. The declaration shows clearly that there is to be no democracy for India if Britain can prevent it. Another Round Table Conference is promised at the end of the war. Like its predecessor, it is bound to fail. The Congress asked for bread and it has got a stone. What the future has in store for India I dare not foretell. I do not blame the Viceroy or the leaders of Britain for the unfortunate result. The Congress will have to go into the wilderness again before it becomes

strong and pure enough to reach its objective. I have no doubt that Congressmen will await the Working Committee's decision.

DR. RAJENDRAPRASAD:—

India would be false to her interest and untrue to the best interest of other suppressed nationalities if she would help Imperialism to strengthen itself.....The announcement has effectively destroyed the foundation for any moral or spiritual support and the war is, as it now appears to everyone to have always been, a war for strengthening Britain's Imperial position in her possessions. The much advertised high aims have crumbled into dust at the first touch of reality.

Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, Leader of I.L.P.:—The statement of the Viceroy will disappoint many ; but what else could the Viceroy have done in the circumstances of the case ? I am sure he could not have done anything better or anything -different. The blame for this outcome of the negotiations must be borne entirely by Mr. Gandhi and the Congress. So long as Mr. Gandhi and the Congress retain the Orangemen's mentality which ultimately proved to be the curse of Ireland and seek to establish race ascendancy in the name of majority rule, so long as Mr. Gandhi and the Congress do not give up their primitive method of gaining unity by suppression in fa-
Tour of the more civilised method of gaining it by accommodation, I am afraid there is no hope of political advancement.

Mr. N. Siva Raj, M. L. A. (Central):—The scheduled classes throughout India would welcome the Viceroy's statement and thank him for the assurances contained and the principle accepted therein that the minorities would be taken into consultation in any future alterations in the Indian constitution.

Mr. R. Srinivasan, M.L.C.:—The scheduled classes should feel relieved of anxiety on the score of 'their interests not being safeguarded by the British Government.

Sir Shapoorji Billimoria, *a trustee* of the Parsi Panchayet:—

Having regard to the difficult times through which we are all passing, the Parsi community in particular, warmly appreciate the Viceroy's announcement which gives a clear indication that minority interests would not suffer in any change that would be made in the Constitution. The Parsi community wholeheartedly support His Majesty's Government in attaining the object for which His Majesty's forces are now fighting.

Sir H. P. Mody, M. L. A. (Central):—

The Viceroy's statement is just what was expected by detached political observers. One very significant fact emerges from it. India's advance towards Dominion Status will be conditioned at every stage by the measure of agreement which may subsist between important political elements in the country. In other words, there will have to be peace at home before peace abroad can bring any striking change in India's political status.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE

On the Viceroy's Statement

London, Oct. 18

In the House of Lords Marquis of Zetland made a lengthy speech on the events in India immediately preceding and² following the invasion of Poland by Germany. At the outset he mentioned the unanimous feeling in India against Nazi outrages but he also mentioned that the Indian National Congress—early in August took exception to certain precautionary measures taken by His Majesty's Government and the Government of India in pursuance of their obligation to secure the safety of India, and called upon Congress Members of the Central Legislative Assembly to refrain from attending the forthcoming session. He went on to observe:—

"The particular measure to which exception was taken was the dispatch of external defence troops from India to Egypt and Aden and Singapore. This action was taken on the urgent advice of the highest naval and military authorities. The situation, at that time, was such that the possibility of a threat to the safety of India, both from the West and from the East, could not be excluded, and from the military point of view it was essential that the western and eastern approaches to India should be adequately defended. It would clearly have been the height of folly to have given the world by discussion in the Legislature" advance notice of our military dispositions. Nevertheless, both the Viceroy and I were anxious to take leaders of political parties in India into our confidence, and our plans were, therefore, communicated to the leaders of political parties in the Assembly including, of course, the Congress Party.

So much for precautionary measures whereto exception was subsequently taken. I now come to the outbreak of war.

For a long time past the Viceroy, with my full knowledge and approval has been in close touch with the most outstanding figure on the Indian political stage—Mahatma Gandhi; and here may I pause for a moment to pay a personal tribute to Mr. Gandhi known to and beloved by peoples of India, for the readiness which he has shown not only to interpret to us the viewpoint and aspirations of the Congress but to endeavour to appreciate in his turn our viewpoint and difficulties with which we have had to grapple, and furthermore for the help which he has most willingly given us in our endeavours to surmount them

This being so, it was natural that immediately on the outbreak of war the Viceroy should have invited Mr. Gandhi to take counsel with-him. The invitation was promptly accepted and within 48 hours of the declaration of war they were in close consultation. The outcome is known, for Mr. Gandhi has himself stated publicly that speaking in his purely personal capacity-y-for he was not authorised to speak for the Congress—his view was that in the struggle upon which this country had entered India should give us unconditional support."

Marquis of Zetland then narrated the events between September 14 on which the Congress Working Committee's views were published and October 1-7, on which His Excellency the Viceroy issued his statement. All the consultations, to which the Viceroy has referred at length, and the variety of views expressed in those consultations were summarised by His Lordship who proceeded as follows:—

"There, then, you have the background of the Indian picture; what of the main features of the picture itself? They

may be said to be two in number; first the desire on the part of all communities to see the overthrow of the menace, which overshadows Europe in particular and the world in general; and secondly, the desire for self-expression, which takes the form, in the domain of politics, of self-government on a democratic basis. But here there are qualifications, for there is on the part of minorities insistent demand for safeguards against consequences which, rightly or wrongly, it is feared might result from unfettered domination of the majority. And herein is to be found the root cause of our difficulties—difficulties which those, who are not burdened with the responsibility which rests upon His Majesty's Government and the Government of India, may—and frequently do—discount, but which His Majesty's Government themselves cannot ignore. For those who confine their gaze to one part only of the picture, the problem of self-government for India may appear to be a comparatively simple one: but for those who, like His Majesty's Government, have to view the picture as a whole, this is far from being the case. I shall have something to say on that aspect of the case before I resume my seat.

"Meanwhile, let me say that it is in our view eminently desirable that consultations with the leaders of public opinion in India which the Viceroy has initiated since the outbreak of the war—I think he has seen more than 50 leaders—should not only be maintained, but should be provided for by some more definite machinery. The means proposed for achievement of that object are set out by the Viceroy in his statement.

"Briefly stated what we have in mind is a broadly based consultative body, whose personnel would be drawn by the

'Viceroy from panels of individuals nominated by various political parties and interests. From this main body the Viceroy, who would himself preside over its deliberations, would summon members to attend particular meetings at which, according to the business to be taken into consideration, their presence was desirable. Such a body would serve as a liaison between Government and the people, since it would have imparted to it views and proposals of Government and in its turn would be in a position to give free and frank expression to its opinions on all matters laid before it. These might well include matters which in times of war it would be inconvenient to discuss in a more public manner. Such a scheme would possess this further advantage; that those concerned, representing different parties, communities and interests, would be in close association not only with the Viceroy, but also with one another, and it would be my hope that the association and collaboration in so great an enterprise as the conduct of war would tend gradually to lessen the differences and emphasise the extent of the common interest of all those taking part in it and of those whom they represent.

"I should like in conclusion to say a few words of a more general character. Responsible self-government for India is the goal set forth by Parliament in the preamble of the Act of 1919; and it was with the full authority of the Government of the day that my noble friend the Foreign Secretary stated ten years later that the natural issue of India's progress as there contemplated—that is to say in the preamble of the Act of 1919—was the attainment of Dominion Status.

From that objective we never have had and have not now the slightest intention of departing,

The purpose of the Act of 1935 was to provide the machinery whereby the people of India might acquire that measure of political unity, which surely is the pre-requisite to the attainment by them of their eventual goal. Much has been said in disparagement of the measure, yet it should not be forgotten that it was the outcome of immense labour on the part of Indians and Britons alike and was based on the greatest measure of common agreement which was then obtainable. And I would add this, that even in the case of a written constitution provisions of the Statute are no more than the bony skeleton of a structure; flesh and blood, which give it life and vigour, are added day by day by those engaged in working it. Within the framework practices take root and conventions grow up. The constitution becomes a living and growing organism deriving form and substance from its environment. The truth of that has been demonstrated by two years' working of the Act in so far as it affects the provinces of British India, as, I feel sure, the Ministers of today, some of whom a little more than two years ago rejected it as of little worth, will be willing to admit. I believe that similar experience of the working of the federal provisions of the Act would be attended by similar results.

"But if at the end of the upheaval caused by the war, when circumstances may well differ markedly from what they are today, there is a desire on the part of those concerned for modifications of particular features of the plan, then—His Majesty's Government declare now that they will in such circumstances be very willing to enter into consultation with representatives of the several communities, parties and interests in India, and with Indian Princes, with a view to

securing their aid and co-operation in the framing, of such modifications as may then seem desirable.

"I say 'then' because in my view it is not practicable, nor do I believe that it would be in the true interests of the* people of India themselves to endeavour, while we are all labouring under the strain and stress of a life-and-death struggle, to embark upon a task of immense complexity and one, moreover, which would inevitably give rise to no little-controversy in India itself. And that brings me back to what I said earlier in the course of my remarks as to the root cause of the difficulties in the domain of constitutional building in India. What we have to work for is elimination of those communal antagonisms, which still militate against the political unity of India. You cannot abolish them by merely closing' your eyes to their existence. You must face them and search for means to remove the underlying forces. I believe that the menace which now confronts all of us Englishmen, Hindus, Muslims, Princes and peoples alike, may aid us to achieve what hitherto has eluded our grasp. Can we not, standing shoulder to shoulder for a common purpose, banded together in comradeship of arms, learn to view in truer perspective against the background of the supreme and imminent peril—for what would it profit India if the forces of aggression and of evil emerged victorious from this war?—those internal and domestic differences which have hitherto raised such formidable obstacles along the road to that goal towards which the peoples of both, countries have determined to travel.

"This, then, is my appeal to the peoples of India—that in comradeship with us, while" presenting a united front to the forces ranged against us, they strive after

that agreement among themselves without which **they will** surely fail to achieve that unity which is an essential of nationhood, of which those with vision among her leaders have long dreamed, and which must surely be the crowning achievement of long and intimate political relationship between the peoples of Great Britain and India."

ANGLO-FRANCO-TURKISH PACT

Oct. 19

While the Viceroy was busy having talks with numerous Indian leaders, a very important development was taking place in Europe, culminating on Oct. 19 in a definite diplomatic victory for England and France. Since the month of May negotiations were going on between England and France on the one hand and Turkey on the other for a Treaty of mutual assistance. About the end of September an agreement on the terms of the Treaty was reached, but the signature by the parties was postponed because about that time M. Sarajoglu, Turkish Foreign Minister, was invited to Moscow for negotiating a Turco-Russian Treaty. Those negotiations went on **for well-nigh three weeks. At the end of that period M. Sarajoglu left Moscow with certain proposals from the Soviet Government for Ankara. The Government of Turkey on examination found some of those proposals unacceptable and on 18th October suspended negotiations with Russia. When those negotiations were definitely suspended the Turkish Government decided not to defer any longer the signature of their Treaty with England and France. The Anglo-Franco-Turkish Treaty was signed at Ankara in the afternoon of October 19. This Treaty**

is to remain in force for the minimum period of fifteen years and has meant substantial fortification of the position of Great Britain and France. This Treaty created a profound impression all over the Muslim world including Indian Muslims. The text of the Treaty consists of nine Articles.

The Text of the Pact

First, Britain and France will assist Turkey in the event of the latter being a victim of aggression.

Secondly, it provides for mutual assistance in the event of Turkey on the one hand and Britain and France on the other being involved in war in the Mediterranean as a result of an act of aggression.

Thirdly, Turkey will assist Britain and France in hostilities arising in virtue of the Anglo-French guarantees to Greece and Rumania.

Fourthly, in the event of Britain and France being, involved in hostilities in consequence of aggression by a European Power without the provisions of Articles 2 and 3 being applicable, the contracting parties will consult together while Turkey will observe at least benevolent neutrality towards Britain and France.

Fifthly, it provides for similar consultation with a view to common action in the event of aggression against another European State which any of the contracting parties has undertaken to assist or, in the event of indirect aggression, which menaces the security of any of the contracting Powers.

Sixthly, it affirms that the treaty is not directed against any country.

Seventhly, the provisions are equally binding as bilateral obligations between Turkey and each of the two other contracting parties.

Eighthly, if the contracting Powers be engaged in hostilities in consequence of the operation of the treaty, they will not conclude a separate peace.

Ninthly, the treaty is valid for 15 years and is automatically renewable for a further period of five years unless denounced at the expiration of 15 years, and becomes effective immediately.

The Protocol exempts Turkey from obligations under the treaty which would compel her to enter an armed conflict with the Soviets.

Last War And This War

During the last World War Turkey was fighting against Britain and, therefore, there was severe anti-British feeling among Muslims of India. In this war Muslims can be enthusiastically sympathetic to Britain.

SIR TEJ BAHADUR SAPRU

on the Viceroy's Statement.

October, 20

The position which emerges from the present declaration is that at the end of the war His Majesty's Government would be very willing to enter 'into consultations with representatives of several communities, parties and interests in India **and with Indian Princes** with a view to securing **their aid and cooperation** in framing modifications to plan **the future Government and** in giving effect **to** the assurances **given in Parliament.** If Dominion Status carries with it **among other**

things responsibility for the defence of the country more or less on the lines suggested by the recent report of Lord Chatfield, then it cannot be long delayed. For the interim period, the Viceroy has indicated the establishment of a Consultative Group representative of all major political parties in British India and of Indian Princes over which the Governor-General will himself preside. So far as this Consultative Board is concerned, I welcome it as I do not think that those questions of defence and industrial organisation, particularly of industries connected with war in which India is interested, can be or should be excluded from its purview. As regards the constitutional issue, detailed consideration of which has been postponed until after the war, as a believer in Dominion Status, the content of which has varied from decade to decade enabling some of the Dominions to take most important decisions with regard to their internal politics and even foreign relations, I think the declaration makes it clear that that is His Majesty's Government's objective—an objective the realisation of which cannot be postponed for long.

The Viceroy has asked for the exercise of a little patience and has prepared a platform which may in actual practice be found to be useful in a wider sense than apparently indicated. Of course, those, who will have nothing to do with any Constitution excepting the one framed in accordance with their own method, may emphasise on this occasion their disagreement with this objective or demand of patience, but I fear our constitutional future may once again repeat our history of the last two decades. A settlement with Great Britain must be preceded by, or at least be simultaneous with, a settlement of our internal differences and the establishment of a general atmosphere of confidence as to the future of the country

as a whole. I am not saying there must be perfect unanimity for there can be none in such a big matter, but at least a working union on certain broad lines of national welfare is not beyond the bounds of possibility. This can only materialise *it* to give a start to the country on its new career each party and each community realises the value of mutual readjustment and does not stand out merely because all its views do not command assent. I do not suggest or say that any minority has got the right to hold up the progress of the country as a whole. I know the validity of such a proposition is open to some theoretical objections, but taking facts as they are, we can serve no useful purpose by refusing to face their reality or throwing the onus from our shoulders on to those of others.

MAJOR ATLEE AND MR GREENWOOD

in a joint statement:—

London, Oct. 20

At the beginning of the great struggle for liberty and democracy against dictatorship and domination, we realise the depth of the feeling of the Indian people in support of the principles of freedom and self-government. They naturally wish to rally to the great cause for which they, too, stand. They wish to bring all their power and resources to bear to bring about a victory for the forces of freedom in the world and they are entitled through their accredited spokesmen to participate in the decisions which such a struggle entails. To seal the common bond uniting our two peoples, the Indian people are entitled now to an opportunity for full and responsible co-operation with the Government of India, so that their valued contribution to the common cause can be made generously and with the knowledge that the downfall of dictatorship in Europe will herald the day of India's freedom.

CONGRESS WORKING COMMITTEE

Refuses Support to Britain.

Oct. 22

The Working Committee of the Indian National Congress passed the following resolution on the Viceregal Statement:—

The Working Committee is of opinion that the Viceroy's statement in answer to the Congress invitation for a clear declaration of British war aims, particularly in their application to India, is wholly unsatisfactory and calculated to rouse resentment among all those who were anxious to gain and are intent upon gaining India's independence. This invitation was made not only on behalf of the people of India, but of the millions of people all over the world who were weary of war and violence and Fascist and Imperialistic systems which exploited nations and peoples and were ultimately the cause of war and who yearned for a new order of peace and freedom. The Viceregal statement is an unequivocal reiteration of the old imperialistic policy. The Committee regard the mention of the differences amongst the several parties as a screen to hide the true intentions of Great Britain. What the Committee had asked for was a declaration of the war aims as a test of Britain's *'bona fides'* regarding India, irrespective of the attitude of opposing parties and groups.

The Congress has always stood for amplest guarantee of the rights of minorities. The freedom the Congress claimed was not for the Congress or any-particular group or community but for the nation and all communities in India that go to build that nation. The only way to establish this freedom and to ascertain the will of the nation as a whole is through a democratic process which gives full opportunity to all. The Committee must, therefore, regard the Viceroy's-Statement as

in every way unfortunate. In the circumstances it cannot possibly give any support to Great Britain, for it would amount to an endorsement of the imperialist policy which the Congress has always sought to end. As a first step in this direction the Committee call upon the Congress Ministers to tender their resignations.

The Committee earnestly appeal to the nation to end all internal controversies in this hour of grave crisis and call upon all Congress Committees and Congressmen generally to be prepared for all developments and eventualities and to show restraint of word and deed so that nothing may be said or done which is not keeping with India's honour or the principles for which the Congress stands.

The Committee warn Congressmen against any hasty action in the shape of civil disobedience, political strikes and the like. The Committee will watch the situation and the activities of the British Government in India and will not hesitate to guide the country to take further steps whenever the necessity for them arises. The Committee desire to impress upon all Congressmen that a programme of resistance to be commensurate with the magnitude of the issue before the country requires perfect discipline within the Congress organisation.

The Working Committee realise that the non-violent resistance offered by the Congress in the past has been sometimes mixed with violence. The Committee desire to impress upon all Congressmen that any resistance that may, have to be offered must be purged of all violence and to remind them of the pledges taken to this effect as early as 1921 during the Congress Session at Ahmedabad and repeated on many subsequent occasions.

MUSLIM LEAGUE WORKING COMMITTEE PARTIAL SATISFACTION

Further Clarification Sought

New Delhi, October 22

The Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League passed the following resolution :—

After careful examination of the statement of His Excellency the Viceroy dated October 17, 1939, the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim League appreciates that His Majesty's Government have emphatically repudiated the unfounded claim of the Congress that they alone represent all India, and note with satisfaction that His Majesty's Government recognise the fact that the All-India Muslim League alone truly represents the Mussalmans of India and can speak on their behalf; also that the rights and interests of the minorities and other important interests concerned have been duly recognised.

The Committee, however, feels constrained to state that the points of vital importance raised by the Muslim League in their Statement dated September 18, 1939, are not precisely and categorically met. The Committee, therefore, ventures to suggest that, in order to secure co-operation on an equal footing, as desired by His Excellency, further clarification and discussion of those matters, that are left in doubt and have not been met satisfactorily, are necessary with a view to arriving at complete understanding, which alone would enable the Muslim League to co-operate in the matter which concerns not only the Mussalmans of India but the country at large.

The Committee cannot wholly accept the narration of facts culminating in the enactment of the Government of India Act of 1935 as given in the statement of His Excellency,

but **does not** think it necessary to enter into a controversy regarding those inaccuracies, historic and otherwise. The opposition of the Muslim League is not merely to the 'details' of the plan embodied in the Act of 1935 but their demand is that the entire problem of India's future constitution should be wholly examined and revised *de novo*. The Committee reiterates emphatically that no future plan of India's constitution will be acceptable to the Muslim League unless it meets with their full approval.

The Committee also considered the proposal of His Excellency the Viceroy for the establishment of a 'consultative group,' but cannot at present express any opinion with regard¹ to it until its status, constitution, powers, scope and function are fully known, but welcomes further consultation regarding this matter as proposed by His Excellency in his statement.

In view of the urgency of the matter, the Committee hereby authorises the President to take such steps as he may consider proper to get the doubts removed and secure complete clarification of His Excellency's statement, and if the President is fully satisfied, the Committee empowers him to give an assurance of support and co-operation on behalf of the Mussalmans of India to the British Government for the purpose of the prosecution of the war.

THE INDEPENDENT LABOUR PARTY

The Executive Council of the I. L. P. expressed the opinion that the present was not the proper occasion for withholding cooperation from Great Britain and **that a** more satisfactory response **would have come from the British Government** if the Congress **had endeavoured to bring about** unity among the different communities and **sections in the country.**

INDIAN LIBERALS DISSATISFIED**Oct. 22**

The Council of the Indian National Liberal Federation after two days' deliberation issued the following:—

The Council of the National Liberal Federation of India while confirming the resolutions passed by its Working Committee at its meeting held on September 10, whereby the Committee recommended that India should unhesitatingly and unconditionally support the democratic Powers in the prosecution of the war, and at the same time appealed to the British Government to create such psychological conditions in the country as would lead to general political appeasement in India, regrets that the appeal so made by the Working Committee has not been responded to by Government.

The Council is of opinion that the Viceroy's statement cannot but be deemed unsatisfactory inasmuch as:

It does not make clear that the Dominion Status to be attained by India is to be of the same character as is enjoyed by the self-governing Dominions, and as is contemplated by the Statute of Westminster;

It contemplates the advent of Dominion Status at some indefinite future period and fails to envisage the attainment of such status by India within a definite period ;

It ignores the urgent need for taking immediate measures for the Indianisation of the Defence Forces in all their branches within a fixed period, the development of an Indian Air Force and its substitution for the Royal Air Force. It also ignores the demand for the organisation of the man-power for

the defence of the country on a broader basis and the need for widening the basis of recruitment so as to give a greater opportunity to all classes for serving in the Defence Forces;

It leaves, at least during the period of the war and for some indefinite period thereafter, the Central Government entirely irresponsible as at present ;

And the mere Consultative Committee without any power of any sort mentioned in His Excellency's statement is no substitute for responsibility at the Centre and will not satisfy anyone, the creation of such a body for war purposes being no sufficient and effective association of India in the prosecution of the war..

DOOR STILL OPEN

October, 23

The following was cabled by Gandhiji in reply to a press correspondent representing various European papers:—

In answer to (your) inquiry (I may say) the Congress has demanded no constitutional change during war. Its demand is for declaration that Britain's war aims necessarily include India's independence according to the charter framed by her elected representatives *after* war. This declaration should be acted up to during war to the utmost extent possible. The minorities question is a bogey. Not that it does not exist, but its proper solution can only come out of the proposed Constituent Assembly. The burden of solving the tangle rests not on Britain but on the Constituent Assembly. According to Indian opinion Hindu-Muslim question is the direct product of British rule. The least the Congress could do was to withdraw the Congress ministers from provincial administration.

Further action will wholly depend upon Britain's handling of the crisis. The Congress has left the door open to Britain to mend the mistake.

CONGRESS DEMAND MISUNDERSTOOD

In response to a request from *The News Chronicle* (London) Gandhiji sent to it the following Cable:—

I have no doubt whatsoever that the Viceregal statement on behalf of British Government in reply to Congress invitation could not have been made more irritating than it has proved to be. What Congress had asked was not an answer to India's demand for Independence, but it had reminded Britain of neglect to declare whether her war against Herr Hitler to preserve democracy included India. This had no connection with India's readiness to digest Independence. But the Congress demand was evidently misunderstood, and the Viceroy began a sort of Round Table Conference in which one member did not know what the other said to the Viceroy, and as a result of these talks he was instructed to make a statement wholly unrelated to the unprecedented upheaval going on in front of us. If the British Government wanted to measure the strength of the Congress and that of other political organizations, it should have been obvious that the Congress could not satisfy the Government standard. But the Congress had set before itself a higher mission. The Congress wanted to help Britain by giving her the moral support which was its speciality, and the only thing it could give. The Congress would not give this unless it was clear that Britain's political morality was wholly sound. I wish British **Government would** realize that India is not begging for independence. The Congress asked Britain to say that Britain

would not resist Independence. The Hindu-Muslim and other difficulties are there beyond dispute. The question is whether Britain will stand aside and let India settle her own difficulties in her own way when the war is over. That is why the Congress has suggested a Constituent Assembly where every community will be fully represented to frame India's constitution. The mischief done is very real. The Working Committee have passed a mild resolution. It still affords scope for repairing the blunder. Will the British public realize that it is a blunder, or will they persist in the hypnotic belief that the India Office can never err and that India must always remain their milch cow? I can only say that the Congress will not rest and will give no rest till the goal is won. Its very existence depends upon its relentless pursuit of the goal which is no less than complete independence of India.

THE ARABIC WORLD SUPPORT ALLIES

London, Oct. 25

Mr. Fuad Hamza, leaving Istambul for Paris as the new Saudi Arabian Minister in France, was interviewed by Reuter and said:—

"The Arabic world is unanimously ready to give the fullest support to the Allied Powers, who are fighting with the object of re-establishing order and justice in the world."

Apparently Mr. Hamza based his opinion on the facts, that the Egyptian King wholeheartedly supported the Allies, that the Iraq Government, besides offering support to Britain cut off diplomatic relations with Germany, that several small Arab chieftains declared their friendship for Britain and France, and even the Arabs of Palestine expressed readiness to help Britain.

GREAT PART THAT INDIA HAS TO PLAY

SIR SAMUEL HOARE

Oct. 26

There was a debate in the House of Commons on India, initiated by Mr. Wedgwood Benn, ex-Secretary of State for India. The reply on behalf of Government was given by Sir Samuel Hoare, another ex-Secretary of State. Mr. Wedgwood Benn made certain comments on the Viceroy's statement of Oct. 17 and pointed out that constitutional progress in every part of the Empire was opposed by certain interests but that when the changes actually came into force they were acclaimed as successful. Sir Samuel Hoare opened with personal references to Mr. Benn and referred to the successful working of Provincial Autonomy.

Sir Samuel Hoare went on to say:—

On September 3rd of this year India and the British Commonwealth of nations were faced with war. The crisis found India united. It found India united in its determination to resist brute force and in the realisation that that danger was a common danger threatening every part of the British Commonwealth of Nations. It was in the face of this unity that the Viceroy showed his wholehearted and sincere desire for Indian goodwill and co-operation. The Viceroy first had a series of interviews with the leaders of Indian opinion and as a result of those interviews he made two definite proposals.

The first was rather in the nature of a pledge. It was a clear and definite statement that at the end of the war, there would be a reconsideration of the constitutional problem in the light of the experience of recent years.

Secondly, with a view to availing himself of Indian advice and with the intention of bringing Indian leaders within his confidence, he suggested that a consultative committee should be formed to discuss with him many problems arising out of the war and to bring him into the closest and most constant contact with the trends of Indian opinion.

The proposal regarding the Consultative Committee was made with the full desire to obtain the greatest possible co-operation with the principal bodies of Indian public opinion. The Congress, admittedly the greatest party in India, rejected it. Non-Congress India, representing, it must be remembered, many millions of Indians, substantially accepted it.

It may be asked, would it not have been possible for the Viceroy to have gone further and made some kind of proposal that would have avoided this division of opinion between Congress and non-Congress India? This is the first question, to which I would invite the attention of the House. If the members are to follow its implications, they must recall to their minds some of the most important discussions that took place over the Government of India Act. They centred round the pledge of Dominion Status and the aim of the Indian policy.

These pledges, as Mr. Wedgwood Benn has said, were repeated time after time. They were reaffirmed in very precise terms in the speech with which I introduced the second reading of the Government of India Bill. I made it clear, and I make it clear again today, that we stood by Lord Irwin's pledge and that when we spoke of Dominion Status, we meant what we said and did not mean some system of government that deprived India of full status of equality with other members of the British Commonwealth. There are no two kinds of Dominion

Status as some people seen) to think. The Dominion Status that we contemplated was Dominion Status which has been described by Mr. Wedgwood Benn—the Dominion Status of 1926. I went on to state that Dominion Status is not a prize that is given to a deserving community but a recognition of facts that actually exist. As soon as these facts exist in India and, in my view, the sooner they exist the better, the aim of our policy will be achieved. If there are difficulties in the way, they are not of our making. They are inherent in the many divisions between the classes and communities in the great sub-continent.

It must be the aim of Indians themselves to remove these divisions just as it should be our aim to help Indians in their task. So far are we from wishing to **divide and govern** that we regard these divisions as a calamity and are ready to do our utmost to remove them. We have shown our good faith in the matter. We showed it when we made the Communal Award. At that time, supposing we had wished to divide and conquer, we might very well have said 'settle your own communal differences first; until you have settled them there can be no constitutional advance.' We did not take that course, but at a great risk to ourselves and in the face of much criticism we made the Communal Award without which provincial autonomy would have been impossible. But in spite of our award, these divisions still exist and until they are removed, we have responsibilities to the minorities that we cannot repudiate. That was our position in 1935 and it is our position today. We wish to see these divisions removed, but we shall never get them removed, if we shut our eyes to their existence and refuse to admit that they are there. It is these divisions that have made so difficult the task of setting up

responsible government at the Centre and of achieving the great ideal of an all-India federation.

The Princes are afraid of domination by British India, the Muslims are firmly opposed to a Hindu majority at the Centre. The depressed classes and other minorities genuinely believe that responsible government, meaning a government dependent on the Hindu majority, will sacrifice their interests. These anxieties still exist. I wish they did not. But as long as they exist, it is impossible for this Government to accept the demand for immediate and full responsibility at the Centre on a particular date.

If we did so, we should be false to the pledges that time after time we have given in the most solemn words to the Muslims, other minorities and the European community. It may be said 'supposing that full and immediate responsibility at the Centre is impossible, are there not other steps that could be taken to show our good faith and to make clear to India that that goal is just as much in our minds today as it was when we made those pledges four years ago?' Mr. Wedgwood Benn himself made a number of these suggestions this afternoon and I will try to deal with them. Firstly, let me disabuse him of the idea which I think he held that we are contemplating in the near future an Imperial War Cabinet in London and that in it India ought to be represented by more than a single representative.

At present there is no intention to set up an Imperial War Cabinet of that kind. If and when the time comes, I will certainly remember the observations he has made on the subject and I imagine they will be given extremely careful attention.

Next he spoke on the project that has been discussed more than once before. He asked: Would it not be possible to introduce into the Viceroy's Council political leaders who would hold portfolios in certain of the great departments? As I have said, this is not a new proposal. I remember it being made during the joint discussions of the Joint Parliamentary Committee. I think the Leader of the Opposition himself made it at one time. We went fully into it then and at that time we found ourselves confronted by certain difficulties in the way of its adoption. I do not enumerate those difficulties to-night. I wish to close no door. I wish to explore every possibility within the ambit of the Government of India Act.

I agree with very much of what Mr. Wedgwood Benn said as to the impossibility of having constitutional reform by stages in war time or contemplating another Government of India Act when we are in the throes of this terrible struggle. I do not elaborate the difficulties that are inherent in a suggestion of this kind. He knows them as well as I do, but so far as the British Government are concerned, we see no reason why, provided that difficulties are remembered, this proposal should not be very carefully considered.

The Congress, in my view, with undue haste has assumed that **the** Viceroy's Consultative Committee means nothing, that it is merely a constitutional advance. The Princes, the Muslims and other **parties do not take** this view. They **believe that a body of this kind can be of real value to India and that if it is set up, it will prove to be a further step towards, and not away from, responsible government.** I feel that the Congress have been too hasty in their repudiation of this proposal. Let them

and other political leaders clear up any doubts that they have as to the scope of its working and personnel that would be members of it.

If they do, I believe they will find that it is the definite intention of the Viceroy to take Indian political leaders into his confidence on many problems that arise out of the conduct of the war and that it is his convinced belief that if Indian leaders of different parties and communities in British India and Indian India meet to discuss these manifold questions, their advice will carry the greatest possible weight with the Indian executive; and, perhaps even more important, that their meetings by bringing together divergent interests will materially help to provide that basis of agreement among Indians themselves which is essential to swift constitutional advance.

I believe that the great possibilities of consultation of this kind have not been sufficiently appreciated. If they are fully used—and I give an undertaking that the Viceroy is anxious to make the fullest use of them—they may well prove to be the bridge that is needed to carry Indians over the great divide of communal bitterness that at present stands chiefly in the way of constitutional advance. If it be the case **that these** wartime meetings will make easier constitutional discussions that will take place after the war, what a calamity it **would be**, if for some reason or other, they were not **started**.

Mr. Wedgwood **Benn** spoke of the discussions **that took place in the last war on the subject of the constitution**. He mentioned the Montagu-Chelmsford discussions and asked **whether it would** be possible **for discussions of that kind to take place in the course of this war**. I do not wish to give a

final answer but I would point out that in certain respects the situation today differs a good deal from the situation at the time of the Montagu-Chelmsford discussions. The issues had not then become so bitter as they have today. I am thinking more particularly of the communal issue. Further—at any rate at the beginning of a war—it seems to me impossible for discussions of that kind to take place. The Montagu-Chelmsford discussions only took place, I think, three years after the beginning of the last war. As I have said, however, I would rather not give a final answer tonight on a point of that kind.

Nor, indeed, would I give a final answer on another issue Mr. Wedgwood Benn has raised, namely, that there should be a general election in India. At any rate at the beginning of a war a general election would seem to me to be almost impossible. In India officials are working night and day on war work. Moreover, there would be the fact that communal feelings would, I am sure, be very much aroused in an election and while again I do not want to dogmatise and use terms like 'never' and 'in no circumstances', I would say that as things are today a general election to the Central Legislature would, in my opinion, be impossible.

To come back to the broad question of consultation. The Viceroy has not tied himself down to the exact methods of this consultation. It is essentially a question to be settled between him and the political leaders. I am able to state that he is ready to discuss the method and details with the leaders and he proposes without delay **to send** an invitation to meet him for these discussions. **Until these** and **other** discussions take place, I claim that **it would be a**

blunder of the first magnitude to take up an irrevocable position. Let the Indian leaders weigh these possibilities. Let them meet and discuss them once again with the Viceroy, and let them also ponder once again upon the alternatives.

As regards the alternative of direct and immediate responsibility at the Centre, I hope I have convinced the the House that in the present circumstances it is impossible to accept an alternative of that kind. I come to another alternative and I would ask the Indian leaders seriously once again to ponder upon it. I wish, indeed, that I had not to make any reference to it at all. It is the alternative of non-co-operation, an alternative under which the Indian Congress goes its own way and the British Government and the minority communities in India go theirs. If it came to this issue, we should have no choice. The King-Emperor's Government must be carried oh, and it would be carried on with strength and with justice. We, like any other Government in similar circumstances, would give the Viceroy our full support.

But let every man of goodwill in India and Great Britain contemplate the waste that such a chapter of non-co-operation would mean. There would be a waste of all our constitutional efforts with these many years of round table conferences, joint select committees and debates in this House. There would be the waste of all the effort we have made to bring to an end the grim chapter of non-co-operation and to make it easier for the Indians and the British to work together towards the solution of these great problems.

When I went to the India Office I found non-co-operation in full blast. During four years that I was the Secretary of State, like Mr. Wedgwood Benn, who was my predecessor,

almost my sole effort was to bring the British and the Indians together and to put an end to this chapter of wasted effort and miserable controversy. I hoped that when the Act came into force, this chapter would be brought to an end. But it is here now in the face of the greatest crisis that has ever confronted the world—a crisis in which our danger is India's and India's danger ours, in which our determination to set up a new and better order in the world is as great as India's and India's is as great as ours—that there is a grave risk of our drifting into a position in which we shall be wrangling with each other instead of fighting the enemy on the common front. I am told—though I can scarcely believe it—that it is being said in some quarters in India that the British Government is searching for a conflict. I repudiate that suggestion, with all the power I have. The British Government wants co-operation and not conflict. The British Government wants to see the aim of its policy to be achieved and conditions realised in which India can take its true place in the British Commonwealth of free peoples.

Non-co-operation may put the clock back for years. Whether its proirotors desire it or not, non-co-operation leads to civil disobedience, to breaches of law and order and to a vicious circle of riot and repression from which we had hoped to have escaped for ever. Until these things actually happen, I will not believe that they are going to happen. I shall continue to believe that, when these great peoples of our own and the peoples of India are faced with a common danger and inspired with a common ideal, non-co-operation of any large section of a community would be a calamity and futility of the first magnitude. Millions of Indians in British India and in the States agree with this view. They wish to co-operate with us

just as much as we wish to work with them. And the Congress Party itself—I quote the words of Mr. Gandhi—'wanted to help Britain by giving her moral support, which was its speciality. The Congress would not give this unless it was clear that Britain's morality was wholly sound.'

' claim that our position is as sound as a bell. In good faith and perfect sincerity, we have started India on the greatest constitutional experiment that the world had ever seen. We have long ago set aside imperialistic ambitions. We believe that our mission in the world is not to govern other peoples but to help other people to govern themselves.

It was in this spirit that Parliament passed a series of great Acts which gave the Dominions their free constitution. It was in this spirit that we passed the Government of India Act of 1935, under which, of our own free will, we transferred wide authority to the Indian Government. It is in this spirit that we intend to administer the Act and during the war to do our utmost to remove the divisions that stand in the way of its full achievement. And when the war ends—and ends victoriously as a result of the Empire's united efforts—we mean to proceed at once to deal with the constitutional difficulties that have emerged in the experience of recent years. Non-co-operation, and non-co-operation alone, will stop this swift and steady progress. For those of us who have devoted years of our lives to the building of the new constitution, often at some risk to ourselves ; for those of us who are thrilled by the antiquity of the Indian civilisation ; for those of us who are proud of the common effort that Indians and we have made to give India a unique position on the Continent of Asia—another chapter of strife, controversy and non-co-operation would come as a great human tragedy. Such a breach

in the common front would be a repudiation at one of **the** gravest moments in the world's history of the call to **both** of us to resist the aggressor, to fight brute force and to **build** up a new and better order in the world in which we and Indians can go about our lawful vocations without the peril **that** now walks by day and night in so many parts of this world.

It was not—I quote the Prime Minister's weighty words of October 12—with any vindictive purpose that we embarked on the war but simply in defence of freedom. It is not alone freedom of small nations that is at stake. There is also in jeopardy the peaceful existence of Great Britain, the Dominions, India, the rest of the British Empire, France and, indeed, of all freedom-loving nations. Whatever may be the issue of the present struggle, and in whatever way it may be brought to a conclusion, the world will not be the same world that we have known before. Looking to the future, we can see deep changes will inevitably leave their mark on every field of men's thought and actions, and if humanity is to guide aright the new forces that will be in operation, all nations will have their part to play. In this new world India—perhaps in area the greatest of any Asiatic country—has a great part to play. A great part also in the British Commonwealth of Nations, for **it will** be an outward and visible sign that with us there is no racial discrimination. It has a great part also to play in **the world at large**, for **India** should stand out as a **model of a League of Nations** from which war has for **generations** been banished and the rule of law and justice firmly set. With this great hope before us, let us once and for all abandon the barren paths of non-co-operation and help each other to win the war and to win peace and in this double victory to **e** a great step towards the fruition of India's hopes.

PROVINCIAL ASSEMBLIES ON WAR

The Bombay Legislative Assembly on 27th October passed the following Resolution :—

"This Assembly regrets that the British Government have made India a participant in the war between Great Britain and Germany without the consent of the people of India and have further, in complete disregard of Indian opinion, passed laws and adopted measures curtailing the powers and activities of the Provincial Governments.

"This Assembly recommends to Government to convey to the Government of India, and through them, to the British Government that, in consonance with the avowed aims of the present war, it is essential in order to secure the co-operation of the Indian people that the principles of democracy be applied to India and her policy be guided by her people ; and that India should be regarded as an independent nation entitled to frame her own constitution providing, among other things, adequate safeguards for the protection of the rights and liberty of the members of all minority communities in India, and further that suitable action should be taken in so far as it is possible in the immediate present to give effect to that principle in regard to the present governance of India, giving at the same time a voice to important minorities in the machinery that may be devised for the purpose.

"This Assembly regrets that the situation in India has not been rightly understood by His Majesty's Government when authorising the statement that has been made on their behalf in regard to India.*'

On Oct. 16, the Behar Assembly and on Oct. 26, the Madras Legislative Assembly passed a similar Resolution.

FIRST MINISTRY RESIGNATION

Oct. 27

The Congress Ministry of Madras tendered their resignations to the Governor.

**CONGRESS LEADERS
ON HOARE'S STATEMENT****MAHATMA GANDHI**

Oct. 27

I have read Sir Samuel Hoare's Speech with the attention it deserves. I appreciate the conciliatory tone behind it. It makes it, therefore, embarrassing for me to produce what may appear to be a jarring note. But even as he speaks from a sense of duty I hope I shall receive the same credit. Has Dominion Status for India any meaning unless it is synonymous with independence? Has the India of his imagination the right to secede from the Commonwealth? I like the declaration that the British have shed imperialistic ambition. Will he allow the people of India to judge for themselves whether in reality that ambition has been shed? If it is, the proof of it should be forthcoming even before India is statutorily declared independent.

When the protection of minorities is pleaded against the declaration required by the Congress, the great pronouncement made by Sir Samuel Hoare sounds unreal. What the Congress has asked is not any sounding of Indian opinion but a declaration, of Britain's intention.. I have endeavoured to show that there is no such thing as real minorities in India, whose rights

can be endangered by India becoming independent. With the exception of the Depressed Classes there is no minority which is not able to take care of itself. I observe that Sir Samuel Hoare has mentioned the Europeans also as a minority. The very mention of Europeans, in my opinion, condemns the cry of the interest of minorities. But the protection of minorities, whatever they are, is common cause between the British Government and the Congress. I would like the British Government to remember that there is every prospect of Congress India, to use Sir Samuel's phrase, being a hopeless minority. I like Sir Samuel's division of India into Congress and non-Congress. And if non-Congress India contains not merely the Princes but the people of Princes' India, all the Mussalmans, all those who might be represented by the Hindu Mahasabha and others who refuse to be classified as part of Congress India, it is Congress India which will be in danger of a non-Congress majority. And the Congress has got to make good its position even though it may represent a minority wholly unarmed, partly by outside force but largely by its own will.

I am glad that Sir Samuel Hoare has declared that the present British policy is to be judged in the moral scales suggested by me. I venture to suggest that if Sir Samuel's speech is the last word on behalf of the British Government, British political morality will be found wanting. Sir Samuel has laughed at non-cooperation as a barren doctrine. I am convinced that it is not as barren as he thinks. It has proved its worth in the eyes of millions of Indians and will do so again if the Congress remains truly non-violent, as I hope it will. The Congress decision is an imperative call of duty puts both the Congress and the British Government on their

trial. Nothing but good will come out of it, if both will play the game.

In a public meeting in Bombay Pandit J A W A H A R L A L N E H R U said:—

"Sir Samuel Hoare's speech has not in the least altered the Congress attitude to war. The Congress demand is not met and so the Congress decision not to cooperate with Britain in the prosecution of the war also remains unchanged."

CONGRESS PRESIDENT

Dr. Rajendra Prasad said :—

Mahatma Gandhi's statement represents my reaction to Sir Samuel Hoare's speech in the House of Commons and it is hardly necessary for me to say much more.

Oct. 30

The United Provinces Legislative Assembly passed the same Resolution as Madras Assembly on Oct. 26. Subsequently similar Resolutions were passed by the Assemblies of Orissa, C. P. and Berar, North-West Frontier Province, and Assam.

The U. P. Ministry tendered their resignations to the Governor.

The Governor of Madras issued a Proclamation under sec. 93 of the Government of India Act, assuming the government of the Province to himself.

Oct. 31

The Ministries of Bombay and Bihar tendered their resignations.

PART V**TRIPARTITE TALKS****JOINT MEETING AT VICEROYS**

November, 1

The Viceroy sent invitations to Mahatma Gandhi, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, and Mr. Jinnah for a joint consultation to be held on November, 1. Mr. Jinnah was at liberty to bring with himself one more Muslim League spokesman. The object of the consultation was to find a *modus operandi* for the association of responsible political leaders with the Central Government of India. The invitations were accepted and as arranged the consultation was held, after which a communique was issued in the afternoon making the bare announcement that at the request of His Excellency the Viceroy, Mahatma Gandhi, Dr. Rajendra Prasad and Mr. M. A. Jinnah attended a meeting at the Viceroy's House. Discussion of a general character took place, after which the meeting adjourned.

HOUSE OF LORDS DEBATE**SECRETARY OF STATE'S DECLARATION**

Nov. 2

Lord Snell initiated a debate on India in the House of Lords,

LORD SNELL

"The situation in India has been viewed with increasing anxiety by my party, and our support to Government will depend on the extent to which we are satisfied that they are trying to meet the passibnate and, as we believe, the legitimate

hopes and demands of the Indian people. We have quite definite opinions on the matter, and if, on the one hand, we counsel Indian statesmen and reformers not needlessly to hinder such machinery of self-government as they possess on the other hand we warn Government we shall not support either blank negation or a merely equivocal promise of future action. The Indian people in our opinion have given proof of their capacity to run the affairs of their own nation. They have every right, as we believe, to Dominion Status, and the Labour Party will continue to give their support to all lawful and practical attempts to secure it."

Lord Snell was followed by Lord Samuel who made a very long speech. Lord Samuel had paid a visit to India and therefore had firsthand knowledge of how minds in India were working.

LORD SAMUEL

It is now agreed in principle that India shall have Dominion Status, and the disagreement is as to when and how. The complaint is made by the Congress that while the British Government agree to Dominion Status in principle they take no steps to give effect to, or implement, it in practice. Sir Samuel Hoare has said that pledges had been made time after time that Dominion Status was the aim of Indian policy. The Viceroy, in the White Paper, says we are working to the end that India may attain **her** due place amongst **the** great dominions, **and** he quotes this **statement**: 'The **natural issue of Indian progress is the attainment of Dominion Status**'. The aim—the issue—is almost something in the future. The last quotation was from a statement made by the present Foreign Secretary, then Lord Irwin, and the date was 1929—

ten years ago. Year after year goes by, and this policy which is declared the goal, the end, the aim, is not in fact carried into effect, and Indian political leaders see the best years of their lives go by, and they are still in the phase of the struggle. I may be permitted to use the familiar quotation *Man never is but always to be blessed'. It is like some mountain climber who sees what he takes to be the summit before him, and when he reaches the top of the ridge after much effort sees that the summit lies farther beyond, and again when he struggles on to a further ridge the goal is still out of his grasp.

The Government say that if only Indians could agree among themselves on the outstanding questions as between the communities and between the Congress Party and the States, at once Dominion Status could be brought into effect. But that, in substance, means that the Muslims are to have the veto on the introduction of Dominion Status. Muslim India is not eager for Federation. They are rather apprehensive of the possible results of Federation, and they are not pressing for Dominion Status. It is natural for them to say to the Hindus : 'Unless you can concede all we want, we will refuse an agreement and if we refuse an agreement, the British Government say they will not introduce Dominion status'. Consequently, the present proclivity of His Majesty's Government leads to the conclusion that the final decision is left with the Muslims. That would mean that one-fourth of the population of India is to decide the future of India rather than three-fourths. Such a situation may easily become a permanent deadlock, and it is not surprising that the Congress suspects that that is the intention.

All of us in this House, I think, understand the Muslim position and sympathise with that. Undoubtedly Great Britain

has duties towards the Muslims of India. We cannot wash our hands of the question and say that their future is no concern of ours. And it is the case that friction is serious between the Hindu and Muslim communities. When I was there last year, I was told by almost everyone that in most places friction was worse in recent years between the Muslims and Hindus than earlier. That is not so politically in great States like Hyderabad and Mysore; but over the greater part of India it is almost chronic, sometimes acute and dangerous. The minorities must be protected in their rights, and if the minorities have rights, so also have the majorities. It is the fundamental problem of democracy in countries of mixed population how to reconcile the principle of government by majority vote with securing the liberties of the minority communities.

In a country which is homogeneous, or substantially so like Britain or France, or which has become homogeneous like the United States, the question does not arise, but in those where there are several different races or religions or communities within the same geographical area as in many States of Eastern Europe, like Palestine or India, there is a great problem which prevents democratic institutions from working at all. You have a conflict of two principles; has the majority the right to decide on main issues? It has, we believe, in a democracy. On the other hand, have the members of the minority communities the right to be protected? They have. But if the two principles clash, what then?

There is in India the further complication of States. The Princes have their treaty rights, and it is obviously a sound principle of government that treaties must be respected, but if the Princes have treaty rights, their peoples have moral

rights, and we cannot say that the 18th or early 19th century treaties are to be allowed to block for all time the development of modern institutions, and I do not think that the Princes themselves would claim it.

It appears to me that recently His Majesty's Government here and in India have not shown sufficient zeal and energy in tackling these difficult problems. All these inter-locked problems—minorities, Federation and Dominion Status—ought not to be postponed, and the Congress is right in urging that the questions be taken in hand *now*. It has been assumed in many quarters that the outbreak of war makes it impossible even to conceive of these matters being pressed, but I do not see why. Statesmen, who would be engaged in dealing with these Indian constitutional problems, are not those who would be engaged in active prosecution of war measures. It may well be that a group may be considering these questions in India or here, while others devote their energies entirely to war.

During the last war, the House will remember, several of our most embittered and difficult problems were settled while the war was proceeding, and it would be immense proof of the strength and governing ability, if while with one hand we were conducting a great war, with the other we were dealing with difficult material problems in some part of the Empire. I was glad to notice in the debate in the other House that several speakers thought that after all some of these questions must be considered in the immediate future. I notice that Mr. Wedgwood Benn took that view and Sir Samuel Hoare and the Under-Secretary did not dissent from that. I regret that the White Paper suggests a different course. The Viceroy there has proposed that the only step to be taken during the

war was the establishment of a consultative group, the membership of which he outlined. This group, to quote the words of the White Paper, 'would have as its objects the association of public interests in India with the conduct of the war and with questions relating to war activities.'

The Congress members say that they are not prepared to discuss what should be the war measures to be taken by India unless they know what share India should have in determining what those war measures shall be. I trust that it will be possible for Lord Zetland to give us some guidance on that aspect

The White Paper does embody one definite advance. Contrary to what has been said hitherto it agrees that any necessary legislation for the amendment of the 1935 Act in respect of Federation should be contemplated before Federation is brought into effect. That is a considerable step to meet Indian opinion. I trust that the second step will be taken, namely, that all these matters shall not be postponed until after the war but dealt with now.

Mr. Gandhi has explained to me and others that by 'independence' he does not necessarily mean separation from the Empire, but means that the people should have the right to determine for themselves what should be the future of their own country. Many of us think that if we conceded that right they will unquestionably agree to continue the membership of the British Commonwealth on the same footing as the present Dominions. I cannot suppose that Mr. Gandhi or his **colleagues would** suggest that **in** these discussions representatives of **Great Britain should take no part. It appears to me essential that we should take part, first because we have obligations to the Muslims and the Princes, from which we cannot**

in honour withdraw: secondly, because the future defence of India must rest in a great degree with the British Commonwealth. I cannot imagine that India in the near future would wish to undertake immense cost for providing herself with adequate defences apart from the British Empire. If she did not do so, she would run the risk of the same fate at the hands of one or more of her aggressive neighbours as has befallen China. If Britain took part in the discussions, then the two sides are not very far apart. The Viceroy in the White Paper said: 'I am authorised by His Majesty's Government to say that at the end of the war they will be very willing to enter into consultation with representatives of various communities, parties and interests in India and with Indian Princes with a view to securing their aid and co-operation in framing all such modifications of the 1935 Act as may seem desirable.' That is not very far removed from the Constituent Assembly which the Congress plead for. It appears to me that the difference between the two might be bridged with no very great difficulty. If a meeting took place in India, and if it were fully representative of the Indian people, with the present Indian Government, it is not unlike a Constituent Assembly the Congress desires.

I venture to make one suggestion, not, of course, expecting any immediate or early reply, and that is **whether the time has not come in connection with these changes that there should now be established a Privy Council in India. If a body modelled on our Privy Council, which is not sufficiently used here, were to be established in India, containing leaders belonging to different sections and men not only in ministerial office, but of out it, it might be easier to secure adequate discussions on matters of interest to different communities.**

Further, it appears to me quite essential that when discussions take place at the end of the war on the terms of peace and arrangements to be made subsequently, and when the Dominions, as they certainly will be, are brought into consultation, India should be brought into consultation on equal terms. Even if on that date Dominion Status has not been enacted by Statute, still that step might be taken. It would be quite in accordance with British ideas if such a measure were adopted in practice before it has been recognised in law. Furthermore I would urge upon Government that they should breathe through their declaration of policy a conception of the new position in India and the future which is not far distant for her. We sometimes do not remember that of every ten inhabitants in the British Empire seven are Indians. I do not see in the language of this White Paper and in the methods of consultation proposed the new spirit in relation to India which the time requires.

Let me say finally, I am bound to express the view that the *action of the Congress in calling upon the provincial Ministries to resign is wrong*. It appears to be an error of political judgment. Although I am in general agreement with most of the underlying aims of the Congress, I think tactically they have been in error.

I hope the Government will make it as easy as possible to arrive at an accommodation and so take a further step forward towards the aims that we shall not merely maintain in India an imperialistic rule over reluctant subjects, but succeed in enlisting the co-operation of a self-respecting nation.

The Marquis of Zetland replied on behalf of Government.

LORD ZETLAND

My Lord Samuel says you have promised India Dominion Status. It is always coming, but has never come. What have you done to give effect to your intention ?' I rather gather from the speech of Lord Samuel that he thought we could bring Federation and Dominion Status into effect tomorrow, if only we had the will to do so. The Noble Lord spoke of the pledge given by the Foreign Secretary and said that the natural issue for India was the attainment of Dominion Status, but his comment was that that was in 1929* Does he suggest that a federation could be formed before the units have come into existence ? Surely the purpose of the Act of 1935 was to create units which would subsequently be federated. The Noble Lord may say we took a long time in drawing up the provisions of the Act of 1935.

He made a reference to the Viceroy's statement and said that the promise contained therein, that at the end of the war they would take into consultation leaders of various communities and parties interested with a view to effecting such modifications of the federal provisions as might seem desirable, was all to the good. But he said very little of what we propose to do pending the end of the war. I cannot agree with him if he thinks you can redraft the federal provisions of the Act with a view to bringing federation into existence while we are all burdened with the task of carrying on a life and death struggle. But we do agree it is natural that leaders of Indian public opinion should be associated in some way with the Central Government during the progress of the war, and it was with a view to bringing them into close association with the Central Government that we proposed a consultative body.

That was a perfectly sincere and genuine attempt to associate leaders of Indian political parties with the Central Government in the conduct of the war. I remember observing to the House that, in my opinion, it would have three different advantages.

First, it would have enabled the Governor-General to communicate to leaders of political parties confidential information.

Secondly, it would have enabled them to express opinions frankly to the Governor-General as to their views of the measures the Government propose to take; and since the whole idea was conceived on the assumption that there would be goodwill on both sides with the Governor-General and that members would collaborate for a common purpose and, as it is perfectly well-known, all of them have at heart the successful prosecution of the war. I regarded it as axiomatic that the Viceroy would have attached the utmost worth to the views expressed by such a body in such circumstances.

The third advantage was that, since the representatives of different communities would be working in close association not only with the Governor-General but with one another, it would tend to lessen the differences by which they are at present divided and would bring to the surface such measure of common ground as would justify us inviting them to become associated with the Government in even a more responsible position.

I regret profoundly that the proposal does not appear to have been received in India in the spirit in which it was given. Meanwhile, these communal differences persist. I need not

lay stress upon them. They are known to Your Lordships. The manifesto of the All-India Muslim League as well as the manifesto of the Congress are in the White Paper, and since then the leader of the All-India Muslim League has issued a statement which appeared in the *Manchester Guardian* only two or three days ago. I do not want to underline the differences but they cannot be ignored. You have to try somehow or other to reconcile them. What, in these circumstances, is the path of wisdom? Surely, the path of wisdom in these circumstances is to invite leaders in the first instance of the two main communities—Hindus as represented by the Congress, Muslims as represented by the All-India Muslim League—to meet under the auspices of a neutral and discuss their differences frankly and see whether they cannot find some solution thereto. That is precisely what the Viceroy is doing at the present moment. He has invited leaders of the Congress and the All-India Muslim League to meet him for that very purpose, and I have no hesitation in saying that if, as a result of these discussions and consultations, we can find a common ground on which the two great communities will work together, then the main obstacle in the way of associating leaders of political parties in the actual Executive at the Centre will have been removed. I need hardly say I share the regret expressed by Lord Samuel at the action taken by the Congress Ministries in the provinces. I agree with him that has been a most unfortunate move and I believe that history will prove it has been most unwise, but there it is. With, it seems to me, an undue haste, while discussions are still proceeding, the Ministries in four of the provinces have already tendered resignations and the resignation of the Ministry in a fifth province is expected in the very near future. That will mean

that the Government will be obliged to proclaim the breakdown of the Constitution as far as these provinces are concerned and to take into its own hands the administration.

I would make one comment on what Lord Samuel said. The communal problem is not confined to British India, nor is it true to say it has not become accentuated in some of the Indian States during the past two or three years.

Let me only say this in conclusion with regard to our war aims in India. It is sometimes said still in India that we are fighting to maintain imperialism in that country. If by British imperialism is meant domination and exploitation of one people by another people, I say that if it ever existed it was abandoned by Parliament when it accepted the preamble to the Act of 1919 and every step, which has been taken since that time, has emphasised and ratified the determination of the people of this country to work for self-government in India. I cannot conceive of anyone, who wished to maintain imperialism in India in the sense in which I have described, having voted for the Act of 1935, which was passed by a large majority by the House of Lords and House of Commons. No, our intentions remain what they have been ever since the Act of 1919. We are striving our best, with all sincerity, to assist in removing obstacles which at present lie in the path of full fulfilment of the promises which have been made. While I appreciate the idealism of Lord Samuel, who wishes to see a great quickening up of the process on which we are engaged, I find from all my practical experience that has come to me as the Secretary of State, every day of the year for the past four or *five* years, that it is no use ignoring difficulties in our path. What we may do is to work patiently and in all sincerity to remove them.

BREAKDOWN

On Nov. 3 Governors of the U. P. and of Bihar and on 4th Nov. the Governor of Bombay assumed the government of their Provinces under sec. 93 of the Government of India Act. Subsequently, similar assumption was proclaimed by the Governors of Orissa, C. P. and N. W. F. P.

The talks between Congress and Muslim League leaders initiated at the instance of the Viceroy concluded on Nov. 4, without any agreement being arrived at. The Viceroy issued¹ a statement on the situation as it obtained, to which were appended the letters which passed between him and the Congress and Muslim League Leaders.

VICEROYS STATEMENT

New Delhi, Nov. 5

It was in the light of profound consideration and long discussion that on October 18, I made a declaration on behalf of His Majesty's Government. That declaration emphasised, first, that Dominion Status remained the goal for India; second that His Majesty's Government were prepared to reconsider the scheme of the present Act at the end of the war in consultation with leaders of opinion in India; third, that His Majesty's Government attached importance to associating public opinion in India with the prosecution of the war, and that for that purpose they contemplated the formation of a Consultative Group, the details of which were to be settled after I had further consulted with party leaders. The announcements in my statement are of great importance. Their importance has been belittled, but they represent points of real substance. The debates in Parliament which followed the publication of my-

statement brought out another important point—the readiness of His Majesty's Government, if certain conditions were secured, to associate Indian opinion in a still closer and more responsible manner with the conduct of the war by a temporary expansion of the Governor-General's Executive Council.

I next invited Mr. Gandhi, Dr. Rajendra Prasad and Mr. Jinnah to come to see me on November 1, and I discussed the whole position with them frankly. I had already, in my previous conversations, discussed with them, as with almost all my visitors, from various aspects, the possibility of an expansion of the Governor-General's Council. I now told them that, if in regard to association at the Centre, we had been unable to go further than the Consultative Group, it was because of the lack of prior agreement between the major communities such as would contribute to harmonious working in the Centre. I added that the manifestoes issued on October 22 by the Congress Working Committee and the Muslim League had shown only too clearly the gulf that existed between the attitude of these two great parties. I begged my visitors, in these circumstances, to meet and to have discussions among themselves on the provincial position, with a view thereafter to putting forward in agreement proposals which could be considered for some expansion of the Governor-General's Council at the Centre. I told them that I saw no necessity for every detail of the differences between them in the provinces to be resolved. What was needed was a sufficient resolution of those differences to make the devising of a scheme for harmonious co-operation at the Centre practicable. I begged them in the most earnest manner to spare no endeavour to reach agreement; and I emphasised that this was essentially a question affecting Indians, on which

agreement between Indians themselves was what I was anxious to secure. I repeated the profound anxiety not only of myself but of His Majesty's Government to leave nothing undone which would contribute to achieve that agreement.

The discussions which I suggested have taken place, but the result to me has been a profound disappointment. There remains today entire disagreement between the representatives of the major parties on fundamental issues. All I will say now is that *I am not prepared to accept this failure*. I propose in due course to try again in consultation with the leaders of these great parties and the Princes, to see if even now there may still be the possibility of securing unity.

During all the time I have been in India there is nothing I have been more anxious to secure than unity. And unity matters far more to India than is perhaps always realised. Unity, too, means that Indians, whatever their community or whatever their party allegiance and whether they dwell in British India or in the Indian States, must work together in a common scheme.

It is worth a great deal to try to bring that about. I may have been unsuccessful so far, but I shall try again. And when I try again, I would ask India to remember my difficulties, and give me credit for an earnest goodwill and an earnest desire to assist. We are dealing with a problem that has defeated the united endeavours of the greatest organisations in this country. There are grave differences of view which have to be taken into account, which should be bridged. There are strong and deeply rooted interests which are entitled to the fullest consideration and whose attitude is not a thing lightly to be brushed aside. There are minorities which are great in numbers, as

well as great in historic importance, and in culture. Those are all factors to which full weight has to be given.

Complex as the problems are, I refuse to regard them as insoluble, and I prefer to believe that, like other human problems, they will yield to patient discussion in a spirit of goodwill. In this belief I am encouraged by the friendly feeling which has pervaded my discussions with the leaders of parties. I would ask the country, and I would ask the leaders of the great political parties and their constituents, who I know have faith in those leaders and are ably led by them, to give me the help which I so much need if there is to be any hope of overcoming our difficulties and reaching the result which I am sure that we all of us desire.

The Viceroy's Letter

to Mahatma Gandhi, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, President, All-India National Congress, and Mr. M. A. Jinnah, President, All-India Muslim League, dated the Viceroy's House, New Delhi, November 2 :

"You will remember that I agreed during our conversation yesterday to let you have in concrete form the proposition which I put to you and the other gentlemen who were present at the meeting, emphasising that I did so with a genuine desire to help, a desire fully shared by His Majesty's Government.

"2. The proposition which I invited you and the other gentlemen present to consider, as leaders of the Congress and the Muslim League, was that, given the great importance of ensuring harmonious working at the Centre, you should enter upon discussions between yourselves with a view to discovering whether you could reach a basis of agreement between your-

selves in the provincial field, consequent on which you could *let* me have proposals which would result in representatives of your two organisations immediately participating in the Central Government as members of my Executive Council.

"I brought out, too, that, in my judgment, it ought not to be necessary absolutely to resolve every detail of such differences as may exist in the provinces. What was required, as was remarked in the course of the discussion, was a degree of agreement in respect of the provinces, such as to make it possible for my visitors, and the organisations which they represented, to put forward a scheme which could be considered for the Centre.

"3. I added, in regard to any arrangement at the Centre:—

"First, that one would hope that it might be found practicable to include also one or possibly more representatives of other important groups, and that that was a question on which I should value your advice when we came to grapple with the details:

"Secondly, that the arrangement which I invited you to consider for the Centre would be an *ad hoc* arrangement for the period of the war, and quite distinct from the much wider question of constitutional reform at the end of the war; and I mentioned that on that last point my declaration had set out the position of His Majesty's Government. I attach a copy of the extracts from that declaration which I brought to the notice of the meeting yesterday :

"Thirdly, that the position of any one appointed to my Executive Council as a member of a political party would be identical, in privileges and in obligations, with that of the existing members of my Council: and

"Fourthly, that the arrangement would be within the general scheme of the existing law. It would be admittedly and inevitably a make-shift arrangement for the duration of the campaign. I brought out that what was required now, if we could get a workable scheme together, was to put it into operation with as little delay as possible, pending the more general review of the whole constitutional position, which His Majesty's Government have expressed their readiness to Undertake after the conclusion of hostilities."

DR. RAJENDRA PRASAD'S REPLY

Letter from Dr. Rajendra Prasad to the Viceroy, dated Birla House, New Delhi, November 3 :

"I thank you for your letter of November 2, embodying in concrete form the position which you had placed before us when we saw you on November 1. My colleagues and I have given our earnest consideration to it. We have had also the advantage of full talks with Mr. M. A. Jinnah, but we find ourselves unable to vary the answer we gave you during the interview.

"At the outset, I would like to say that both Gandhiji and I missed at the interview any reference to the main and moral issue raised by the Congress about clarification of war aims, without which it was impossible for the Congress to consider any subsidiary proposal.

"Subsequent statements made on behalf of the British Government in Parliament have not made any **essential** difference to the policy **outlined in the Viceregal statement, and as you have rightly pointed out, that policy is still governed by the extracts from it that you have kindly sent us. I am afraid it is quite impossible for us to accept this policy or**

consider any step to further co-operation unless the policy of the British Government is made clear in a declaration on the lines suggested by the Congress.

"It has pained us to find the communal questions being dragged in this connection. It has clouded the main issue. It has been repeatedly said on behalf of the Congress that it is our earnest desire to settle all points of communal controversy by agreement and we propose to continue our efforts to this end. But I would point out that this question does not in any respect come in the way of a declaration of Indian freedom as suggested above.

"Such a declaration applies to the whole of India and not to any particular community, and the Constituent Assembly which will frame India's constitution, will be formed on the widest possible basis of franchise and by agreement in regard to communal representation. We are all agreed that there must be full protection of minority rights and interests and this protection should be by agreement between the parties concerned. The British Government, in taking and sharing the burden has, in our opinion, made a settlement of the question much more difficult than it should have been. It should allay all real anxiety on the part of the British Government when the Congress declares that it contemplates no constitution which does not carry with it the protection of **real** minorities to their satisfaction.

"It seems **to** us that a clear declaration of **the kind suggested is an essential preliminary to any further consideration of the matter.** I should like to add that recent developments in the European war have made it all the more necessary for a clear enunciation of war aims. If a **satisfactory declaration is**

made, a discussion of the proposal made by Your Excellency will be appropriate and useful and we shall gladly discuss it with you. It is perhaps unnecessary to state that Gandhiji is in full agreement with this letter. We propose to leave tomorrow evening for Wardha, unless Your Excellency desires -otherwise."

Mr. Jinnah's Letter

Letter from Mr. M. A. Jinnah to the Viceroy, dated November 4:—

"With reference to the joint interview which Mr. Gandhi, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, President of the Congress, and myself had with you on November 1, and in reply to your letter dated November 2, I beg to inform you that I understood that the Congress leaders and myself were to consider the proposals of Your Excellency...I understand that we were to consider your [proposals without prejudice to the resolution of the Muslim League of October 22, stating that the declaration of Your Excellency on behalf of His Majesty's Government was not satisfactory and required further clarification and assurances, and also without prejudice to the demand of the Congress for a declaration as adumbrated in the resolution of the All-India Congress Committee on October 10.

"In consequence I met the leaders of the Congress. I was informed by them finally that they had come to the conclusion that they could not discuss any question with regard to matters referred to in your letter of the 2nd instant, **relating to the provincial field or to the Centre, until that British Government had complied with their demand as embodied in the resolution of the All-India Congress Committee. Hence these two questions were not further discussed.**"

PART VI

U. S. A. LIFTS ARMS EMBARGO

ARSENAL WITH UNLIMITED RESOURCES

Worldwide Repercussions

Nov 4 and 5

Precisely at this time an event of far-reaching importance favourable to Britain and France happened in the United States of America. In that country was in force a law which forbade the sale of any war material to any belligerent country. The law was enacted with the sole intention of keeping the U. S. A. out of war and was called the Neutrality Act. Ever since the Munich Pact of September, 1938, President Roosevelt had been striving to amend that law, because in his opinion, the law, though apparently a neutrality law, was conducive to 'actual unneutrality'. On July 15, 1939, the President sent a special Message to Congress appealing tersely and firmly for the enactment of an amending law during its last Session. But Congress resolved to adjourn without acceding to his appeal and he bitterly expressed his disappointment. Then came the war. President Roosevelt declared the neutrality of his country and as in duty bound enforced the law as it was. As the President expressed himself, the Americans were out of the war but could not be expected to be neutral in thought. He was right. Opinion in the U. S. A. gradually but certainly turned away from isolationism. A Special Session of Congress was convened and the amending legislation, which President Roosevelt asked, was enacted on Saturday Nov. 4

Under the law as amended the embargo on war material is lifted. Any country whether belligerent or neutral may purchase war material in the U. S. A. 'cash down and remove the same in ships other than American.

Although the lifting of the arms embargo applies equally to all under the terms of the law, the amendment actually operates to the very significant advantage of Britain and France. Not only have these countries the cash, of which Germany has little, but also have Britain and France the required ships and control of the sea-routes, while German ships have virtually been driven off the High Seas. Moreover, the embargo had held up even the supply of 800 aeroplanes contracted for by the Allies before hostilities broke out. The lifting of the embargo at once released these aeroplanes to be sent to Britain and France.

Opinion in the Allied countries was jubilant while that in Germany was bitter. Dr. Leslie Burgin, Minister of supply (Britain) stated at a Press Conference that with the removal of the American arms embargo the Allies were faced with the possibility of "*an arsenal with unlimited resources*"

Le Petit Parisien wrote : "The vote leaves no doubt about American sympathies. To their valuable moral support will be soon added material help, which will hasten victory for the Allies."

Germany considered the repeal of the Arms Embargo as unequivocal support to Britain and France and regarded the U. S. A. as "practically in the war." The German wireless described it as "nothing but machinations of Jewish war profiteers"

The British Press greeted the repeal as an event bound to have important *world-wide* repercussions. One paper declared that

the lifting of the embargo was also the lifting of
American *shields* against barbarism and Hitlerism.

After the Anglo-Franco-Turkish Treaty, this was the most favourable blow struck for Britain and France.

The news of the signature of the new Neutrality Act was beard and acclaimed by thousands of officers and airmen of the British and French Air Forces gathered round radio sets in the offices, messes and billets on the Western Front. Toasting U. S. A. and the President was general at dinner.

The potentialities of the move of President Roosevelt are really immense if not unlimited. This war is going to be decided in the air. No belligerent can succeed in the air without ample replenishment not only of aeroplanes but also of oil. In respect of both the resources of the U. S. A. are almost unlimited.

The new legislation further strengthens President Roosevelt's hands. He has already opened the trade with South Africa and India to American ships, though both of these are belligerent states. Canada is being differentially treated. U. S. A.'s power is hereby enhanced both in respect of war and peace.

PART VII

THE GAME OF SEASAW

CONGRESS TOTALITARIAN

Nov. 4

The principal factor in the negative attitude of the Congress Party is suspicion. Its chiefs seem to believe that the British Government's declarations on the subject of Dominion Status are insincere; that the Round Table Conferences were organised to excite, rather than compose, communal differences; that the hostility of the Muslim League to the Hindu majority is greatly exaggerated. A parallel to these suspicions may be found in the attitude of the Muslim League to the Congress Party, and the Princes take an equally unfavourable view of the intentions of Congress,

' Regrettable as this atmosphere of suspicion may be, it should not prevent the Imperial Government from taking steps to find means of giving satisfaction to the legitimate demands of Congress Party. They urge that Government should define its future policy to India, and Indian leaders should be associated in more than a consultative capacity with the Central Government in the prosecution of the war. It is possible to envisage such a solution by agreement between Hindu, Muslim and other leaders. If Congress chiefs could arrange matters directly with Mr. Jinnah—and Lord Linlithgow clearly hopes for such an understanding—agreement on these lines would hasten the attainment of Dominion Status, and facilitate the association of Indian leaders in the Central Executive, but here all depends on the sincerity of the Congress leaders.

They demand a definition of the aims of British policy to India. The Imperial Government and the minorities have an equal right to demand their intentions. Mr. Gandhi must know that political representation and protection of minorities is the acid test of constitutional democracy. Neither Mr. Gandhi nor his colleagues can expect the Imperial Government to accept the totalitarian claim on behalf of the party. The minority of 80 millions, with a strong military and political tradition, cannot be ignored.

What has the Congress Party done to allay the apprehensions of the Muslims, Princes and Depressed Classes in the last two years? The withdrawal of the claim of political monopoly is surely the condition of their success, and in this direction they cannot expect the Imperial Government, much as they desire to obtain Congress co-operation, to arrive at a settlement over the heads of the Muslims and other Minorities. Such a course would make the Indian communal rift into an impassable gulf; would be grossly impolitic, and would, be even more grossly unjust to the Muslims, who have given support without reservation in the life and death struggle against aggression.

—*The Times*

JINNAH-NEHRU TALKS

NOV. 6

In view of the Statement of the Viceroy that entire disagreement existed between the representatives of the Congress and the Muslim League, Pandit Jawaharlal issued a statement that he was not aware of any disagreement on fundamental issues and that in his talks with Mr. Jinnah he found that there was no difference as to the objective to be achieved by India. The talks in Delhi between Mr. Jinnah and Pandit were a continuation of their earlier talks. The talks would be

resumed, said the Congress President also in an interview with a Pressman. Mr. Jinnah, on his part, was looking forward to meeting Pandit Jawaharlal because, he said, "I like Jawaharlal immensely."

PUNJAB ASSEMBLY

Supports Britain Wholeheartedly

Lahore, Nov. 6

The Punjab Legislative Assembly passed the following Resolution:—

"This Assembly approves of the policy of the Punjab Government towards the present international crisis in condemning Fascist and Nazi aggression and declares its determination to resist this aggression and to protect the security and honour of the Punjab and India with all the available resources of the province.

"It further desires that it should forthwith be made absolutely clear that the constitution of India shall be examined *de novo* at the end of the war with a view to the immediate attainment of the objective of Dominion Status with effective protection of the due rights of the minorities and other sections and in consultation with, and agreement of, all parties concerned."

MAHRATTAS' SUPPORT

Nasik, Nov. 6

Unanimous support to the British Government in the prosecution of the war against Germany was voted by the All-India Mahratta Conference. The Conference was attended by nearly 10,000 Mahrattas from various parts of India. The Conference demanded increased representation of Mahrattas in the Indian Army and recruitment to the Navy and Air Force.

ZETLAND'S NO TO CONGRESS

Nov. 6

Asked by Lord Snell for a statement on India the MARQUIS of ZETLAND said:—

I need hardly say that His Majesty's Government share the profound regret of the Governor-General at the failure of the consultations which he had been holding during the last week to produce an agreement between representatives of the Congress on the one hand, and the All-India Muslim League, on the other. May I remind the House briefly that the previous discussions which the Governor-General had been so patiently conducting for several weeks past had convinced him there was little, if any, prospect of securing an agreement on plans which he had been considering with the object of bringing Indians into association with the Central Government of India in the conduct of war, unless some accommodation could first be reached on the difficulties felt by Muslims as to their position in the Provinces where the Congress Governments were in power.

As the House will have seen from the documents published yesterday that the Congress has definitely refused to consider any concrete plans such as those outlined by the Governor-General, unless His Majesty's Government should be willing, first, to make a declaration to the effect that India is an independent nation and that His Majesty's Government will raise no opposition to her future form of Government being determined without their intervention by a Constituent Assembly called upon the widest possible basis of franchise, and by agreement in regard to communal representation. The Congress have further consistently taken the line, which they

still maintain, that the fact that there are racial and religious minorities in India is of no relevance in that connection, and that it has always been the intention of the Congress to secure through the constitution to be framed by Indians themselves such protection for their rights as may prove acceptable to the minorities.

His Majesty's Government find it impossible to accept this position. The long standing British connection with India has left His Majesty's Government with obligations towards her, which it is impossible for them to shed by disinteresting themselves wholly in the shaping of her future form of Government.

Moreover, one outstanding result of the recent discussions, in which the Governor-General has been engaged with representatives of all parties and interests in India, has been to establish beyond doubt the fact that a declaration in the sense proposed with the summary abandonment by His Majesty's Government of their position in India, would be far from acceptable to large sections of the Indian population. But this does not mean that we had in any sense weakened in our determination to assist India by such means as are in our power to reach without avoidable delay the position in the British Commonwealth of Nations to which we are pledged,

Let me take this opportunity for removing some doubts and suspicions which appear to have been felt in India about reference in the recent India debate in the House of Commons by the Lord Privy Seal to the 'Dominion Status of 1926 as being the status we contemplate for India. The suggestion, I understand, has been made that the passage of the Statute of Westminster in 1931 has produced for the Dominions, to which the Statute applies, a status which is somewhat

different from, and is superior to, the relationship described in the Balfour Declaration contained in the report of the Imperial Conference of 1926. This House, at all events will have no difficulty in believing me when I say that there is no foundation for any such suggestion. Sir Samuel Hoare referred to the Dominion Status of 1926, because it was in that year that the Imperial Conference described the status of the Dominions, and the status so described has not been altered by anything •which has since occurred, the Statute of Westminster having merely given legal effect to certain consequences of the constitutional position as was then recognised.

It was our hope that the plans which the Governor-General has indicated, including as they did the incorporation of the leaders of the main political parties in India in the Central Government, if they could have been brought into play, would have done much towards facilitating the removal of the outstanding obstacle at present in India's path. The Governor-General has made it clear that he is not deterred by his present failure in hoping for a reconsideration by the parties interested, and His Majesty's Government warmly approve the readiness which he has expressed to be of such service as he can whenever an opportunity offers,

END THE GAME OF SEESAW

(By Mahatma Gandhi)

8 Nov.

I have read with respectful attention His Excellency the Viceroy's broadcast and his introductory remarks on the correspondence between himself and Shri Rajendra, Prasad and Jinnah Saheb released by His Excellency, I welcome His Excellency's refusal to accept defeat and his determination to

solve what seems to have become insoluble. I share to the fullest extent His Excellency's anxiety to reach a solution. Without, therefore, waiting for the Congress reaction to these two declarations and purely for the sake of assisting the common cause, I would like to suggest that *no solution is possible unless an acceptable declaration of war aims about India is forthcoming*. The pronouncements hitherto made, whether here or in Great Britain, are after the old style, suspected and discredited by freedom-loving India. If Imperialism is dead, there must be a clear break with the past. Language suited to the new era has to be used. If the time has not yet come for the acceptance of this fundamental truth, I would urge that further effort at reaching a solution should be suspended. In this connection I would remind British statesmen that *what is wanted is a declaration of Britain's intention regarding her Indian policy irrespective of India's wishes*. A slave-holder, who has decided to abolish slavery, does not consult his slaves whether they desire freedom or not.

Once a declaration to free India from bondage, not in stages but at once is made, an interim solution will be found to be easy. Protection of rights of minorities will then become simple. The game of seesaw will cease. The minorities are entitled to protection, not in stages but to the fullest extent and in one single step. No charter of freedom will be worth looking at which does not ensure the same measure of freedom for the minorities as for the majority. The minorities will be full-fledged partners in the framing off the constitution. How that can be attained will depend upon the wisdom of the representatives charged with the sacred duty of preparing the constitution. Britain has hitherto held power—this is inevitable in any system of imperialism—by

playing the minorities against the so-called majority and has* thus made an agreed solution among the component parts-well-nigh impossible. The burden of finding a formula for the protection of minorities should be thrown on the parties themselves. So long as Britain considers it her mission to bear this burden, so long will she continue to feel the necessity of holding India as a dependency. And patriots impatient for deliverance will fight, non-violently if I can guide them and violently if I fail and perish in the attempt. *God's curse of war, I had hoped and still hope, would be turned into a blessing by Britain realising that the one thing needful for her to justify and hasten the end of this war was to free a great and ancient country like India from her yoke.*

Believing as I do in the Viceroy's sincerity, I would urge fellow-workers not to lose patience. *There can be no civil resistance so long as, first, the Viceroy is exploring the possibilities of a settlement, secondly, the Muslim League blocks the way, and, thirdly, there is indiscipline and disunity in Congress ranks.*

The second condition should not offend Muslim friends. So long as there is no workable arrangement with the Muslim' League, civil resistance must involve resistance against the* League. No Congressman can be party to it. I observe that my note in *Harijan* has shocked Jinnah Saheb. I am sorry for it. But at this stage I would not defend myself. I do not want to mar in any way the negotiations between him and Pandit Nehru, which I hope will be resumed soon and pray will lead to communal peace.

Since making the above statement I have read the report of the further statement of the Secretary of State in the House' of Lords yesterday. *It leaves the main position unchanged.*

HITLER ON INDIA

Munich, Nov. 8

Herr Hitler, in his speech on the anniversary of the Munich Beer Hall putsch of 1923, said:—

"If Britain started granting her own empire full liberty by restoring the freedom of India, we should have bowed before them."*

INDIA IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

London, November 9

Mr. D; Kirkwood (Lab.) asked Sir Hugh O'Neill, Under-Secretary of State for India, in the House of Commons, "if with a view to securing the whole-hearted cooperation of India with this country, he will immediately issue a pronouncement that it is the Government's policy to grant responsible self-government to India as soon as feasible, and that the representatives of all the leading parties and communities will immediately be invited to attend a conference for the purpose of framing a constitution to embody full responsible self-government."

Sir Hugh O'Neill replied that, as regards the first part of the question, he would refer Mr. Kirkwood to the statement made by the Governor-General on October 17, and the subsequent observations thereon by Sir Samuel Hoare and Lord Zetland respectively in both the Houses of Parliament.

As regards the second part of the question, Sir Hugh said he could add nothing to the statement made by Lord Zetland on November 6, the substance of which he had repeated in the House of Commons.

They I Have Faith in Parliament

Madras, Nov. 10

R. Srinivasan, M. L. C, President of the, Madras Provincial Scheduled Castes' Federation:—

"The depressed classes can rely only on a constitution planned under the auspices of Parliament; Soon after the war broke out, I made it clear that even in my 80th year, after toiling over half a century to uplift the depressed classes, I am ready to fight and lay down my life for Great Britain. That is also the attitude of my community expressed in public meetings throughout India. Our experience of the last 50 years does not permit us to believe in the Congress demand for a constitution framed through a constituent assembly. Though' the Congress has now emphasised protection of minority interests, as a signatory to the Poona Pact, I may say that we do not attach any value to such assertions. We are convinced that there is the widest divergence between the professions and practices of the Congress. The Depressed Classes today are emphatically of the view that only separate electorates will really safeguard their interests. Mr. Jinnah, in his recent speech at Bombay, has 'exposed the hollowness of the Congress conception of democracy. Congress insistence on the constitution framed through a constituent assembly must in no circumstances be met. That will be a step fraught with gravest danger to the Depressed Classes. We shall stoutly resist such a constitution being foisted on us, The real Congress is neither a friend of the minority communities nor of Great Britain. Let not Great Britain think lightly of non-Congress India which forms the majority of India."

THE MAIN ISSUE

Nov. 14

The following message was cabled to *The News Chronicle* (London) by Mahatma Gandhi:—

I observe that the main issue between Britain and India is being confused in the British Press. Does Britain intend to recognise India as an independent nation or must India remain Britain's dependency? This question has not been raised by the Congress to gain an advantage over Britain, but to enable the people of India to decide how they should behave during the world crisis. The issue thus becomes purely moral for, owing to her material and military control of India, Britain is able to regulate the Indian and British garrison and drain India's wealth at her will. Eight provinces out of eleven have said in emphatic language that they cannot participate in the war, if it does not mean, among other things, India's complete freedom. All other issues are subordinate. The question of minorities is purely a domestic one for the majority and the minorities to settle themselves. The proposed Constituent Assembly is the only body that can evolve a proper and lasting solution. Any other can only be a make-shift carrying no popular sanction. To fling the minorities question in India's face is to confuse issues. To raise the question of the Princes is still more untenable. They are part of the Paramount Power. It is painful to think that British statesmen do not so much as mention the millions of people of the States. Have they no voice in their own government? Are they to remain serfs, which they are, though they are dragged into the war? No wonder Hen Hitler has challenged the British Government to prove her sincerity by

recognising India as a free nation. Whatever may be his intention in issuing the challenge, it cannot be denied that it is pertinent. Anyway, let the British public know that the Congress demand is unequivocal and capable of being satisfied if there is the will to shed Imperialism. The Working Committee meets on the 19th inst. at Allahabad to consider the next step. There should be no misunderstanding, therefore, about the issue. If there is to be a fight between Britain and the Congress, the world should know clearly what it is to be for.

A New Order

In his message cabled on Nov. 15 from Allahabad to a public meeting in London under the auspices of the India League, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru:—

"India holds fast today, as before, to democracy, freedom and peace, and condemns all aggression. If the war is for this, then the Governments must state their aims clearly, agree to and Fascism and Imperialism, support self-determination, declare independence for India and act up to these declarations. Then all freedom-loving forces in the world will rally and establish a new order. India cannot support the preservation of Imperialism."

ALTERNATIVE MINISTRY IN ASSAM

Nov. 17

In the place of the Congress Ministry resigned, the Governor of Assam has appointed another Cabinet with Sir Muhammad Saadulla as Prime Minister.

Sir Muhammad Zafrulla Khans Brbadcast

London, November 17

"Every section of Indian opinion is determined to see that the Nazis are beaten; there is no doubt about that it all Indians have watched with anxiety, the expansion of Nazi ambitions and the progressive development of the unpleasant means by which they have chosen to achieve their ends. The ideas of force, deceit and brutality, on which Nazi philosophy is based, are the very antithesis of all that Indians hold in the highest esteem. There is not the least doubt in their minds that the time has come when a stop must be put to further aggression. I have been struck by the way in which Indians of every type, even men who cannot read and write and whose lives are normally filled with local or personal problems, have shown how closely interested they are in the international situation. It was quite different in 1914. Recruiting offices have been overwhelmed with offers of service, not only from classes from whom the Army is normally recruited, but from every class, community and walk of life. Both rich and poor have demonstrated their loyalty. Indians have, of course, their internal differences regarding the future of their country, but you must realise that these differences are purely domestic, and do not affect the unity of all Indians in their dislike and distrust of Nazism. India's sympathy for the Allies is complete and her practical contribution to the war effort, which is already striking, will increase steadily as the weeks and months go by. Indians know that the war will decide whether India's future is to be decided by men of my country and yours in mutual consultation, both guided by political principles which we share, or by Hitler or principles which we both detest."

GREENWOOD ON INDIA

London, Nov. 17

Mr. Arthur Greenwood, M. P., in a statement to Reuter said that had he been able to attend the meeting in Conway Hall, London, held under the auspices of the India League, at which he was billed as the principal speaker, he would have said:—

"it is vital that the people of India during the time of a world crisis should be enabled to shape their policy in cooperation for the purpose of ending the Nazi rule. This implies active participation by organised opinion in Indian legislation and administration. It is also essential that in addition to taking immediate steps, a declaration should be made pledging Britain to fulfilment of self-government for India—"

WORKING COMMITTEE'S RESOLUTION

Allahabad, Nov. 23

The Working Committee of the Congress passed the following resolution:—

The Working Committee have noted with pleasure the response of the country to the policy enunciated by them regarding the war in Europe and its repercussions in India, This policy, based on numerous declarations of the Congress, was laid down in a statement issued by the Committee on September 14 and subsequent events have amply justified its wisdom and expedience. The course of the war and the policy pursued by the British and French Governments, in particular the declarations made on behalf of the British Government regarding India, seem to demonstrate that the present war, like

the World War of 1914-18, is being carried on for Imperialist ends, and British Imperialism is to remain entrenched in India. With such a war and with this policy the Congress cannot associate itself, and it cannot countenance the exploitation of India's resources to this end.

The Working Committee's unequivocal demand was for a declaration of war aims in regard to Democracy and Imperialism and in particular, how these aims were going to be applied to India. These aims could only be considered worthy, if they included the elimination of Imperialism and the treatment of India as an independent nation whose policy would be guided in accordance with the wishes of her people. The answer to this demand has been entirely unsatisfactory and an attempt has been made on behalf of the British Government to create misunderstandings and to befog the main and moral issue. In justification of this refusal to make a declaration in terms of the Working Committee's resolution, communal pleas have been advanced and the rights of the Minorities and of the Princes pleaded as a barrier to India's freedom. The Committee wish to declare with all emphasis that no communal considerations arise in meeting the demand of the Congress, and the Minorities, whatever their other differences might be, do not oppose India's right to freedom and independence. The Princes are represented by, and are emblems of, the Paramount Power in India. In the end, it will be the people of Indian States who will determine what part they will take in a free India, though the British Government have consistently ignored their wishes in the matter which vitally affects them. In any event, the wishes of those who may oppose India's independence are, and must be, irrelevant to the declaration of the British Government's intentions. The Committee can only interpret

this attempt to avoid a statement of their war aims and Indian freedom by taking shelter under irrelevant issues, as a desire to maintain their Imperialist domination in India in alliance with the reactionary elements in the country.

The Congress has looked upon the war crisis and the problems it raises as essentially a moral issue, and has not sought to profit by it in any spirit of bargaining. The moral and dominant issue of war aims and India's freedom have to be settled satisfactorily before any other subsidiary question can be considered. In no event can the Congress accept responsibility of the government, even in the transitional period, without real power being given to popular representatives. The Working Committee, therefore, approve of and endorse the reply dated November 4, 1939, sent by the Congress President to the Viceroy.

The Committee wish to declare again that the recognition of India's independence and the right of her people to frame their constitution through a Constituent Assembly is essential in order to remove the taint of Imperialism from Britain's policy and to enable the Congress to consider further co-operation. They hold that a Constituent Assembly is the only democratic method of determining the constitution of a free country, and no one, who believes in democracy and freedom, can possibly take exception to it. The Working Committee believe too that the Constituent Assembly alone is the adequate instrument for solving the communal and other difficulties. This, however, does not mean that the Working Committee will relax their efforts for arriving at a solution of the communal problem. This Assembly can frame a Constitution in which the rights of *accepted* Minorities would be protected to their satisfaction, and in the event of some matters relating to Minority

rights not being mutually agreed to, they can be referred to arbitration. The Constituent Assembly should be elected on the basis of adult suffrage, the existing separate electorates being retained for such Minorities as desire them. The number of these members in the Assembly should reflect their numerical strength.

The declarations, made on behalf of the British Government being inadequate, have compelled the Congress to dissociate itself from British policy and war efforts, and, as a first step in non-co-operation, to bring about the resignation of all the Congress Governments in the Provinces. That policy of non-co-operation continues and must continue unless the British Government revises its policy and accepts the Congress-contention. The Working Committee would, however, remind Congressmen that it is inherent in every form of *satyagraha* that no effort is spared to achieve an honourable settlement with the opponent. While a *satyagrahi* is ever ready for a non-violent fight, *if it has to come*, he never relaxes his effort for peace and always works for its attainment.

The Working Committee will, therefore, continue to explore the means of arriving at an honourable settlement, even though the British Government has banged the door, in the face of the Congress.

The Committee must, however, resist by the non-violent methods of the Congress, all attempts to coerce the people of India along paths which are not of their choice and every* thing that is against the dignity and freedom of India.

The Working Committee appreciate and express pleasure at the readiness exhibited by Congressmen for the laun

ching of civil disobedience, *should this become necessary*. But civil disobedience requires the same strict discipline as an army organised for armed conflict. The army is helpless unless it possesses its weapons of destruction and knows how to use them ; so also an army of non-violent soldiers is ineffective unless it understands and possesses the essentials of non-violence. The Working Committee desire to make it clear that the true test of preparedness for civil disobedience lies in *Congressmen themselves spinning* and promoting the cause of *khadi* to the exclusion of mill cloth, and deeming it their duty to establish harmony between communities by personal acts of service to those other than members of their own community, and individual Hindu Congressmen seeking occasion for fraternising with the Harijans as often as possible.

Congress organisations and Congressmen should, therefore, prepare for future action by promoting this programme. They should explain to the people the message and policy of the Congress and implications of the Constituent Assembly, which is the crux of the Congress programme for the future.

ANGLO-INDIANS' ATTITUDE

Calcutta, December 1

Presiding over the annual General Meeting of the All-India Anglo-Indian and Domiciled European Association, Sir Henry Gidney made an appeal to the members to stand loyally by the British Empire regardless of whatever may be in store for their community. He emphasised the justice of the cause for which Great Britain had entered the war, in which not only were the interests of the Allies and Great Britain at stake but also the welfare, peace and prosperity of

their own motherland, India. Therefore, as true citizens of India, and loyal subjects of His Majesty, it was their duty to place every ounce of their energy at the disposal of the Empire.

Sir Henry regretted the absence of any realisation by Congress leaders of the vital part played by the Anglo-Indian community in the life of this great country. Congress leaders did not admit of their existence, even as a minority. "They refuse to study our needs," he continued "while they are prepared to enjoy the protection afforded by our Volunteer services in the Auxiliary Force (India). If this is what Dominion Status will mean to us, all I can say is: God help us. Mr. Gandhi recently stated that no community in India needed help except the depressed classes, who were the only minority. I wonder if any well-informed person in India could honestly say that he was not aware of the apprehension of the Anglo-Indian community in an independent India and without the safeguards adumbrated in the Government of India Act of 1935. Let those, who claim self-determination from Great Britain, declare their preparedness to sacrifice something in order to ensure the bread and butter of others who cannot help themselves except by serving others. When this spirit of compromise is in evidence and in practice, I have no doubt that the Anglo-Indians will join hands with others in the attainment of the goal, that is Dominion Status for India, only as a partner in the British Commonwealth of Nations. But under no circumstances could they or would they agree to the proposition that they must surrender their birthright, their loyalty to Great Britain, their family traditions, their standard of living and their mode of life, the maintenance of which in turn depends on their protected existence in the economic

sphere. If the new order of things should demand the surrender of these, they might yet become the Ulster of India."

Criticising the Congress policy with regard to the war as a bargaining attitude, Sir Henry said:

"We condemn any attempt to place a price on our support to the Allies and give our wholehearted support in all ways unconditionally."

IMPERIALISM NOT DEAD

Dec. 4

The following statement was cabled to *The News Chronicle* by Gandhiji:

Mr. Chamberlain is reported to have said, "If imperialism means the assertion of racial superiority, suppression of political and economic freedom of other people, the exploitation of the resources of other countries for the benefit of an imperialist country, then I say these are not the characteristics of this country." This is pleasing to the ear but does not square with facts. The policy adopted in Kenya, the clove business in Zanzibar, the Ottawa Pact, not to speak of the Dominions which exploit the so-called uncivilised races of the earth, do not show as if the imperial spirit was dead. Coming nearer home, is the Paramountcy over Indian Princes consistent with even elementary democracy, let alone death* of imperialism? Princes are made and unmade not for India's good. Millions of Indians remain under undiluted autocracy by reason of the Paramountcy.

Also I fail to see why Britain's intention about India should be dependent upon Muslim, Hindu or any other opinion. The only opinion that counts is India's opinion, not even the Congress opinion. India's opinion can only be ascertained by

the free vote of her people. The only true and democratic method is to ascertain their will through adult suffrage or any agreed equivalent. So far as the Congress is concerned, the people of Princes' India should be represented precisely on the same footing as those of British India. The Muslims and other accepted minorities may be represented by separate electorate, if necessary, and in the exact proportion of their numbers. They will determine what is required for their protection. In all matters of common interest a composite majority decision should prevail. If a better way than a Constituent Assembly can be found for knowing the will of the people, so far as I know, the Congress will accept it without hesitation. Neither the size of the country nor the illiteracy of the masses should be a bar against adult suffrage. The election campaign will itself be sufficient education for the purpose of broadly knowing the popular will.

The declaration of British policy about India is a purely moral issue, for freedom-loving India has neither the will nor the capacity to resort to armed revolt. Nevertheless, it is her right to know Britain's will about her. I am aware that Britain can impress men and money from India treated as her dependency, but she can get moral weight on her side only from an India conscious of her freedom. I am anxious, as a friend of Britain bound by many personal ties, that she should come out victorious not because of her superiority in the use of arms but because of her will to be just all along the line. She will then have the true friendship and sympathy of millions of people all over the world, who have become sick of the wanton waste of precious life and of the palpable lies disseminated to sustain greed and hunger for dominion.

The "Times" on
CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY

London, December 5

The Times, in an editorial article on its Indian correspondent's analysis of the implications of the Congress demand for a British declaration on war aims in relation to India, says that the demand has raised graver issues than appears to have been appreciated among the left wing elements in both countries who are inclined to sweep away practical difficulties as having no bearing on the main question, the future Constitutional status of India.

To ignore the difficulties does not make the situation any the better in India, and some effort must still be made to overcome them so that all sections of Indian opinion may be associated with the people of this country in the more important task of winning the war. The Congress itself condemns Nazism, and Mr. Gandhi reflected the general Indian people when he indicated that his own sympathies were, for humanitarian reasons, on the side of Britain and France.

Unhappily, the extreme elements in India have greatly lessened the international value of Mr. Gandhi's attitude by demanding from British Government an immediate declaration on India's future constitutional status. The latter has long been clearly and authoritatively proclaimed as Dominion Status, but its latest reiteration by the Viceroy did not satisfy the Congress. The assertion is made that the British authorities, in pointing to communal and other difficulties, have confused the issues and made the difficulties an excuse for withholding constitutional advance, but real confusion lies in this assertion.

Constitutional experts all agree that Dominion Status cannot be "conferred" upon the people but exists automatically when certain required conditions are present. When the various political elements in India have agreed on the kind of constitution under which they are prepared to live, the country will have secured Dominion Status for the simple reason that the British Government will have neither the power nor the desire to resist or reject the demand.

The argument that the existence of the minorities in Canada and South Africa had not prevented the attainment of Dominion Status is true enough, but the minorities in both the countries were satisfied with their constitutions and content to live under them. The minorities in India have yet to be satisfied of the conditions under which they are expected to live in future.

Moreover, Congress leaders have not admitted frankly that they accept Dominion Status as the goal. Their recent policy has taken the form of a demand for independence which will give the Indian people the right to frame their own constitution by means of a Constituent Assembly. The convening of such an Assembly now, or even after the war, could only prove to the world the extent of Indian political disunity, and many hold that an attempt to solve the communal problem on the simple majority basis would split India from top to bottom, perhaps irretrievably.

Congress leaders should, therefore, frame their demand to meet actual conditions and show some willingness to accept a position which calls for the reservation of defence, external affairs and some other matters which will qualify complete independence and should, in consultation with the minorities,.

find some basis of agreement that will bring into existence the* environment calculated to make Dominion Status a practical possibility.

On the long view, British policy has already produced definite tangible results. Until ordered out by higher command, the Congress supplied Ministries in eight provinces. That very fact intensified communal bitterness, and it is illogical for the Congress leaders to assume that even greater extension of majority rule could be likely to lessen communalism in the future. Proposals for a constitutional advance, based in the first instance on agreement among the communities and then with Princes would almost certainly have smooth passage through Parliament which, backed by public opinion, is definitely pledged to assist India to attain the full status awaiting her within the British Commonwealth.

BENGAL LEGISLATURE

Wholehearted Support

Dec. 14

The Bengal Legislative Council by 35 votes to 12 passed the following Resolution:—

"This Council is of the opinion that wholehearted help and support should be given to the British Government in the prosecution of the war against the German menace.

"The Council further approves the policy of the Bengal Government towards the present international crisis in condemning the Nazi aggression, and declares its determination to resist this aggression and to protect the security and honour of the Province of Bengal and India with all available resources of the Province.

"It further desires that it should be forthwith made absolutely clear that the Constitution of India shall be examined *de novo* at the end of the war with a view to the immediate attainment of the objective of Dominion Status with effective protection of the due rights of the minorities and other sections in consultation with and agreement of all parties and communities concerned."

A resolution on the same lines was passed by the Bengal Legislative Assembly on Dec. 18 by 142 against 82 votes.

INDIA IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS

MINORITIES MUST BE SAFEGUARDED

Dec. 14

Marquis of Zetland made a statement in the House of Lords, in the course of which he said :—

Since I last addressed your Lordships on the matter, there has been a further meeting of the Working Committee of the Congress and a further statement of their position. There is a sentence contained in it which I warmly welcome; it runs as follows: 'It is inherent in every form of *satyagraha*—that is to say passive resistance—that no effort is spared to achieve an honourable settlement with an opponent.' That I need hardly say is what we ourselves most earnestly desire.

What then, you may ask, stands in the way? Not the least of the obstacles is the difference of opinion between the Congress and the Muslim League as to the relations of the Congress and what, for want of a better term, are described compendiously as minorities. The nature of this difference is

well illustrated by another sentence in the most recent statement by the Congress Working Committee, which runs as follows : 'The Committee wish to declare.....that no communal considerations arise in meeting the demands of the Congress.' I am sure they are sincere in holding that belief; nevertheless, it is one which His Majesty's Government are unable to share.

In their view, no constitution could be expected to function successfully which did not meet with the general assent of the minorities who had to live under it. I am not, of course, in any way, intending to minimise the importance of such sections of the population as the Scheduled Castes, or indeed, of any other minority, when I say that by far the most important of the so-called minority communities are the Muslims. I am well aware that I need hardly say that there are Muslims to be found in the ranks of the Congress; yet the fact remains that of the 482 Muslims elected to the Lower Chambers of the Provincial Legislatures at the last general election only 26 stood as Congressmen, 'and Mr. Gandhi himself has stated that the All-India Muslim League is undoubtedly the largest organisation representing Muslims, though he also' speaks of Muslim bodies which deny its claim to represent them.

There is a further consideration to be borne in mind. We speak of Muslims as a minority, because, on a purely arithmetical basis, they are less in number than Hindus. But they are a community of from eighty to ninety million with race memories of days when, for 200 years, the Moghul Dynasty ruled over a greater part of the Indian sub-continent, They have behind them a tradition of military service which

persists to this day, and is exemplified by the high proportion of the Indian Army which they fill. I have recalled these facts because they make it clear that the minorities of Europe present us with no full analogy and, God knows, the minorities of Europe have been a source of sufficient trouble in the world of today.

I observe that Mr. Gandhi himself in his paper *Harijan* of November 25 speaks of summoning a Constituent Assembly subject to safeguards to the satisfaction of minorities' and he goes on to say : 'The expression-satisfaction of minorities-may be regarded as vague. It can be defined beforehand by agreement.' We too regard it as essential for constitutional advance, by whatever means advance is to be obtained, that assent of the minorities should be secured as far as is possible by agreement. But it is not within our power to impose an agreement upon them ; that can only be reached by Indians themselves. It was with a view to promoting discussion with a view to reaching agreement on safeguards for all minorities between leaders of the Congress and of the All-India Muslim League that they were invited by the Viceroy, not long since (Nov. 1) to meet one another.

*

*

*

I am convinced that so long as the legislatures are divided on communal rather than on political lines, so long will serious difficulty be experienced in the working of democratic institutions with success. What we have to aim at is a state of affairs under which the legislator will think of himself as an-Indian first and as Hindu or Muslim afterwards. When that has been achieved, the greatest stumbling block in the way of India's progress will have been removed.

There are of course, other matters which have to be taken into account. There is the defence of India, our obligations to the Princes, and the position which our own people have built up in India by the enterprise of generations, to mention only some of them. But the supreme problem of the moment is that of minorities, and it is for this reason that I confined myself to it this afternoon.

LORD SAMUEL

Lord Samuel commenting upon Lord Zetland's statement said he had previously expressed the view that while the Congress case was a very strong one, he thought they would have taken the wiser course if they had endeavoured to secure a settlement with the Muslims by friendly negotiation rather than by forcing the issue. He endorsed Lord Zetland's appeal that the two parties should call a truce and endeavour to arrive at a friendly settlement and end these grave difficulties. Lord Samuel ceatimied :—

"It is often said in India that it is the secret policy of Great Britain to foment these religious differences in pursuance of the maxim of divide and rule. That, I am certain, is not true, and the opinion expressed by Lord Zetland today that he would welcome nothing with greater satisfaction than a settlement of these differences is a view which I am sure is held generally in this country. It is an unhealthy state of things that political divisions should follow religious lines. A combination of the two imperil the working of democracy, and if it is possible for a truce to be called, I am sure it would be a step to end the present deadlock that would be most welcome to every political party in this country."

Dec. 15

Speaking at the India-England Luncheon, under the Chairmanship of Mr. G. S. Dara, Lord Samuel observed:

"We are at this moment at a crisis in the civilisation of Europe and the whole world. There are two conflicting philosophies at grips and if the cause, for which we stand, that of liberty and the care of justice and liberty, be defeated, It will be calamitous for the whole of mankind. Why should the burden of this conflict be left to Britain and France, when all progressive minded countries are concerned in it, and rightfully should take up arms in it? Indian public opinion is opposed to Hitlerism and it is deeply to be regretted that the impression should be given to the whole world that the members of the British Commonwealth are not united."

VICEROYS DELIBERATE SILENCE

Calcutta, December, 18

The Viceroy opened the Annual meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce. He dealt with many questions including the crisis in the international sphere and his failure to bring parties and communities in India together on a basis that would admit of harmonious cooperation and progress. With reference to the burning question of the day viz.- the demand of the Congress His Excellency said :—

"There are times when silence about constitutional developments is better than speech and in my judgment this is one of them."¹

AMERICAN STAND

New York, Dec. 21

The Government of New York State have decided to impose a 'moral embargo' on the sale of plans, plants, manufacturing rights and technical information necessary for the manufacture of high quality aviation spirit to countries engaged in unprovoked aerial bombing or machinegunning of civilians. The countries affected are not named but Germany is possibly one of them, (vide pp. 175-7)

TUFKEY'S STAND WITH BRITAIN

London, Dec. 21

At the Overseas League Meeting, at which the French and Turkish Ambassadors were the principal guests, Sir Firozkhan Noon, High Commissioner for India, spoke at the special invitation of Lord Willingdon. He declared that it was very important that the leading Muslim nation should be in amity with Britain and France. All the Muslims of the British Empire were at one in the pleasure that Turkey should have entered into alliance with Britain and France. He asked whether the people of Britain quite realised how much that meant to the Muslim world throughout the Empire* (vide page 129 supra).

SOLUTION IN INDIA

Karachi Dec. 22

Sir M. Zafrullah Khan, who returned by air from Europe, arrived at Karachi and said :—

Britain is very keen on settling the Indian question along reasonable lines, but the trouble is here and the solution has to take place here.

WORKING COMMITTEE'S RESOLUTION

Wardha, Dec. 22

The Working Committee of the Congress after three days' deliberation passed the following Resolution :—

The Working Committee have studied with regret the recent pronouncement of the Secretary of State. His reference to the communal question merely clouds the issue and takes the public mind off the central fact that the British have failed to define their war aims especially with regard to India's freedom. In the opinion of the Working Committee, the communal question will never be satisfactorily solved so long as the different parties are to look to a third party, through whose favour they expect to gain special privileges even though it may be at the expense of the nation. The rule of a foreign power over a people involves a division among the elements composing it. The Congress has never concealed from itself the necessity of uniting the various divisions. It is the one organisation which, in **order** to maintain its national character, has consistently tried, not always without success, to bring about unity. The Working Committee are convinced that lasting unity will only come when foreign rule is completely withdrawn. Events that have happened since the last meeting of the Committee have confirmed this opinion. The Working Committee are aware that the independence of India cannot be maintained if there are warring elements within the country. The Committee are, therefore, entitled to read in the British Government's raising the communal question as reluctance to part with fear.

The constituent assembly as proposed by the Congress is the only way to attain a final settlement of the communal

question. The proposal contemplates the fullest representation of all communities, with separate electorates where necessary. It has already been made clear on behalf of the Congress that minority rights will be protected to the satisfaction of the minorities concerned, differences, if any, being referred to an impartial tribunal.

Congressmen by now realise that independence is not to be won without very hard work. Since the Congress is pledged to non-violence, the final sanction behind it is civil resistance .

which is but a part of *satyagraha*. *Satyagraha* means good will to all, especially towards opponents. Therefore, it is the duty of individual Congressmen to promote and seek good-will. Success of the programme of *khaddar*, as an accepted symbol of non-violence, harmony and economic independence, is indispensable. The Working Committee, therefore, hope that all Congress organisations will, by a vigorous prosecution of the constructive programme, prove themselves fit to take up the call, when it comes.

INDEPENDENCE

By Mahatma Gandhi

From a correspondent's letter I take the following extract:

"While you ask for India's Independence you promise nothing in return. Don't you think a promise of active partnership would show a spirit of reciprocity and may well be given ? Co-operation and interdependence is the law of life. India is in no position even if it gets Independence, to be able to retain it. In Anglo-Indian partnership is our best hope, and a 'Constituent Assembly' on a wide franchise will only make confusion worse* confounded. This work can only be rightly done by a few wise men."

In the first place, the Congress has not asked for Independence. It has asked for a declaration of Britain's war aims. Secondly, Independence, when it comes, will come because India is ripe for it. Therefore there can be no consideration to be given for it. This, however, does not mean a frog in the well status. There may or may not be an alliance with Britain. My hope is that there will be. So long as I have a share in the attainment of Independence, it will be through non-violent means and, therefore, a result of an honourable treaty or settlement with Britain.

I must dissent from the correspondent's view that "India is in no position, even if it gets Independence, to be able to retain it." This is surely a contradiction in terms. The correspondent has involved himself in it because he thinks that Independence can be a gift from someone. India will never have it until it is able to keep it against the whole world. The alliance with Britain will be not for India's protection but for mutual benefit. So long as she needs Britain's protection for whatever cause, her status will be less than Independence. We see the mockery of it going on in Europe today among the small nations. Their Independence is on the sufferance of big nations. I attach little importance to such Independence. So long as the basis of society is force, smaller nations must hold their status on sufferance. I should not be interested in India being in such a position. And India is not a small nation. I would far rather have India engaged indefinitely in a non-violent fight for gaining her Independence than be satisfied with anything less as her goal. She can settle down to peace only when she has Independence which she can hold against any combination. This is possible only on a non-violent basis. It may be far off. It

may not be realised in my lifetime. It may even take generations. I have patience enough to wait. Joy lies in the fight, in the attempt, in the suffering involved, not in the victory itself. For, victory is implied in such an attempt.

I see no difficulty in a Constituent Assembly elected on a wide franchise. But I do in an Assembly of wise men. Where are they? Who will certify to their wisdom?

—*Harijan of December 23*

CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY

Dec. 23

Sir Maurice Gwyer, Chief Justice of the Federal Court of India who is also Vice-Chancellor of the Delhi University, delivered the Convocation Address, in the course of which he dealt with the question of a Constituent Assembly. He said that constituent assemblies elected on a wide franchise, which had sought to combine the securing of unity among diverse elements with the writing of the new constitution itself had not always had a happy result. Referring to the constituent assemblies after the French Revolution, the German National Assembly at Frankfurt and the Russian Constituent Assembly, he said the French National Assembly did indeed produce a constitution on paper, but it failed and was succeeded by a dictatorship, because, intoxicated with theory, it took no account of realities.

By way of contrast it was profitable to look at the procedure adopted for the purpose of bringing into existence the constitutions of Canada, Australia and South Africa. In each of the three cases the body which hammered out the scheme consisted of a very small number of delegates, and though there were difficulties to be overcome, there was no organised volume of opinion which either refused to co-operate

or which recorded its dissent from the scheme ultimately adopted. In a body of delegates like this, men came to know one another better, to appreciate the strong points of another's case and to realise the weaker points of their own*. The impact of mind upon mind had its effect, and after some time (such was the experience of those who had taken part in transactions of this kind) a sort of corporate sense was born, out of which there might emerge, if not a common will, at least a common desire to produce results. This did not always or necessarily happen, but it could and did happen, for it was impossible for a body of men to labour together with a common object for any considerable period of time, without asperities becoming softened, misunderstandings lessened and mutual respect engendered. He drew attention to all these matters because it seemed to him that they deserved to be studied and considered by those whose natural and reasonable desire it was that an Indian constitution should receive an imprimatur from Indians themselves. It was not the making of the constitution itself which necessarily produced agreement. No agreement of any kind was possible without personal contacts, and certainly was not to be achieved by a long-range artillery duel. Constitution-making was a laborious affair which required infinite pains and patience, if lasting results were to be achieved.

Sir Maurice Gwyer pleaded for a new approach to an intractable problem and for that touch of imagination which could transform a whole situation as by the wand of a magician. The agreement for which he pleaded was not the facile arrangement which could always be secured by one party conceding all the claims of the other; not a mechanical compromise, with the ambiguous formula which each party hoped to interpret to

its own advantage; but a union of hearts, an agreement free from illusion, based upon realities and upon mutual confidence and trust. On these foundations, and upon no others, could great States be built.

It might be, concluded Sir Maurice, that the unique and complex problems of Indian Government would be found to require a new technique, or perhaps a new application] of old principles. But why should a suggestion be either rejected at first sight or insisted upon as the only panacea? In God's name, let all suggestions be examined and discussed. Was misunderstanding to continue to breed misunderstanding, and were motives always to be suspect? And, at the end of it all, was India to be confronted with the spectre conjured up by a poet's imagination—the spectre which cried :

"Look in my face; my name is might-have-been;
I am also called no-more, too-late, farewell."

CRIPPS DN SOCIALISM

Calcutta, December 24

Sir Stafford Cripps, K.C., M. P., in the course of his cold weather tour of India was at Calcutta on Dec. 24 and in reply to journalists said that a considerable change in English opinion regarding India had taken place, and they had now become convinced of the need to grant self-government to this country. Even those known to be conservatives and reactionaries were beginning to appreciate the problem and the majority in the House of Commons were in favour today of granting self-government to India immediately after the war. The first step in the solution of the communal problem and in forwarding the cause of socialism was to attain freedom. He added that there was no likelihood of a Popular Front Government in Britain so long as the war lasted.

RUSSO-GERMAN ENTENTE

Moscow, December 25

M. Stalin replied to greetings received on his 60th birthday. To Herr Hitler:

"I request you to accept my gratitude for your congratulations and my thanks for your good wishes to the peoples of the Soviet Union."

To Herr von Ribbentrop :

"The friendship between the peoples of Germany and the Soviet has been cemented by blood and as every reason to be lasting and firm."

SARDAR VALLABBHAI

Bombay, Dec. 26

Addressing the Congress Party in the Bombay Legislature, Sardar Vallabbhai Patel said :—

Congress is not going back to office until it can wield the real power of governance in a free India, In the very nature of things British Imperialism cannot last long. When the war started, Gandhiji declared his sympathy with Britain. Pledged as we were to freedom, we could not have any sympathy for Nazism, though it must be confessed that *it was the humiliating Treaty of Versailles, which the Britishers and their friends imposed upon Germany, that was responsible for Nazism.* However, Gandhiji made it clear that the Congress did not agree with him on this question. The Congress had bitter memories of the last great war.

Indian Troops in France

London, Dec. 27

The first contingent of Indian troops disembarked at a French Port. It consisted entirely of Muslims.

PART VIII

WAR AND PEACE AIMS

Nov. 26. Mr. Chamberlain in his broadcast said:

"Our war aim is to defeat the enemy—not merely the enemy's military forces but also his aggressive and bullying mentality.

"Our peace aims would be to establish a new Europe, not in the sense of redrawing the map according to the ideas of victors, but a Europe with a new spirit, in which the nations of Europe would approach their difficulties with goodwill and mutual toleration. This would take many years, and some machinery would be needed capable of guiding the development of the new Europe in the right direction "

Nov. 28. Mr. Chamberlain in the House of Commons:—

"What we say is that, first of all, we must put an end to this menace under which Europe has lain for so many years. If we could really do that, if confidence could be established throughout Europe, then, whilst I am not excluding the necessity of dealing with other parts of the world, still we feel that Europe is the key to the situation and if Europe could be settled, the rest of the world would not prove so difficult a problem.

"Mr. Atlee said that Imperialism must be abandoned, but he did not say what country he had, in mind as practising Imperialism today. If Imperialism means the assertion of racial superiority, suppression of the political and economic freedom of other peoples, the exploitation of the resources of other countries for the benefit of the Imperialist country, then I say that these are not the characteristics of this country... Whatever might have been the case in the past, the British have no thought of treating the British Empire on the lines I described."

The earlier pronouncements of the King, the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary were the following:—

Sept. 20. in the House of Commons Mr. Chamberlain:—

"Britain's general purpose in this struggle is to redeem Europe from the perpetually recurring fear of German aggression and to enable the peoples of Europe to preserve their liberties and independence."

Nov. 7. In the House of Lords, Lord Halifax:—

"We have learned that there can be no opportunity for Europe to cultivate the arts of peace until Germany is brought to realise that recurrent acts of aggression will not be tolerated. It must accordingly be our resolve not only to protect the future from a repetition of the same injuries that German aggression has inflicted on Europe in the last few years, but also so far as we can, to repair the damage successively wrought by Germany upon her weaker neighbours... We are determined, so far as it is humanly possible, to see to it that Europe shall not again be subjected to a repetition of this tragedy."

November 12. His Majesty King George VI replying to the Monarchs of Belgium and Holland:—

'The larger purposes, for which my peoples are now fighting, are to secure that Europe is redeemed, in the words of the Prime Minister, from the perpetually recurring fear of German aggression to enable the peoples of Europe to preserve their independence **and** liberties' and to prevent the resort to force instead of pacific **means** for the settlement of international disputes."

December 5. Lord Halifax in the House of Lords:—

"We desire to redeem the peoples of Europe from the constant fear of German aggression and safeguard our own freedom and security."

Nov. 28. Major Atlee in the House of Commons: —

"That aggressive spirit was not confined to Germany. The problem of peace is not a continental one; least of all should they look at it from a narrow European angle."

Oct. 18. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru pointed out that the 'better international system' to which Mr. Chamberlain referred 'relates to peoples of Europe and not to Asia or Africa. India continues where she is. The colonies remain where they are. Imperialism is still meant to flourish."

Nov. 11, H. N. Brailsford:—

The Labour movement should without delay state its terms. Some test we must choose. For me, it will be *India* ...How shall we look if we deny democracy to India, while we boast that we are fighting to win it for Germany?"

Nov. 28. The united Provinces Political Conference presided over by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, passed the following Resolution:—

"This Conference is of opinion that the events of the last few weeks have made it clear that the war in Europe is being waged for *imperialist aims* and purposes, and thus the Congress demand that the war and peace aims should be declared, especially so far as they are applicable to India, is fully justified."

October 24. Mahatma Gandhi:—

"My attempt and my prayer are and will be for an honourable peace between the belligerent nations in the least possible time. I had nursed the hope that there would be an honourable peace and partnership between Britain and India, and that I might be able to play a humble part in finding a way out of the awful carnage that is disgracing humanity and making life itself a burden. But God had willed it otherwise."

December 16. Mahatma Gandhi in *Harijan* :—

"I observe that British statesmen have now begun to confine the war aims to the freedom of European nations. Unless the war comes to an abrupt end, they will find it necessary to go back to the original aim of saving the world for democracy."

December 20. Lord Chatfield, Minister for the Co-ordination of Defence, in a broadcast:—

"We have a cause to bring us all together—the inspiration to create a better Europe."

NEXT STEP IN INDIA

Mahatma Gandhi:—

"I hold the opinion strongly that whilst by their own action the British Government have made it impossible for the Congress to co-operate with them in the prosecution of the war, the Congress must not embarrass them in its prosecution."

Harijan, Nov. 3

"The position that is about to face the country is that of the British Government, in alliance with the so called minorities, arrayed against the Congress singlehanded. Civil Disobedience against this combination is a contradiction in terms. It would not even be civil war; it would be criminal war."

A. P. Message, Nov. 5

"Civil Disobedience is by no means the next inevitable forward step."

Harijan, Nov. 18

"I see no immediate prospect of declaring civil disobedience. There can be no civil disobedience for the sake of embarrassing Great Britain."

Harijan, Dec. 2

"I am a general, but a taskmaster as well. Hence I appeal to you for complete devotion to the constructive programme before the signal for a fight is given." —Dec. 28

November 7. Congress President:—

Dr. Rajendra Prasad addressed a meeting of the Bihar' Provincial Congress Committee when he said that non-cooperation had already been declared with the resignation of

the Congress Ministries. The question now was about the -starting of the civil disobedience movement. The Congress had not yet decided when it would start the movement, but the first requisite for that movement was that Congressmen -should be perfectly non-violent. Comparing the position now with that when the previous civil disobedience movements were launched, Dr. Prasad said that during the two previous movements, the Muslim population offered little opposition to the Congress. Today, however, when minor differences led to communal clashes, it was not unnatural that serious communal riots -should break out on political issues, and that was the reason why the Congress was taking time to declare civil disobedience. But, if it was at all declared, then it must be seen that the communal question did not step in any form in ;the struggle. The Muslim population should be shown that the Congress was as much theirs as anybody else's.

.Dec. 14. Pandit Jawaharlal :—

Addressing a public meeting in Bombay Pandit Nehru reviewed the situation which had ended in the resignation of the Congress Ministries. When that step was taken six weeks ago, he said, people expected thai either the Congress would launch *satyagraha* or that the Government would launch an attack on the Congress. But nothing had so far happened. *Up to new Government had net taken any step that would warrant the launching of satyagraha by the Congress.*

Area and Population of the Principal Countries

Countries (including dependencies)	AREA		POPULATION		
	in 1000 sq. km.	Percent of world area	in mil- lions	percent of world population	per sq. km.
Earth	134,500	100'0	2,139	100'0	15'9
German Empire	635	0'5	86	4'0	135'0
Poland	390	0'3	35	1'6	89'3
Japan	1,984	1'5	137	6'4	69'1
China	10,362	7'7	437	20'4	42'2
Holland	2,081	1'5	75	3'5	36'2
Spain	846	0'6	25	1'2	29'5
Turkey	763	0'6	16	0'8	21'6
Egypt	994	0'7	16	0'8	16'0
British Empire	34,946	26'0	525	24'6	15'0
U. S. A.	9,682	7'2	145	6'8	15'0
Italy	3,823	2'8	53	2'5	13'9
Afghanistan	650	0'5	7	0'4	10'8
Mexico	1,969	1'5	19	0'9	9'7
Belgium	2,422	1'8	23	1'1	9'4
Iran	1,644	1'2	15	0'7	9'2
France	12,370	9'2	111	5'2	9'0
Soviet Russia	21,176	15'7	171	8'0	8'1
Colombia	1,162	0'9	9	0'4	8'0
Portugal	2,174	1'6	17	0'8	7'7
Chile	742	0'6	5	0'2	6'2
Peru	1,249	0'9	7	0'4	5'2
Brazil	8,511	6'3	42	2'0	5'0
Saudi Arabia	1,108	0'8	5	0'2	4'7
Argentina	2,797	2'1	13	0'6	4'6
Venezuela	1,020	0'8	3	0'1	3'4
Bolivia	1,333	1'0	3	0'1	2'4

OPEN A NEW CHAPTER

[culled from theHartjan.)

"Let them i. e. the British shed their exploitation policy and their immoral gains first."

"How can anyone work for peace, who has not dissociated himself from the Empire and all it means?"

"If the British are fighting for the freedom of all, then their representatives have to state in the clearest possible terms that the freedom of India is necessarily included in the war aims."

—Mahatma Gandhi¹

"The British Empire in its present exclusive form, with its Imperial preference system—and with all the envies, suspicions and criticism which it causes throughout the world—is one of the greatest obstacles to world peace."

—Charles Roden Buxton

N. 5. If the area and the population of India and Burma be deducted, the incidence of population per sq-kilometre in the British Empire works out at about six only.

Poland is less than one tenth of India both in population: and in area. The minorities make 40 percent of the Polish

EFFORTS FOR PEACE

POPE, ROOSEVELT AND de VALERA

Dec. 24

His Holiness the Pope in his Christmas message to the College of Cardinals said:—

"Atrocities and unlawful use of the means of destruction even against non-combatants and evacuees, against women, old people and children, and contempt of liberty and human life are acts which call for divine vengeance. We have had to witness a series of acts incompatible with international law and humanity. These acts reveal how much juridical sense has been distorted by totalitarian considerations. This category includes premeditated aggression against a small, laborious and pacific nation on the pretext of a menace which never existed and was not even possible. We envisage with horror the consequences of the war. Those responsible for the destiny of peoples should be able to define at an opportune moment the fundamental points of a just and honourable peace, and not refuse *a priori* to negotiate, if the occasion arises."

His Holiness emphasised five points as the foundation for a just international peace :

First, the assurance of the independence of all nations;
Second, the end of the armament race;

Third, juridical institutions must guarantee that the loyal and lawful application of an agreement is of supreme importance to the honourable acceptance of a peace treaty, and that arbitrary and unilateral interpretations of the conditions of a treaty must be avoided;

Fourth, the needs and just demands of the nations and peoples and also ethnic minorities must particularly be considered, if necessary by means of just, wise and acceptable revisions of treaties;

Fifth, the need for those who govern peoples to be imbued with a sense of responsibility.

At the close of his address the Pope thanked President Roosevelt for his noble and generous effort to restore peace, and said other high personalities also whose names he did not wish to mention had approached him with efforts to restore peace.

President Roosevelt sent a message of greeting to the Pope on Christmas Eve and announced the appointment of Mr. Myron Taylor as his personal representative at the Vatican. In his message the President said :—

"It is specially fitting to send your Holiness a message of greeting this Christmas when the world is in sorrow. I believe that, while statesmen are considering a new order of things, a new order may well be at hand. I believe that it even now is being built silently and inevitably in the hearts of the masses whose voices are not heard, but whose common faith will write the history of our time.

"I should like to send a personal representative to the Vatican in order that our paraltel endeavours for peace and alleviation of suffering may be assisted.

"I trust ail Churches which believe in one common God will throw the great weight of their influence ifcto this great cause,,,"

The appointment of Mr. Myron Taylor, former Chairman of the United States Steel Corporation, as President Roose-

velt's personal representative to the Vatican in order, as the President stated in his message to the Pope, "that our parallel endeavours for peace and alleviation of suffering may be assisted," was regarded by observers from Washington, "as part of the preparation by President Roosevelt for a new effort to bring about peace."

The Hew York Times declared that many Washington diplomats held the view that, unless hostilities ended by the spring, "the great war machines in Europe would be unleashed! in earnest."

Mr. Taylor's appointment was regarded as an indication of "co-operation between the two great leaders, whose efforts, more than those of any other heads of nations, might be welcomed by the belligerent countries, should there be any desire on their part to sit around a council table."

On Christmas Eve it was announced that the Pope would pay a return visit to the King of Italy—a historic event* Since 1870 the Pope did not cross home to visit the reigning Sovereign of Italy.

Broadcasting from Dublin to the people of the United States of America, Mr. de Valera urged that a conference of war leaders should be held to seek a settlement. People of the Eire and the United States were not belligerents, but both sympathised with those enduring the horrors of war. It was better to seek a settlement in goodwill rather than wait until exhaustion had forced it. The way to a conference would have to be tried eventually when the war ended and common sense suggested that it should be tried now before the war had wrought its full havoc.

From the October Encyclical of

HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS XII

"Let us leave the past and turn our eyes towards that future, which according to the promises of the powerful ones of this world is to consist, once the bloody contests of today have ceased, in a new order founded on justice and on prosperity. Will that future be really different, above all, will it be better? Will treaties of peace, will the new international order at the end of this war be animated by justice and by equity towards all, by that spirit which frees and pacifies? Or will there be a lamentable repetition of ancient and of recent errors? To hope for a decisive change exclusively from the shock of war and its final issue is idle as experience shows. The hour of victory is an hour of external triumph for the party to whom victory falls, but it is in equal measure, the hour of temptation. In this hour the angel of justice strives with the demon of violence; the heart of the victor all too easily is hardened; moderation and farseeing wisdom appear to him weakness; the excited passions of the people, often inflamed by the sacrifices and sufferings they have borne, obscure the vision even of responsible persons and make them inattentive to the warning voice of humanity and equity which is overwhelmed or drowned in the inhuman cry 'vae victis, woe to the conquered.'¹ There is danger lest settlements and decisions born in such conditions should be nothing else than injustice under the cloak of justice."

Historic Meeting

Dec, 28* His Holiness the Pope visited the King and Queen of Italy at the Quirinal.

INDEX

			PAGE
Aga Khan	...	...	38,80
All-India Congress Committee	••	...	58,60,96
Ambedkar, Dr.	...	...	47, 86, 96, 119
Anglo-Franco-Turkish Pact	...	...	127, 177, 207
Anglo Indians	...	...	195
Anglo-Polish Pact	...	...	17, 19
Arab Support	...	...	139
Area of Countries	...	...	221
Assam Ministry	...	...	189
Atlee	...	...	90,131
Bargain	...	...	81, 193
Bengal Legislature	...	...	201
Bhopal, H. H. the Nawab of	...	...	66
Bhulabai J. Desai	...	...	1, 4, 6
Billimoria, Sir S.	...	...	120
Bose, Subash Chandra	...	...	89, 96, 117
Brailsford, H. N.	...	...	217
British Empire	15, 35, 36, 38, 46, 162, 195, 207, 216, 222	...	
Canada	...	...	26,46,200,211
Catholics	...	...	29
Chamberlain	19, 21, 23, 27, 34, 39, 150, 215, 216	...	
Chintamani, Sir C. Y.	...	...	47
Christians	...	...	29
Churchill	...	...	23
Commons, House of	...	99, 108, 140, 166, 186	
Congress	57, 58,76, 79, 86,94,99,121,138, 165, 167, 173, 178.	181 202 214 219	
Constituent Assembly	53, 137, 139, 161, 173,'193,' 195.'199,	208,211	
Council of State	...	...	
Cripps, Sir Stafford	...	...	99,413
Daily Herald	...	••	93
Democracies	...	••	32
Desai—see Bhulabhai J. Desai	...	...	
Eire	...	...	•• 26
Federation	..		45108, 159

	PAGE
Feroze Khap Noon, Sir	207
Gandhi—See Mahatma Gandhi	
Germans	27, 34, 39, 56
Gidney, Sir Henry	149
Government of India Act—See India Act	
Governors	71, 152, 154, 167
Governor-General—See Viceroy	
Greenwood	131, 191
Gwyer, Sir Maurice	211
Halifax. Viscount	91, 109, 156, 216, 217
Hassan-Ud-Din, Sir S.	35
Hitler	9, 11, 12, 16, 19, 33, 34, 65, 138, 186, 188, 190, 124
Hoare, Sir Samuel	140, 152, 153, 182, 183
Huq, Fazlul	73
Independence	209, 210
Independent Labour Party	47, 119, 135
Iridia Act	25, 50, 59, 69, 74, 107, 108, 109, 110, 125, 135, 144, 149, 161, 163, 166, 167, 196
Indian National Congress—See Congress.	
Indian States	54, 79, 108, 114, 116, 158, 166, 188
Jawaharlal Nehru	40, 61, 72, 81, 89, 93, 94, 154, 179, 189, 217, 220
Jinnah, M. A.	29, 36, 85, 86, 94, 104, 155, 168, 170, 172, 174, 179, 185
King George VI	19, 21, 38, 45, 109, 217
Landlords	30
Liberal Party (Indian).	6, 43, 86, 116, 136
Linlithgow, Marquis of—see Viceroy	
Lords, House of	75, 79, 155, 181, 202, 216, 217
Mahatma Gandhi	29, 32, 61, 63, 75, 79, 94, 100, 103, 118, 122, 137, 152, 155, 160, 168, 170, 174, 183, 188, 197, 209, 218, 219, 222
Mahrattas	180
Manchester Guardian	42, 84, 92, 93, 100, 118, 165.
Mehta, Jamshed N. R.	84
Mody, Sir H. P.	120

			PAGE
Molotov	...	...	9, 13, 14, 15, 67, 68
Moral Asset	...	...	61
Muslim League	68, 73, 76, 116, 134, 165, 167, 168, 185, 203,		204
Muslim Opinion	*•	35, 129, 203, 207, 214, 220	
News Chronicle	••	••	94, 138, 188, 197
Non-cooperation	...	...	219
Parsis	...	...	30, 98, 120
Poland	...	...	17, 24, 47, 51
Pope	...	...	... 223, 226
Population of Countries	...	...	221
Provincial Assemblies	...	...	151, 154, 203
Provincial Ministries	...	...	152, 154, 162, 165
Punjab Assembly	...	...	180
Radhakrishnan, Sir S.	••	...	31
Rajagopalachariar, C.	...	...	100
Rajah, M. C.	...	...	... 95, 98
Rajendra Prasad, Dr.	93, 119, 154, 155, 168, 170, 172, 219		
Ribbentrop, Herr von	...	...	15, 214
Roosevelt	«•*	...	40, 175, 177, 224
Russo-German Pact	...	...	9, 15, 214
Samuel, Lord	...	...	156, 166, 205, 206
Sapru, Sir Tej Bahadur	...	...	- 34, 129
Satyagraha	...	••	194, 202, 209
Scheduled Castes	••	...	86, 95, 187, 203
Seven Leaders	...	...	86
Secretary of State—see Zetland			
Shafaat Ahmad Khan, Sir	...	...	*•• 36
Sikandar Hyat Khan, Sir	...	...	26
Siv Raj (M.L.A.)	••	...	120
Snell, Lord	...	...	75, 76, 77, 78, 155
South Africa	...	...	26, 200, 211
Soviet Parliament	...	...	13, 14, 19
Srinivasan, R.	«••	••	... 120, 187
Stalin	...	• «•	11, 14, 15, 214
Statute of Westminster	...	...	 183
Sultan Ahmed, Sir	...	• «	37

	PAGE
Tagore, Dr. Rabindranath	... 4Z
Times, London	... 46,116, 179,199
Turkey	... 127, 128, 129, 177, 207
U.S.A.	... 175,207
Vallabhbhai Patel, Sardar	... 89,93,214-
Versailles, Treaty of	... 20,52,214-
Viceroy	23, 36, 45, 63, 66, 69, 71, 78, 103, 116, 121, 123, 124, 145, 155, 164, 167, 170, 172, 174, 206
War	... 21
War Aims	... 103,106,215
Wazir Hassan, Sir	... 38
Withdrawal of M. L. A. 'S	... 59
Working Committee (Congress).	50, 59, 81, 97, 132, 168,, 191, 208
Zafarulla Khan, Sir M.	... 190, 207
Zetland, Marquis of	75, 77, 80, 81, 95, 121, 122, 163, 181, 202

