

ALL INDIA
Akhand Hindusthan Conference

Held at NEW DELHI
October, 1944.

Lala Narayan Dutt,
Chairman
RECEPTION COMMITTEE.

हिंदू महासभा के मन्तव्य ये हैं—

- क) हिन्दू समाज के सभी अङ्गों को संगठित करके एक सूत्र में आबद्ध करना।
- ख) जहाँ और जब आवश्यकता हो हिन्दू हितों को आगे बढ़ाना और उनकी रक्षा करना।
- ग) असुस्थिता का निवारण करना और हिन्दू समाज में दलित कही जाने वाली जातियों की स्थिति को सुधारना।
- घ) हिन्दू नारीत्व के उच्च आदर्शों को पुनर्जागृत करना तथा उन्हें आगे बढ़ाना।
- ङ) गोरक्षा को प्रोत्साहित करना।
- च) हिन्दुओं की शारीरिक शक्ति को बढ़ाना और सैनिक शिक्षा के लिये सैनिक स्कूलों और सैनिक स्वयं-सेवक-मण्डलियों की स्थापना कर हिन्दुओं में सैनिक भाव भरना।
- छ) जिन लोगों ने हिन्दू धर्म को छोड़ दिया है, उन्हें हिन्दुत्व की गोद में वापिस लेना तथा दूसरों को भी हिन्दू-धर्म जाति में प्रविष्ट करना।
- ज) निराश्रित स्त्रियों तथा अनाथ बच्चों के लिए अनाथालयों तथा वनिताश्रमों की स्थापना करना।
- झ) हिन्दू जाति के धार्मिक, शिक्षा-संवर्धनी, सामाजिक, आर्थिक तथा राजनैतिक हितों और अधिकारों की रक्षा और पोषण के लिए आवश्यक उपाय करना।
- ञ) भारत के हिन्दू, भूतपूर्व हिन्दू तथा अन्य धर्मावलम्बी समाजों में सद्भाव उत्पन्न करना, और स्वयं शासन करने वाली एक सम्मिलित भारतीय-राष्ट्र को बनाने की दृष्टि से उनके साथ मित्रता का बर्ताव करना।

आवश्यक—धार्मिक व्यवहारों के मामले में महासभा हिन्दू-समाज की किसी जाति या सम्प्रदाय का पक्षपात या विरोध न करेगी और न उनमें किसी तरह हस्तक्षेप करेगी।

DS480
83
A1A5
1944

The All India Akhand Hindustan Conference was convened by following

Leaders:—

Conveners.

Syt. N. C. Kelkar.
Bar. Jamnadas Mehta, President Democratic Swaraj Party.
Syt. George S. Arundale, Adyar.
Dr. V. D. Savarkar, President, Hindu Maha Sabha.
Syt. S. M. Parande, President, Varnashram Swaraj Sangh.
Kunwar Guru Narain.
Dr. Sir Gokalchand Narang, Punjab.
Raja Sir Raghunandan Prasad, Bihar.
Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji.
Seth Gulabchand Hirachand.
Syt. Virumal Begraj, Sind.
Syt. B. C. Mandal, M.L.A. (Depressed Classes) Bengal.
Dr. B. S. Moonje.
Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookerji.
Dr. P. N. Bannerji, M.L.A., Leader, Nationalist Party in the Central Assembly.
Syt. N. C. Chatterji.
Dr. P. Varadrajulu Naidu.
Shri B. G. Khaparde, M.L.A., Ex. Minister, C. P. & Berar.
Mahashay Krishan Proprietor "Pratap" Lahore.

Amid scenes of great enthusiasm the Conference began its deliberations on the 7th October 1944 at 7.30 p.m. in the specially erected pandal in the Hindu Mahasabha premises, New Delhi. The Hindus from every province and state of India took part, a list of the prominent delegates is given below:—

Bengal.

1 Mr. N. C. Chattarji.
2 „ Ashutosh Lahiry.
3 „ J. N. Bannerji.
4 „ Akil Sarkar.
5 „ Dhirendra K. Ghose.
6 „ Nalini Ghose.

7 „ Satya Kumar Roy.
8 „ Hemendra Chandra Pandit.
9 „ Nagendra Nath Nandy.
10 „ Mrs. Sarala Devi Chaudharani.
11 „ Mauj Kumar Sarwadhikary.
12 „ Swami Paramanand.
13 „ Swami Vikashanand.

14 Mr. Pt. Mehar Chand Dhiman, Calcutta.

U. P.

- 15 Mr. Ballar.
16 Mr. Ramdas Nirmohi.
17 Lala Hariram Seth.
18 Kunwar Guru Narain.
19 Raj Nath Kanwar.
20 Vishwanath Agrawal.
21 Sidh Prasad Pande,
22 C. L. Parashari,
23 Dr. Dharm Parkash.
24 Mr. R. P. Kishore.
25 „ Kailash Chandra Trivedi.
26 Dr. Lele.
27 Prtaap Narain Misra.
28 Rajaram Sabir.
39 Aditya Kumar Bajpai.

Hardwar.

- 30 Mahant Shiv Dayal Giri.
31 Seth Bhal Chandrari.
32 Seth Chuhan Mal Manjal.
33 Dr. Jagdish Misra Kausal.

Punjab.

- 34 Master Tara Singh.
35 Prof. Ganga Singh.
36 Madan Mohan, Editor Adesh.
37 Varanashram Swarajya.
Sangh, Meerat.

Kashmere

- 38 Prof. Shriram Shrinagar

Mandi

- 39 Hirde Ram

Bihar

- 40 Kumar Ganganand Singh M.L.C

Assam

- 41 Anang Mohan Dew M. L. A. (Central)
42 Satish Singh

Delhi

- 43 Hon'ble Dr. N. B. Khare
44 Hon'ble Sardar Jogindar Singh
45 Lala Narain Datta
46 R. B. Harish Chandra
47 Lala Ganpat Rai ji
48 Prof. Ram Singh
49 Seth Ramgopal Dushalewale
50 Vaidraj Sheo Nathji
51 Satya Narain Gurwale
52 Devavrat Dharamendu
53 Maunit Advocate
54 Baba Milkha Singh
55 Pt. Mool ji
56 K. Gupta
57 Dwarka Khosla
58 Jagbir Singh
59 Pt. Onkar Lal
60 Lala Deva Rsj
61 Lala Deshraj

Berar.

- 62 Mr. B. G. Khaparde.
63 „ Dr. S. K. Kane.
64 „ Dr. Yadavrao Aney

C. P.

- 65 Dharmveer Dr. B. S. Moonje.
66 Mr. P. B. Bhawe General Secy.
C. P. Hindu Sabha Editor Pratap.
67 „ Bal Shastri Madras.
68 „ V. G. Deshpande.

Bangalore.

- 69 Mr. Bhoopalam R. Chandra Shekarayya.
70 Dr. G. V. Ramachar.

Madras.

- 71 Dr. P. Varadarajula Naidu.
72 Mr. Panchraj Ayyar.

Keral.

- 73 Mr. Palat, Ex-Minister Madras

Andhra.

- 74 Mr. Subramhanya, Nandyal

Mahakosal.

- 75 Ramkrishna Pandye.
76 „ Naturam Shukla, M.A.L.L.B.
Editor Shakti

Punjab.

- 77 Dr. Gokal Chand Narang.
78 Capt. Keshash Chandra.
79 Mr. Brijlal.
80 Mr. Ajit Singh Satyarthi.
81 Mr. Hardayal.
82 Dr. Satya Prakash.
83 Mr. Babu Suresh Chandra.
84 Harban Singh.
85 Gyani Pindidas

Sind.

- 86 Mr. Virumal Begraj.
87 „ Bhoj Raj Ajawani.
88 „ Lokamal Chelaram.
89 „ Lal Chand Agrya.

Gwalior.

- 90 Mr. Nathulal.
91 Dr. Parchure.
92 Mr. Puranik.
93 Dr. Kishore.
94 Mr. Dandwate.
95 Mr. Pt. Sureo Deo.
96 Dr. Jamnadas Mukhariyya.
97 Pt. Udivadass Mehta.

Bhopal.

- 98 Mr. Niranjanji Varma, Vakil.
99 Mrs. Parachure.

Jaipur.

- 100 Mr. Phoolchand Gupta.
101 „ Gulabchand Kala.
102 „ Shyamlal Varma.
103 „ Dr. S. P. Banerji.
104 „ Khemaraj Premi.
105 „ Shet Ganesh Narain Somani.
106 „ Rup Chand Luhia.

Baroda.

- 107 Mr. M. K. Sant.
108 „ Anand Priya.
109 „ D. A. Patel.
110 „ E. K. Walankar.
111 „ Jorawar Singh.
112 Miss Yeshoda Ben.
113 „ Rashmi Ben.
114 „ Saguna Kumari.

Indore.

- 115 Mr. Balarao Ingale.
116 Munashi.
117 Mrs. Sushilabai Munashi.

Dhar.

- 118 Mr. Kale.
119 Mrs. Kale.

Hyderabad.

- 120 Bar. Shankar Rao Borgaokar, Ex-M.L.C.
121 Mr. Chdhanpalji.
122 „ V. Ramchandra Rao.
123 „ Yeshvant Rao Joshi, B.A., General Secretary Hyderabad Hindu Mandal.
124 „ Girdharchari.

- 125 Mr. Gundaraji.
126 „ Mohan Singh.
127 „ Kaiser Singh.

Bombay.

- 128 Veer V. D. Savarkar, President, *All India Hindu Maha Sabha, Bombay.*
129 R. B. S. K. Bhole J. P. President, *Bombay Province Hindu Sabha, Bombay.*
130 Dr. D. G. Abhyankar, *Bombay.*
131 Dr. Purandare, *Bombay.*
132 Mr. L. G. Thatte, General Secretary *Anti Pakistan Front.*
133 Mr. Narawane, *Bombay.*
134 Mrs. Kirkire, *Bombay.*
135 Mr. Paramakar, *Bombay.*
136 Mr. A. S. Bhide (Guruji), *Bombay.*
137 Mr. G. V. Damle, *Bombay.*
138 Mr. Appa Kasar, *Bombay.*
139 Mrs. Saraswati Bai Kinwalikar, *Bombay.*

MAHARASHTRA.

Poona.

- 140 Mr. L. B. Bhopatkar.
141 „ D. V. Gokhale, Sub Editor *Kesari Poona.*
142 „ K. H. Dhamadhere.
143 „ N. G. Abhyankar, Leader *National Municipal Party, Poona.*
144 „ G. M. Nalawade.
145 „ H. B. Bhide.
146 „ N. V. Godse, Editor *Agrain.*
147 „ Gangurde, Municipal Commissioner *Poona.*
148 „ Vishwasrao Daware, *Varnashram Swarajya Sangh.*
149 „ Sane.
150 „ Mrs. Kirtan Tarangini Mrs. Shantabai Gokhale.
151 „ Miss Malti Khare.

- 152 Mrs. Janikibai Joshi, President *All India Hindu Mahila Sabha.*
153 Mr. S. V. Joshi.
154 „ Nanal.
155 Mrs. Nanal.

Walchand Nagar.

- 156 Seth Gulab Chand Hirachand, *M.L.A.*

Chalisgaon.

- 157 Mr. Jogalekar, *B.A., L.L.B.*

Ahmad-nagar.

- 158 Mr. Nana Saheb Saptarishi, *B.A., L.L.B.*

Kolhapur.

- 159 Mr. G. R. Bhide.

Sangali.

- 160 Mr. Vitthal Rao Joshi.

Rajghar.

- 161 Rao Bahadur Lele, *Diwan of Rajgad.*
162 Mrs. Lele.

Hyderabad.

- 163 „ Mohan Lal Verma.
164 „ Krishna Rao Morankar.

Delhi.

- 165 Bawa Bachitra Singh.
166 Sardar Sundar Singh Dhupia.
167 R. S. Seth Girdhari Lal.
168 Mr. Indra Prakasha.
169 Mr. Ikbai Krishna Varma.
170 Mr. D. G. Kulkarni.
171 Lala Shankarlal.
172 Mr. Apte.

The pendal was packed to its fullest capacity. The holy song of Vandey Mataram sung in a chorus made the people to think seriously about their future. In the pin-drop silence, His Holiness Shree Shankar Acharya gave his blessings to the conference in the following words.

श्रीमत्परमहंस परित्राजकाचार्य श्री मच्छंकराचार्य श्री १००८ योगेश्वरानन्दतीर्थ महाराज
गोवर्धनमठ पुरी

आशीर्वाद पत्रकम्

जयतु जयतु गंगा निर्मलाम् प्रवाहा ।
जयतु जयतु शैलो हैमनामो नगेशः ॥
जयतु जयतु देवी भारतीचार्यमता ।
जयतु जयतु संघो हिंदुधर्माभिमानि ॥

भो भो आर्यजननी सेवकाः युष्मत्संमेलनेन नितरां हर्षोःपुल्लहृदयवयमभिनन्दामहे
ऽखिला नर्पजनान् ।

श्री भारतवर्षमखण्ड दंडायमानं विराजतेऽज्ञातेतिहासकालात् । श्री भारतवर्षीया “वेदोखिलं
धर्ममूलमिति मत्वा वेदोदित मार्गानुसारेण निवसन्ति स्म नानामताभिमानिनिश्चितकालाभ्रदाह
भावेनेति ज्ञानमित्रद्वीपनिवासिभिरयं प्राचीनेतिहासदृश्यते ।

श्री भगवत्पूज्यपाद श्रीमदाज्ञांकराचार्यवर्यैश्चतुर्विधवेदवेदांग ज्योतिषादिदिशादितरणार्थं
सनातन धर्म प्रचारार्थं च स्थापितानि चत्वारि पीठानि ।

पीठानां स्थापनेऽन्तरहंतुस्तु भारतवर्षमखण्डस्थास्यत्वेयमेवश्रीपूज्यापदानामासीन्नेतर
इति जानीमः ।

अधुना स्वार्थं निबिडांधकारनिमग्नाः केचन महंमदमत्वभिमानिनो भारतवर्षस्य भारतसालुर्वा
खंडनकर्मणि कृत बुद्धयः पापबुद्धयलुक्कुर्वाण न जानन्त्याभहितमिति दृष्टवाहुनोत्पत्त्यन्मानसम् ।

अखंड भारत विच्छेदन प्रतिबंध को भवतां प्रयत्नो यशः शाली स्यादित्वाशीर्वाचनप्रदायामः
श्री जगन्नाथ श्री राधाकृष्णचन्द्र रेण्याणया इति शम् ।

After the blessings Mr. Jamnadas Mehta rose to deliver the inaugural address. In a forceful and vigorous speech, characteristic of a Parliamentarian, and accompanied by thunderous denunciation of the Pakistan Scheme, he declared :—

I consider it a privilege to be invited to inaugurate this historic Conference and I am deeply grateful for this honour. My task is considerably lightened by two facts. In your Chairman of the Reception Committee you have got my esteemed friend Lala

Narayan Dutt, the grand old man of Delhi whose mature wisdom and sterling patriotism all have learned to admire who have come into contact with him. In your president you have secured a profound scholar and an ardent champion of India's unity who will speak to us with an authority all his own. Professor Radha Kumud Mukherji can be depended upon to give us a correct lead in this supreme crisis.

I shall therefore be very brief. We are meeting here to-day to proclaim to all whom it may concern that India is one and indivisible and will remain so for ever and for ever. We are meeting not a day too soon. We are faced with a crisis of unparelled gravity. The cumulative effect of the divide and rule policy of our rulers initiated in 1905 and since systematically fostered has shattered the country's political life, created vested interests against our unity and freedom by throwing out a class of parasites who are feathering their own nests at the expense of national well-being and the fight for freedom has degenerated into a scramble for crumbs of patronage at the hands of the foreigner.

To secure the freedom of India by consolidating ourselves into a strong and virile nation inspite of differences of caste and creed was the objective of the fathers and the founders of the Indian National Congress. Dadabhai Naoroji, Badruddin Tyabji, Tilak, Bannerjee and Lajpat Rai to mention only a few gave their very best in the pursuit of that ideal and they achieved a substantial measure of success, but during the last quarter of a century we are having one set-back after another. We have fallen on strange times—indeed evil times. Pseudo-religious theories, metaphysical doctrines, fanatical communalism, idol-worship in its most abject form and the emergence of an amazing degree of slave mentality have combined to undermine Indian Nationalism; the labours of the patriots and Statesmen of a whole generation are on the point of being destroyed.

The Indian National Congress itself has now evolved some dogmas and doctrines which at best are irrelevant and at worst are suicidal. Its leader announced long ago the theory of the "blank cheque." He gave the fatal advice "neither to accept nor to reject" the so-called Communal award and he has now become a convert to the principle of vivisection, which only yesterday he had denounced as sin. "United we stand divided we fall" was the old battle cry of our political life. We are now told, in the name of India's freedom that we should agree to divide in order to unite. If only we could show some superficial unity to oust "The third party", it is fondly hoped, we can liberate India. A more tragic confession of failure a greater bankruptcy of political acumen it is difficult to conceive. We must commit national suicide first so that we can live as free men ever afterwards, is the new slogan. Indian Nationalism is to be crucified on the cross of expediency and the temple of India's freedom is to be built on the grave of India's unity. Can self-deception and defeatism go further?

Such is the crisis which we have to face: there new lies before us the formidable task of resisting the threat of destruction both of India's freedom and India's unity. I

would not have worried much if the threat had come only from our Imperialistic masters. That has been a calculable risk all along ever since 1884. We could reasonably anticipate it. We had no right to expect them to behave better. But the threat is more mischievous and insidious since we have succumbed to the tactics of "The third party". Those who should have stood like a rock for the oneness of India have fallen flat at the feet of the enemy. Instead of fighting the Britisher as one solid block, we are trying to conciliate communalism; where firmness was needed appeasement is adopted; where courage was called for, wobbling has been chiefly in evidence.

It will not be out of place at this stage briefly to refer to the background of the present crisis. It began with the Partition of Bengal. The "Favourite wife theory" then came to light for the first time and has since then been increasingly relied upon to discredit the nascent nationalism which the Indian National Congress had helped to create. How Lord Minto the then Viceroy engineered out of a coterie of Nawabs and Khan Bahadurs the so-called Muslim deputation to wait upon him in 1905; how he started what Lord Morley called "the Muslim hare"; how this coterie was made to present a faked address to him prepared by the bureaucracy—all this is recent history with that "Command performance" as the late Maulana Mohamed Ali aptly described it, the disruption of Indian Nationalism was started on its way. It has since then been vigorously followed up. The Nawabs and the Khan Bahadurs were unable to resist the lure of patronage and publicity which Lord Minto gave them and they were quite willing to believe that what was to their personal advantage was also for the benefit of the Muslim community. More and more Muslims fell easy victims to the blandishments of the Bureaucracy, although the educated Muslims as a class then stood aloof. Mr. Mohammad Ali Jinnah being one of them, but has since capitulated to this reactionary crowd and is out heroding Hero now. What is true of the Muslim community is true of other minorities. They one and all accepted the new policy as their protection and became the props of alien rule. Only the Sikhs on the whole remained loyal to nationalism.

The Government of India Act 1935 stabilised communalism as the ruling factor in Indian polity. Looking back in the light of the events of the past decade I am beginning to feel that however faulty that act was, it had one great merit. It secured the fundamental unity of India. Lord Lothian had again and again emphasised this aspect of the Federal Constitution and time has shown that he was right. But with the best of motives, Nationalist India rejected it? the Princely Order played with it out of fear and narrowness of outlook, the Hindu Mahasabha rejected it because it was bad and the Muslim League rejected it because it was not bad enough. The result was drift, cleavage, frustration until the emergence of Pakistan has finally stultified all of us.

Communalism made giant strides as time went on. Communal representation, communal franchise, reservations of public offices not on merits but on communal basis,

separate electorate followed in quick succession till in about the year 1920 old values went out of vogue? Nationalism came under the sinister shadow of rabid communal champion. The nation came to be forgotten in the communities. By this time, the old veterans of the congress had mostly died out and Gandhiji came on the scene as the prophet of a new age. He raised rosy hopes of freedom, promised Swaraj within a year, preached strange doctrine, encouraged blind worship and instead of standing up for nationalism pure and unadulterated sought the support of communalists in the fight for freedom. India had to pay and still continues to pay a heavy price for the Mahatma's well meant departure from the straight and the narrow path of true nationalism. The more he preached this new fangled idea, the worse the situation became; communalists became more and more aggressive in their separatism each outbidding the other. Nationalism had become almost disreputable. Communal champions are holding up the country's freedom and Pakistan is the latest form in which the mischief has appeared.

4. The Pakistan idea—the two nations theory in particular—is conceived in ignorance, selfishness and conceit; it is fed by fanaticism, fear and suspicion. It is sustained by a slavish reliance on the part of its advocates on the support of the „Third Party” who by no stretch of imagination can be credited with a desire to give up power, prestige and profit which accrue to it through the continuous subjection of India. If it appears to hold the field to-day in Indian politics that is due to the weakness and hesitancy of the Congress dictator and his evil genius I mean the Great Rajaji to the blind hero-worship of the rank and file of the Congress organisation and to the mental and moral paralysis bordering on coma—which overtakes the Congress Press as soon as Gandhiji makes one of his periodical recantations of all that he had said and preached before. It has been artfully engineered, and adroitly nourished by our masters until it has thoroughly befogged all-Indians and foreigners alike and created confusion where clarity should have prevailed.

The break down of the Gandhi-Jinnah negotiations has been received by every nationalist and patriotic Indian with unfeigned relief. If there are any among the entourage of the two leaders who profess to be sorry over the result of this conspiracy to vivisection India, they are free to stew in their own juice. For weeks these talks were made to appear as if they were some might endeavour in India's interest; a stage managed psychological atmosphere was created in the press. The talks were said to be paving the way for India's freedom. The critics of these talks were denounced as enemies of India's independence and the stooges of an alien domination. We were admonished to hold our peace while the talks were going on so that the two leaders might be enabled to shape India's destiny; truth to tell, these two gentlemen were engaged in nothing better than a game of gigantic bluff. If they had succeeded they would have been guilty of the greatest act of vandalism against this country. I am glad that we refused to remain silent and raised a storm of protest and indignant dissent; we could hardly have done less. The appeal to observe a disciplined silence while the great drama of dismemberment was being planned by the two gentlemen was like an appeal to the Police to withdraw from their beat when on a dark

night two suspicious looking characters are prowling about a house with a view to breaking it open and looting it while the inmates were asleep. And I am glad, they have failed and deservedly failed; if India remains one and united, the historian will record that it was not due to the fault of Messrs. Gandhi and Jinnah who evidently believed that they could bamboozle the British into „quitting India” by such pretended unity and suicidal action.

Although the sinister shadow of vivisection has for the time being been lifted and there is room for some relief, there is no cause for complacency. We must not forget that Gandhiji, though failed, has not admitted defeat. He has retired sine die to fight another day. Mr. Jinnah also had stated that the failure of talks was not the final end of the discussions. I may say at once that I am not much afraid of Mr. Jinnah. His two-nation theory and his insistence on the Lahore Resolution as the last word on India's political destiny are such patent absurdities that they carry their own failure within themselves. We shall not follow him. We shall not agree to divide and be doomed. Such insanities convince no one either in India or outside and the coteries of the Nawabs Nawabzadas, Khan Bahadurs who constitute Mr. Jinnah's brain trust are least likely to carry conviction to any man of average intelligence that India should be partitioned on theocratic basis. I am not therefore much afraid of Mr. Jinnah. I am somewhat afraid of the great Rajaji because of his subtleties and unprincipled expediency. But Gandhiji is another problem. You never can feel sure that what he has said to-day, he will uphold to-morrow; there is nothing to prevent him from saying to us in a few months that 1945 is not 1944. He is the author of the blank cheque theory; he is law unto himself; he has reduced the great Indian National Congress organisation to the position of his marionette and it is difficult to judge what way the Congress cat may jump under the Mahatmic inspiration. Yesterday he considered the partition of India as a sin; today he advocates a variety of Pakistan as the royal road to India's liberation. If eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, it is also the price of unity without which freedom cannot be achieved or maintained. We must, therefore, start some machinery for carrying out the struggle for national unity before we return home. The time is favourable. Public opinion both in India and in England is on our side. Two Viceroy, Lord Linlithgow and Viscount Wavell have realised the danger of vivisectioning India in the interests not merely of India alone but of the world as a whole. The British Press have scented the danger. „India is indivisible and cannot be divided with a pair of scissors” says Mr. Bernard Shaw.

Nor is it to be supposed that Mr. Jinnah has the backing of the Muslim intelligensia. Although their views are likely to be drowned amidst the sound and fury of fanatics, educated Muslims are on the whole showing admirable courage. Mr. Jinnah himself will not claim to be a better Muslim than Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad, the president of the Congress. This is what the great Muslim savant says about Pakistan. „Hundreds of years of our joint life have moulded us into a common nationality. This cannot be done artifi-

cially. Nature fashions through hidden processes in the course of centuries. Destiny has set her seal upon our nationality and whether we like it or not, we have now become the Indian nation united and indivisible. No fanaticism or artificial scheme to separate will break that unity. Those who make the proposal, are flying in the face of history. I detest this communal approach to the national problem." Sir Sultan Ahmad is as good a Lawyer as Mr. Jinnah is, but he has openly discarded the two nations theory years ago. Sir Mirza Ismail is as good a statesman as Mr. Jinnah may be. He has repudiated Pakistan in an unmistakable manner. Mr. Faiz Tyabji, ex-High Court Judge, whose distinguished father was the president of Indian National Congress has denounced Pakistan. Khan Bahadur Allah Bux, Prime Minister of Sind sealed his faith in the Indian Nation by laying down his life at the hands of the assassin. Many good Muslims and true in other parts of India have joined in repudiating the so-called two nations theory. The Hindus are to a man opposed to Pakistan, the solitary exception being perhaps the great Rajaji. Sir Sivaswami Iyer, Sir Chaman Lal Setalvad, Mr. Srinivas Sastri, Sir C. P. Ramaswami Aiyer, Sir Maharaj Singh and other distinguished liberals are loyal to United India. The Sapru liberals alone are still sulking in their tents. Sir Chotu Ram, Sir Manohar Lal, Sir Fazul Huq are not less hostile. The Sikhs have threatened to tear the Rajaji formula to pieces and to lay down the lives to fight Pakistan if necessary. Almost all congressmen and Hindus are opposed to it tooth and nail and it is good in a sense that the Rajaji formula has provided the occasion for the expression of such united determination.

There is no foundation for the two nations theory. It must be plain to the most casual thinker that the change of religion does not change the race of the convert. If that were not so, every country in the world where there is a muslim population could claim to be a separate nation and asked for a Pakistan. But such a claim would be laughed out of court. On the other hand there are numerous instances of people of different races and different nationalities becoming citizens of one sovereign state as in the United States of America. Every European nation has settled there during the last 390 years but all have now become galvanised into one American nation. In Canada, the French and the British are living together in peace and happiness under one common State. In Switzerland, the Germans, the French and the Italians are common citizens of one Republican State. The Welsh, the Scotch and the English have found freedom, wealth and security under common British citizenship and innumerable nationalities have obtained economic and political freedom in Soviet Russia. Mr. Jinnah cannot be ignorant of these patent facts. On the other hand the Balkan states have become the cock-pits of racial animosities for nearly two centuries if not more. They had nothing to gain by separatism except degradation and instability. United they might have been a force to reckon with. Divided and disrupted they have been a danger to themselves and to each other. Burma was lost because of its separation from India and both Pakistan and Hindustan will fall easy prey to an aggressive and ambitious neighbour if isolated from each other. I do not think I should labour more what is so obvious to any man of average intelligence. To

Mr. Jinnah however such light is denied. He talks as if India and her people were his private property to do what he liked with. He wants you to feel that he is Sir Oracle and when he opens his lips to speak no dog shall bark.

After the Gandhi-Jinnah talks the full implication of the Pakistan Resolution of 1940 must have been brought home to every Indian. There should be no doubt hereafter about its significance. Its details may be vague and undisclosed, but its principle is clear and explicit. It is a bid for India being cut into two independent divisions, mutually exclusive of each other. The people of Hindustan to be, constitutionally, as much strangers to the people of Pakistan as the Zulus are to the Hottentots. Mr. Jinnah gives no argument why such an experiment is necessary, why people who have lived together for hundreds of years under one Government should, for no reason that can be conceived, be segregated from each other. It will to my mind be an act of pure vandalism to divide Muslims and Hindus who are so closely knit by political, economic, cultural and territorial interests. The bogey about the Hindu Raj is a monstrous perversion of realities and wholly opposed to facts. In the future democratic Indian states no individual need have any fear about his fundamental rights; no community need feel anxious about its cultural and linguistic privileges. In fact, so far as any claim is legitimate, men and women of all communities and races can have them in their pockets for the mere asking, indeed, even without asking; our common citizenship will secure to us economic self-sufficiency, political freedom and personal opportunities to rise to the fullest height of their talents. If Mr. Jinnah really wants the Muslims of India to have all these rights, Pakistan is not necessary. On the contrary, Pakistan will not secure these things and will inevitably injure the interests of both Hindus and Muslims, create faction and cleavage insulate the aggression of ambitious foreigners and reduce India to the position of a third class state in world affairs.

That being so, one wonders why the Mahatma accepted the principle of Pakistan and in return asked Mr. Jinnah's cooperation in securing the India's independence. The failure of the quit India movement, the thorough paralysis of the Congress organisation and the stern refusal of the Viceroy to have any truck with the Mahatma irritated Gandhiji and drove him into Mr. Jinnah's arms for support. In doing so, he simply set out to cut his nose to spite his face. But for this we have to thank his evil genius, Rajaji and not the Mahatma. I do not wish to go into the dreary arid three weeks of these negotiations as they stand condemned alike for their opportunism and futility. I may add that although the Mahatma went on a useless errand, he became a formidable embarrassment to Mr. Jinnah when they confronted each other. He pulled down the whole of the Pakistan house of cards and showed it to be a stunt as ridiculous as it was disastrous even to the Muslims; but as we know the Mahatma's ways are mysterious and it won't take him a single minute to recant. We must not therefore leave this Conference without setting up some machinery as I have already mentioned in the earlier part of my

speech. A daily English newspaper in Delhi, a Deputation to England and the establishment of a permanent organisation to combat the threat which overhauls our beloved Bharatvarsh and to bury Pakistan five fathoms deep is necessary.

I reject Pakistan as a suicidal phantasy, a reckless thoughtless monomania, an anachronism, a crude form of isolationism in an age of internationalism. As a Hindu I reject it, as an Indian I repudiate it, as an internationalist I repel it. It is against the spirit of the times. It denies the oneness of humanity, the brotherhood of man. It is historically false, culturally reactionary a senseless figment of imagination. It will not work; it is fatal to our defence, it will for ever divide the Hindus and Mohammadans into hostile camps; and in each of the so-called two sovereign states there will be innumerable little Hindustans and Pakistans. Confusion will be worse conformed.

If ever there was a time when Indian Nationalists of whatever community should with one voice acclaim the territorial integrity of India as the basic condition of India's freedom, it is now. If ever there was a time when we should resist at the risk of our lives, if necessary, any attempt to disrupt this holy land of India, it is now. If ever there was a time to proclaim our faith in the greatness of India's future based on one country, one people and one state, it is now. If there was a time when compromise, hesitation, expediency, appeasement and faint-heartedness were virtues, it is not now.

National unity and national freedom have been the cherished dreams of my student life, the fond longings of my youth and the ardent hopes of my political activities and I shall lay down my life for maintaining the one and securing the other. I have done. I feel strongly on the question and. I have spoken strongly.

Then Rai Bahadur Harish Chandra, General Secretary, Reception Committee, Akhand Bharat Conference rose up and delivered a speech. After surveying the collapse of the Muslims; rise of the Mahrattas and the sufferings of the Indians due to British Imperialism he said:-

The question of Minority and its cures is not only confined to India. Minorities exist in various countries in the world. It is only in India that in the struggle of political independence minorities have been given the foremost place in the shape of Religious Minorities. After the last war this question was recognised internationally and has been the subject of various discussions in the League of Nations. But whilst it is customary to speak of racial and linguistic minorities it has never even been suggested that the minorities will claim to be separate nations and separate States, thus completely dismembering the country where they exist as minorities. The question of minorities has been dealt with at length in the League of Nations and the principles applicable to the settlement of these questions in the International worlds are very wellknown.

The Muslims, finding it difficult either to keep pace or cope with their far advanced Hindu brethren, asserted a claim for privileged treatment. Lord Minto, the then Viceroy,

in reply to the Mahomedan deputation said "I can only say to you that the Mahomedan community may rest assured that their political rights as a community will be safeguarded by any administrative organisation with which I am concerned" Thus emerged the principle of separate electorate and separate representation in all administrations in the country. While on one side some concessions were granted the counterpoise was established by creating vested interests. Statesmen both in England and in this country have throughout been unanimous in deprecating this principle of separate representation either on the basis of communities or classes as being destructive of democracy. It has always been recognised as an evil. The Congress policy of appeasement stimulated the separatist tendencies. In the Montague-Chelmsford Reports the authors stated that the Muslims regard separate representation and communal electorates as "their only adequate safeguard". But they held the opinion that "communal electorates are opposed to the teaching of history, perpetuate class divisions, stereotype existing relations, and a very serious hindrance to the development of the self governing principle;" yet they concluded that, "So far as the Muslims are concerned the present system must be maintained until conditions alter, even at the price of slower progress towards the realisation of a common citizenship". Before this had come into existence the Lucknow Pact of 1916 whereby the principle of communal representation to the Muslims was conceded by the Congress in order to win their support.

Lord Oliver had made a tasteful admission "that the maintenance of communal system is antagonistic to the possibility of any proper working of democratic institution in India." In the debate in the house of Lords he reiterated this confession and stated "it militated against the progress of democratic institutions."

Even a person like Lionel Curtis who figured so prominently at the time of Montford Reforms had to say 'Moslems will thus learn to depend on an artificial protection instead of facing the real source of their weakness, their relative backwardness in education. It is like keeping in irons a weak but healthy limb which only needs exercise to recover its strength. I believe that if this principle is perpetuated we shall have saddled India with a new system of caste which will eat every year more deeply into her life. In conceding the establishment of communal representation we have, I hold, been false to that trust. The system has eaten into the life of this people so deeply that already it is not possible to abolish at one stroke what might have been, refused a few years ago.'

After tracing the history of the communal Award the Rai Bahadur declared :-

The 1935 Constitution was defective. The Congress non-co-operated and refused to give it a trial. The Princes had their own objections to it. The result was that only the Provincial portion of it came into effect and the scheme of Federation was buried to the satisfaction of the disruptionists.

To see a series of independent Muslim States from the shores of the Mediterranean up to the Bank of Ravi or even the Sutlej was a Pan-Islamic dream, the realisation of

which could not but be the greatest lure to the Muslim politician. He realised that such a bait to the masses would immediately catch their imagination and obtain their support. In any case the Muslim population of the provinces concerned will be enamoured of it and it mattered not whether the Muslims in other parts of India were most adversely affected thereby. To him even it did not matter whether these provinces could be self-contained. Sir Mohd. Iqbal, the very wellknown poet of the Punjab who had once written सारे जहाँ से अच्छा हिन्दुस्तान हमारा had put forward a similar scheme in his Presidential address of the Muslim League Session held at Lucknow in December 1930/1931. Mr. Rehmat Ali formulated the Pakistan Scheme in 1933. Then the idea was to have a Muslim State in the North, he never thought of Bengal.

It was only in March 1940 that the Muslim League in its Lahore Session of 1940 passed the so called—Pakistan Resolution.

For some time the resolution was not taken seriously by many people in the country. It was considered to be a slogan and it was hoped that it was so fantastic that the saner element in the body politic of the country would never accept it as a basic principle for the future political emancipation of India and it will die a natural death. The whole resolution is vague and indefinite. Muslims of repute and culture and of education scorned at this idea of the partition of the country. The Muslims living in other provinces failed to realise as to what was there in common between their culture and the culture of a tribal outlaw.

The Congress that had followed a policy of non-co-operation and boycott of the Government and its institutions had finally decided to accept offices. It ruled in eight provinces. The constitution of 1935 stimulates the virus of extreme provincialisation. Sharp points of cleavage were created in the U. P. between the Landlords and the Peasants, the labour and the industrialists and instead of democracy a new type of beauracry was visible. Then came the war and the Congress refused to take any part in the war effort. Mr. Jinnah declared a day of deliverance when the Congress Ministry resigned.

The Muslim politicians considered that to be the most opportune moment of putting forward their demand for the partition of India. To give it a racial tinge they started basing it not only on the cultural difference but on a two nation theory. They felt that the British Statesman who have throughout accepted their demand of a differential treatment would now agree to any thing to win their co-operation and support for the war. They thought that the time had arrived when the dream of having an independent Muslim State in the North could be realised. They added Bengal also to it. More so as they found that it was possible for them with the help of British vested interests, not only to establish but to continue a Muslim rule in that province, in spite of Hindu capital, enterprise and education there. Bengal which unsettled the partition of 1905 was confronted with a more mischievous partition. Bengal naturally could not brook the idea of this

humiliation. It was all Hindu Bengal that had figured so prominently in the annals of Hindustan. Indian National Congress that had never officially approved even the Communal Award, opposed it and its opposition was consistent. Mr. Rajgopalchariar was the only person amongst the Congress ranks that somehow or other became enamoured of theory of Pakistan. But Raji Ji lives far in the South in Madras, where it is impossible for him to realise what is happening in the Punjab, in the N. W. F. P., Sind and Bengal. Even he had to quit the Congress on account of his change of creed.

Sir Stafford Cripps having won his laurels in Russia (and perhaps a dangerous political rival for Premiership) was sent out to this country on a peace mission. But the way in which it was done, it could not produce any fruitful results. He came with a sealed offer of which not a single word could be changed. This was entirely against all canons of discussion and compromise. The White Paper that he brought in his pocket had only one important matter in it. It showed that the British Parliament were prepared to accept the theory of Pakistan for future constitution of the country and so yield to the wishes of one section of the Muslims. The Mahasabha was the first to reject the Cripps Scheme as it was destructive of the integrity of India which was its cardinal creed.

The Congress went into wilderness and the Muslim League retired into dignified seclusion. The Congress finding that further inaction was suicidal decided on the fateful August Resolution, the wisdom whereof, its author alone could understand. With the Mahatma's fast the situation further deteriorated and the Government found the lap of Muslim League a place of comfort repose.

Rajaji got the ear of Gandhiji who had just come out of Jail and had no opportunity of consulting his—colleagues. And in his over-enthusiasm to see India free in his life time, even if s he be mutilated and dismembered, he openly announced what is now known as Gandhi-Rajaji formula.

While the Rest of India was feeling bewildered he sought an interview with Mr. Jinnah and the so-called Bombay talks commenced. We have his own authority for the view that the talks failed on account of a third party.

Intelligent, experienced and non-communal politicians all over the country differed from Mahatma but his inner voice told him that he was in the right. Those who realised Mr. Jinnah's political creed could have anticipated only one result of these talks, but whether Mahatma has completely disillusioned or not, he alone knows. There has been at least one silver lining that he has completely refuted the two nation theory.

All of us do realise that merely saying that we want Akhand Hindustan is not the solution of the problem confronting us. Even Lord Wavell in his recent speech reiterated the integrity of India.

But let us in our deliberations give a rational and responsible answer to this theory of Pakistan with full realisation of the problem confronting us. After all we have got to

convince not only our people, but the world opinion that we are not unreasonably refusing the right of self-determination to the Mussalmans, we are only trying legitimately to preserve a country, a State and a Nation from unnatural vivisection.

With these few words I once again welcome you all here, the President and friends."

After it Lala Narain Dutt, President of the Reception Committee Akhand Bharat Conference delivered his following speech :

भारतवर्ष के इतिहास के आधार पर तो मैं निश्चय रूप से कह सकता हूँ कि भारतवर्ष का इतिहास, संस्कृति, राज्य, संस्कार और प्रथाओं के लिहाज से न केवल आरम्भ से ही अखण्ड रहा है किन्तु समस्त भारत में एक ही आर्य राज्य (हिन्दू राज्य) रहा है। यद्यपि छोटे २ राज्यों में अपने अपने प्रान्त में कारोबार की स्वतन्त्रता होती थी परन्तु वह सब एक बड़े राज्य के आधीन रह कर काम करते थे। ज्यों ही एक केंद्रीय राष्ट्र की शक्ति कम हुई और प्रान्तवार पूर्ण स्वतन्त्रता प्राप्त हुई त्यों ही एक पड़ोसी राष्ट्र ने दूसरे पर आक्रमण करके अपनी २ सीमा और शक्ति को बढ़ाने का प्रयत्न किया। परिणाम यह हुआ कि विदेशी लोगों ने आक्रमण करके सबको पृथक्-पृथक् पादाक्रान्त करके अपना एक राज्य स्थापित कर लिया। अंग्रेजों के आने से पहले विदेशी लोग आठ नौ सौ वर्ष तक भारतवर्ष में राज्य करते रहे; मगर बावजूद पूरा बल प्राप्त कर लेने के भी उन्होंने भारत को खण्ड २ कर देने का कभी साहस नहीं किया। और ना ही धार्मिक भेदभाव के लिहाज से राज कर्मचारियों को अधिकार बांटे बल्कि योग्यता को ही प्रधान मान कर राज कार्य चलाते रहे। जब तक मुसलमान बादशाहों की केंद्रीय शक्ति प्रबल बनी रही तब तक भारत अखण्ड रहा और एकता के सूत्र में बंधा रहा। ज्यों ही केंद्रीय शक्ति का बल घटा और यहां के रहने वाले अपने या पराये लोगों में पृथक् २ राज्य स्थापित करने की धुन समाई तो दूसरे विदेशी अङ्गरेजों ने एक २ करके सब को अपने आधीन कर लिया। यह तो होना ही था क्योंकि उस समय विविध बलशाली लोगों ने अपना राज्य स्थापित करना चाहा। यह नहीं सोचा कि केंद्रीय शक्ति बना कर सब के साथ मिलकर विदेशियों का मुकाबला किया जाए।

सारे भारतवर्ष में अङ्गरेजों ने राज्याधिकार प्राप्त करके केंद्रीय शक्ति को मुटुड़ बना लिया। और आज वे अभिमान से कह सकते हैं कि भारत की छिन्न भिन्न शक्ति को एक बनाने में उनका ही हाथ है। इस बात को स्वीकार करने में किसी को संकोच भी नहीं करना चाहिए। और ऐसा करना ही उनकी अपनी शक्ति को स्थापित रखने का साधन बना रहा है। मगर दृष्ट से कहना पड़ता है कि उनकी National Policy, Divide & rule भी साथ साथ ही काम करती रही है। पंजाब में उन्होंने सिखों से राज्य लिया था। और वे जानते थे कि सिखों में राज की उमंग और संस्कार अभी बाकी हैं और यह भी जानते थे कि पंजाब में सिख और हिंदू मिश्र हुए किसी समय

एक बड़ी बलवान् जाति के नाम से काम कर सकते हैं। इसलिए सिखों को प्रसन्न करने के लिए और विशेष रूप से वहां के हिंदुओं को कमजोर करने के लिए, सिखों को अधिकार का टुकड़ा फेंक दिया और उन्हें हिंदुओं से पृथक् कर दिया। ब्रिटेन का यह जादू चल गया। सिख भाइयों ने यह न सोचा कि यह अधिकार उनको, उनकी अमूल्य पैतृक सम्पत्ति, हिंदुत्व से महसूस कर देंगे और यह घाटा उन्हें उस समय प्रतीत होगा जब कभी राष्ट्रीय सरकार (National Government.) स्थापित होकर, योग्यता के आधार पर राजकार्य चलाने के योग्य हो सकेगी।

सन् १९३४ के विधान में इन सब को पृथक् २ सीटें देकर Communal award के नाम से पृथक्ता का ठप्पा लगा दिया और अपने खयाल में इन्हें सदा के लिये पृथक् कर दिया। लेकिन मेरा विश्वास यह है कि यह पृथक्ता सर्वदा के लिए स्थित नहीं रह सकती। ज्यों २ इन लोगों में राष्ट्रीयता के भाव जाग्रत होते जायेंगे और वर्तमान शासन पद्धति बदल कर Democracy द्वारा प्रजातन्त्र राज्य स्थापित होगा और भारतवर्ष के उच्छकोटि के नेता राष्ट्र की ओष्ठम पद्धति को ध्यान में रखते हुए भारत की विविध जातियों में एकता के भावों को भरना शुरू करेंगे तो यह साम्प्रदायिक (Communal) पद्धति की खराबी स्वयमेव दूर हो जायगी और भारतवर्ष के रहने वाले सभी सज्जन एक दूसरे पर विश्वास रखते हुए योग्यता के अनुसार राज्य अधिकार प्राप्त करने में लग जायेंगे। परमात्मा करे कि ऐसा समय शीघ्र से शीघ्र हम लोग देख सकें।

गांधी जिन्ना समझौता टूट जाने के सम्बन्ध में देश-विदेश के प्रमुख नेताओं और पत्रों ने अपनी २ सम्मतियां समाचार पत्रों द्वारा प्रकाशित की हैं। जिनसे आप भली प्रकार परिचित हैं। मैं केवल दो महान् नेताओं के वक्तव्यों की ओर आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

मैं इस बात को नहीं मानता कि राजनीति में दूर दृष्टि का ठेका एकमात्र कांग्रेस ने ही ले रखा है और वह जो कुछ कहे हमें आंख मूंद कर मान लेना चाहिए। दुर्भाग्यवश कांग्रेस के नेता यह समझ बैठे हैं कि देश की स्वतन्त्रता और भलाई के लिए जो उपाय वे सोच सकते हैं वह किसी और के दिमाग में नहीं आ सकते। और जिस स्वतन्त्र विचार के आदमी ने एक विशेष दल के विरुद्ध अपनी सम्मति प्रगट की—वह देश भक्तों की मंडली से न केवल पृथक् कर दिया गया बल्कि उसे देश द्रोही समझकर उसके साथ कुव्यवहार करना प्रारम्भ कर दिया गया। जिसका परिणाम यह हुआ है कि कांग्रेस का राजनीतिक तौर पर बड़ा बल होते हुए भी—सरकार का काम बिना किसी रुकावट के चल रहा है। मैं इसे केवल सरकार की शक्ति ही नहीं समझता बल्कि कांग्रेस के वर्तमान नेताओं की अदूर-दृष्टि का परिणाम भी समझता हूँ।

मुझे अब यह दर्शाना शेष है कि वर्तानिया का ध्येय चाहे जो कुछ भी हो परन्तु भारतवर्ष को खण्ड २ करने के विषय में वर्तानिया के नेताओं की क्या सम्मति है। मैं यहां केवल वर्तमान वायसराय लार्ड वेवेल का भाषण जो कि उन्होंने १७ फरवरी १९४४ को एसेम्बली तथा कॉन्सिल आफ स्टेट के मेम्बरों के सम्मुख दिया था—उद्धृत करके अपने भाषण को समाप्त करता हूँ।

"भारतवर्ष की एकता के सबसे बड़े प्रश्न पर जिस पर हिन्दू और मुसलमानों का परस्पर

मतभेद है सिर्फ यह कह सकता हूँ कि तुम भूगोल को बदल नहीं सकते। देश की रक्षा और दुनियाँ के अन्य देशों के साथ आन्तरिक और बाह्य सम्बन्ध में भारत वर्ष स्वभाविक तौर पर एक है। दोनों बड़ी जमायतों और दूसरे अल्पसंख्यकों तथा भारतीय देशी राज्यों का (जो कि एक भारत वर्ष के अन्दर है) सुविधा के लिए सोचना आप भारतीयों का काम है। इतिहास में बहुत सी मिसालें मौजूद हैं जिनसे साबित होता है कि दो अलग-अलग जमायतें, बल्कि दो अलग-अलग कौम भी एक साथ मिल कर रहने का उपाय कर सकती हैं। इंग्लिस्तान और स्कॉटलैंड ने सदियों के पारस्परिक संघर्ष के बाद एक यूनियन बनाली। कनाडा में अंग्रेज और फ्रान्सीसियों ने एक फेडरेशन कायम कर लिया जो कि बहुत अच्छी तरह काम कर रहा है। स्वीजरलैंड में फ्रान्सीसियों, इटालियनों और जर्मनों ने आपस में मिलकर एक फेडरेशन बनाया। इन तमाम में धार्मिक और जातीय मतभेद विद्यमान थे। संयुक्त अमेरिका में विविध धर्म-वालों और जातियों ने मिलकर एक बड़ी कौम बनाली है जिसका ढाँचा बिल्कुल एक है। रूस की सोवियट यूनियन ने एक बिल्कुल ही नया ढंग निकाला है। उसे भी देखना होगा। ये मिसालें हमारे विधान निर्माताओं के सम्मुख हैं और उन्होंने फैसला करना है कि उनके मतलब के लिए कौनसा विधान उपयुक्त होगा। लेकिन यावजुद इन सब बातों के जुगराफिया तब्दील नहीं किया जा सकता" अर्थात् भारत अखंड है।

इस कान्फ्रेंस में हमें स्पष्टतया घोषणा कर देनी चाहिए कि भारत माता को खंड खंड करने की जो भी कोशिश होगी—चाहे वह धार्मिक आधार पर हो—चाहे राजनैतिक—अथवा आर्थिक या भाषा के आधार पर, हम हर प्रकार से उसका विरोध करेंगे और भारत को एक और अखंड रखेंगे। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं श्री प्रधान जी, तथा सब नेतागण का स्वागत करता हूँ। इति।

Then Mr. V. G. Deshpande, Secretary, read out the following message of:—

1. "Rt. Hon'ble Shrinivas Shastri:—

The talks on Malabar Hill have ended in nothing. But the danger to the integrity of India is not over. At a moment thought propitions the talks may be resumed. That will be on the basis of the formula or of the Mahatma's version of it. When I first expressed the fear that, once yielded, the principle of division may be difficult to recall, some persons accused me of excessive pessimism. Now even the summary rejection of it by Mr. Jinnah has not opened the eyes of the Mahatma. His faith in appeasement is apparently invincible. He contends that Congress has already pledged itself to the doctrine of self-determination. Has not the All-India Congress Committee passed a resolution against the vivisection of India, at the instance of Mr. Jagat Narain? By the ordinary rules of interpretation a categorical negative must prevail against a vague affirmation unrelated to any context or set of facts. There is abundant reason to believe that a large section of Congressmen are opposed to the division of the country. Their numbers it is not easy to determine with accuracy. But when we add them to those of non-Congressmen similarly opposed, the aggregate will be such as a responsible statesman must respect and hesitate to overrule. We have moreover the express undertaking of Gandhiji that he will not surrender the interest of even a small section. Is not the

division of the country acutely resented by millions in the land as ruinous? How can he persist in allowing it and still claim to keep his words?

It is true Mr. Jinnah and he have many disagreements to smooth over before a bargain can be struck. Some of these seem formidable. This fact, however, ought not to induce a feeling of security in the opponents of Pakistan. They cannot afford to go to sleep or even slightly relax their efforts. I would venture to say an earnest word to Congressmen in the name of patriotism. The Motherland is bigger than Congress or the Mahatma. When her welfare is at stake, loyalty to party or reverence to a saintly leader is no consideration at all. The call of conscience is supreme. It is no treason to the Mahatma, he will applaud it as a service, if he is told that he goes further than they desire. Not India's greatness or glory, not her position among the peoples of the world or among those of the east—not these only, but her very peace and safety will be imperilled."

The following also sent their messages.

- | | |
|-------|---|
| (2) | Bar. R. M. Deshmukh, M.L.C.,
Ex-Minister (Congress) C.P.,
Minister,
Gwalior State. |
| (3) | Hon'ble Sardar, Ajit Singh,
Minister (P. W. D.),
N. W. F. P. |
| (4) | Sir Dhanji Shah,
Cooper, M.L.A.,
Ex-Minister,
Satara. |
| (5) | Sir R. P. Paranjpya,
Poona. |
| (6) | Hon'ble Dr. Hemndas
Wadhvani;
Minister (Sind),
Karachi. |
| (7) | Maharajadhrif of
Darbhanga. |

- (13) Karpatri Swami,
Benares.
- (14) Hon'ble Mr. Ghanshyam Singh Gupta,
Speaker, C. P. Legislative Assembly,
Congress Drug (C. P.)
- (15) Sir C. P. Ram Swami,
Diwan of Travankore.
- (16) Georges Arundale,
Adyar, Madras.
- (17) Lokanayak Aney,
Representative to Government
of India, Ceylon,
Colombo.
- (18) Hon'ble Mr. Yuveraj Dutta Singh,
Raja at Oel,
M.C.S.,
Lucknow.
- (19) Mr. Kane, B.A., L.L.B.,
Pandharpur,
- (20) Sahhindranath Saiye,
Hooghly.
- (21) Mr. Vinayak S. Modak,
(Indian Christian),
Ahmednagar.
- (22) Rao Bahadur,
V. Ramappa,
Madras City.
- (23) Pyda Subramayya Chetty,
Nellore.
- (24) D. B. Barve,
Hyderabad.
- (25) P. Rangalharay,
Bar-at-Law,
Bangalore.
- (26) Hari Shankar Paul, K. T.,
Darjeeling.
- (27) Bhagwant Rai Jain, Vaid,
Malerkotla.
- (28) Bhagwat Prasad Saxsena,
Advocate.
Drug.
- (29) Anand Mohan Poddar,
Dacca.
- (30) Swami Satyanand,
President, Hindu Mission,
Calcutta.
- (31) Baleshwar Dayalu,
Raj Sthani Bhil Sewak,
Sangh Bania.

- (32) Rao Bahdur,
Dinkarrao Rajurkar,
M. L. A.,
Chairman, Dist. Council,
Akola. (Berar)
- (33) Leader of the oppositton, C. P. Assembly.
- (34) Dattatray Wable, M. A.,
Ajmer.
- (35) Rao Saheb Ganpati Patil,
Mehkar.
- (36) D. N. Banerjee,
Head of the Dept. of Political Science,
University of Dacca.
- (37) Hon'ble Gokal Das,
Minister, Sind.
- (38) G. N. Karmarkar,
D. M. Bhat,
D. C. Patwardhan,
Dellan States,
Hindu Sabha,
Miraj
- (39) P. U. Deshpande,
Pleader.
Buldana (Berar)
- (40) R. N. Mandlik,
M. L. A.,
Pen.
- (41) Govindanand Swami,
M. A.,
Congress Bharat Ramkirishin Ashram,
Karachi.
- (42) Rai Jatindra Nath
Chowdhury.
- (43) Mahant Digvijai Nath,
Gorkhpur.
- (44) Rao Bahadur,
V. L. Thube,
M. L. A.,
Poona.
- (45) Hindu Rashtra Dal,
Bombay.
- (46) Dr. Udgaonkar,
Bombay.
- (47) Bhaljee Pendharkar,
Kolhapur.
- (48) P. R. Swami Iyer,
Vakil,
Alatur.

- (49)
Agni Kumar Mandal,
(Depressed Class)
Pirojpur. (Barisal)
- (50)
R. M. Kate,
Hindu Nationalist Party,
Nagpur.
- (51)
B. W. Dongre,
Pleader,
Khamgaon. (Berar)
- (52)
G. M. Joshi,
Galgasem
- (53)
Hakim Ganga Prasad,
Bhagalpur.
- (54)
Kumarajah Mylavaram,
Bezwada.
- (55)
Surya Narain P. O.
Bhagalpur.
- (56)
Karnata
Sanatnists,
Udipi.
- (57)
Krishnabakar Gaya,
Mussoree.
- (58)
G. V. Subbarao,
Editor, Goshti,
Bezwada.
- (59)
N. K. Kinkar,
Akhad Bharat Aghadi,
Kolhapur.
- (60)
Haridas Muzumdar,
Leader, Nationalist Party,
Bengal Upper House,
Calcutta.
- (61)
N. K. Basu,
Calcutta.
- (62)
R. Swadkar,
General Secretary,
Ahmedabad.
- (63)
Rama Varma Raja,
Valia Raja at Chiraakkal,
Chirakkal.
- (64)
Narain Dass Khanna,
Amritsar.
- (65)
Sir Kumbli,
Ex-Minister,
Bombay.
- (66)
Diwan Bahadur,
Har Bilar Sarda,
Ajmer.
- (67)
Hon'ble Mr. V. V. Kalikar,
Member, Council of State, and
President, C. P. Hindu Sabha,
Nagpur.

- (68)
Raja Sir Raghunandan,
Monghyr.
- (69)
Kalinath Ray,
Editor Tribune
Lahore.
- (70)
Maharaja of
Cossimbazar.
- (71)
Suraj Bhan Rai Sahib,
Mohinddapur.
- (72)
Raja Narendra Nath,
Lahore.
- (73)
Hindu Rashtra Dal,
Indore.
- (74)
Pt. Nil Kanth Das,
M.L.A. (Central),
Cuttack.
- (75)
M.L. Bishwas,
Calcutta.
- (76)
Nagarkar,
Sholapur.
- (77)
A. V. Tara Singh,
Hony. Secretary,
Chief Khalsa Diwan,
Amritsar.
- (78)
M.L. Dahanukar,
President,
Maharashtra Chamber of Commerce,
Bombay.
- (79)
G.M. Thaware,
A.I. Depressed Classes Association,
Nagpur.
- (80)
Ram Kumar Bhargava,
Lucknow.
- (81)
T. Y. Dehankar,
Advocate,
Bilaspur.
- (82)
K. L. Railla Ram,
(Christian)
M. L. A.
Lahore.
- (83)
R. V. Deshmukh,
Ex-President, Municipal Committee,
Mehakar.
- (84)
V. K. Abhyankar,
Baroda.
- (85)
G. V. Deshmukh,
M. L. A. (Central)
Nagpur.
- (86)
R. S. Ghaveri,
Ahmedabad.

- (87)
K. B. Limye,
Sangli.
- (88)
Satya Virmani,
Amritsar.
- (89)
Gaya Prasad Singh,
Ex M. L. A. (Central)
Lucknow.
- (90)
Raja Sahib of Patan,
- (91)
Ch. Suryanarayana, B. A., B. L.
Bazwada.
- (92)
K. Prabhakaram Thampan,
Ex- M. L. A.
Karimba.
- (93)
K. Shivanandy Thevar,
Editor " Moovender,"
Madura.
- (94)
Surya Dutta Tripathni,
Dharm Sangh,
Kashi.
- (95)
Stya Kumar Roy,
Calcutta.
- (96)
Prithvi Singh Azad,
(Depressed classes)
Lahore.
- (97)
Jagjivan Ram,
President,
A. I. Depressed Classes League.
- (98)
Baburao Seth Khadye,
Bombay.
- (99)
Dr. Laxman Rao Kardika,
Poona.
- (100)
Jailal,
Patiala.
- (101)
Bhalerao Advocate,
Indore.
- (102)
Vasant Kale,
President, Bombay Students Federation,
Bombay.
- (103)
Baburao Kale,
Sholapur.
- (104)
C. V. Reddy,
President, Andhra, M. S.
Bezawada.
- (105)
Hindu Rashtra Dal,
Sangali.
- (106)
Manoranjana Choudhuri,
Calcutta.
- (107)
Shamdas Gidwani,
Karachi.
- (108)
Jodh,
Amraoti.

DR. MOOKERJI'S HISTORIC ADDRESS

The following is the full text of the speech delivered by Doctor Radha Kumud Mookerji, as President of the Akhand Hindustan Conference held at New Delhi on the 7th and 8th of October.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

We are assembled here today at a most critical point in the whole history of our country. A crisis of the first magnitude has been created in our national history by some of our great leader who have convinced themselves that it is impossible for our Mother Country to achieve her independence and the status which is her birth right except on the basis of a Hindu-Moslem unity, with the result that the other party to that unity has kept itself throughout busy in framing more and more impossible terms culminating in the absurd position that Hindu-Moslem unity is to be based on a complete Hindu-Moslem disunity, an out-and-out separation of the two communities into what have been considered as their respective homelands to be designated as Hindustan and Pakistan. Against this complete misreading of our entire national history and politics, I must assert once for all on behalf of Hindus, and with all the emphasis that I can command as President of this All India Conference of Hindu leaders, that the homeland of the Hindus through millenniums of their history has been nothing short of the whole of India stretching in its continental expanse from Kashmir to the Cape, from Nanga Parvat and Amarnath to Madura and Rameshwaram and from Dwarka to Puri. The Hindus through the ages have built up the whole of this continent as their sacred, inviolable, and indivisible Mother Country and infused into it their very blood. Since the days of the Rigveda, the earliest work of India and of the world, since the dawn of history, the Aryan Hindus have conquered and civilised this continent and breathed into it their very soul.

In anticipation of these present day mischievous developments denying this fundamental unity of India, I wrote out a special treatise which was published in London as far back as 1914 and considered even by a diehard historian like the late Dr. Vincent A. Smith as a scholarly and erudite work, "inspite of its avowed political purpose." It was further honoured by the foreword of a British Prime Minister, J. Ramsay MacDonald, who has admirably expressed its substance in words that should go home to every Hindu :

"The Hindu, from his traditions and his religion, regards India not only as a political unit, naturally the subject of one sovereignty, but as the outward embodiment, as the temple, nay, even as the goddess mother of his spiritual culture,

"India and Hinduism are organically related as body and soul."

It is to the eternal credit of Hindu thought that it imparts a touch of the spiritual to the secular, the mundane, and the material. In its intense devotion to the mother-Country, it has deified the country, into a Deity to be worshipped with a Mantram like

Vande Mataram. It has transformed patriotism into a creed. Mother India, the mighty Mother of all mothers, is to be worshipped by proper prayers prescribed in our Sastras which present to the popular mind, the unlettered millions, her visible image and physical form and define precisely the colossal dimensions of her Viratdeha. One prayer views her as the land of seven sacred rivers from the Sindhu or Indus to the Cauvery, from the Ganga and Yamuna to the Godavery and the Narmada, the commingling of whose holy waters imparts their collective purity at the indispensable bath before worship. By such a prayer the South Indian is at once united across the barrier of the Vindhya with his brethren of the North in worshipping what constitutes their common country. Sacred also are the waters of the Kabul (Kubha), of Gomati (Gomati), of Kuram (Krumu) and of Swat (Suvastu) on whose banks were sung the hymns of the Rigveda. The Hindu mode of worshipping the country, the Desu-Matrika, has covered the whole of India with a network of holy places, so that every inch of the country is sacred soil to him. Innumerable indeed are these holy places which are distributed evenly throughout the length and breadth of this continent. The Hindu has no holy place outside the sacred limits of his mother country in far-off Mecca or Palestine. He is not even to lose touch with its sacred soil as far as possible. For him JANANI JANMABHUMISCHA SVARGADAPI GARIYASI "the mother and the Mother country are greater than Heaven itself". The SRIMADBHAG-VATAM represents the very Gods to be yearning for birth in the BHARATABHUMI.

Thus the federation of the whole of India has been an accomplished fact of Hindu thought through the ages. It transcends the artificial, administrative, or historical divisions of the country into Provinces and States. These divisions are of the material plane. They do not affect thought, which is free. They do not obstruct the Hindu's spiritual vision of mother India as a mighty Presence. That vision impressed upon his mind by his sacred scriptures has been popularised by Post Rabindra Nath Tagore in his inimitable and immortal words depicting how the sacred feet of mother India are laved by the waters of the deep-blue ocean, the Himalyas form Her forehead, their eternal snows Her crown, and out of her breasts flow streams of ambrosia in the Jahnvi and Yamuna.

Is the Hindu to be now a consenting party to a sacrilege, to the proposed vivisection and desecration of Mother India for any earthly reason? The mutilation of Mother India is an attack upon his religion, and liberty of worship.

As a student of history, I am anxious that the issue of Pakistan is to be considered in this background of history and tradition. It is wholly unhistorical to suppose that Hindustan by itself does not comprehend the whole of India or that any part of it is the exclusive home and of any community. Let me remind our Moslem brethren that the term Hindustan was not coined and invented by the Hindu. It was first applied to India by her neighbour, by foreigners, the Iranians and Persians with whom they are of late so anxious to establish their racial affinity. The Achaemenian Emperor Darius I. of the sixth century B. C. first used the term Hindu in one of his inscriptions to indicate

a native of India taken by the Persians as the land of the Sindhu (Indus) which they corrupted into the form Hindu, while the Ionian Greeks (Yavanas) as subjects of the Achaemenian empire dropped the hard aspirate and corrupted the term Hindu into Indus, whence India. Thus the term HINDU is not a religious but a territorial term, and any native of India, according to Persians is a Hindu. Historically, every Moslem is a Hindu, and we may give the quietus to all communal problems on this basis by taking India as the country of one Nation called the Hindus.

Not merely did the foreign nations call India as HINDUSTAN, the land of the Hindus. They were busy naming their own countries on that basis after their respective majority communities. I may count a host of these: Afghanistan, Baluchistan, Turkistan, Turmanistan, Arbistan, Luristan, Khuzistan, Kohistan, Kurdestan, Kafiristan, Seistan (old Sakasthana), Shahfistan, Faristan, Ardistan, Usbegistan, Tadjikistan, Baluchistan, Waziristan, Dardistan, or even Daghestan and Kazakhstan some of which are States of U. S. S. R.

The use of the suffix STAN derived from Sanskrit STHANA by so many foreign peoples in naming their own countries is a compliment they pay to India's indigenous Sanskrit Culture. Why should the Moslems of India grudge the history by which India has been called by their Kith and Kin as Hindustan and seek to make a new history for her? As they are fond of plebiscites, let an All-India Plebiscite be taken on the issue to decide whether India as a country, and an integral whole, should continue as such or be split up into any number of separate States. Indians have a right to any whether they stand for the integrity of India as established in history or consent to her division. Such an all India plebiscite, if plebiscites are insisted upon, should first decide the status that India as a whole should have in the coming world-order and at the Comity of Nations and should precede provincial and local plebiscites.

One must take a long view of India's history in dealing with political problems which crop up from time to time and attain a degree of artificial and temporary importance which is out of proportion to their inherent and intrinsic worth and merits, and to their true place in history. The problems of the hour should be viewed in their proper perspective and not be allowed to deflect into new channels the traditional and time honoured course of India's long history through the ages. The basis of that history has been a single and undivided country of which the parts have been related to one another as limbs of a living organism. India has been fashioned by Nature as an indisputable geographical unit marked out from the rest of the world by well-defined boundaries and fixed frontiers about which there can be no doubt or uncertainty. Most of the wars in the history of Europe have arisen out of doubtful and changeable frontiers. India has had no such troubles from disputed frontiers. As an outstanding geographical unit, mountain-guarded in the north and sea girt in the south, India has been naturally the subject of one

sovereignty in several periods of her history under Maurya, Kushan, or Mughal Emperors and, laterly, continuously, for more than a century under British rule. The Government of India has been functioning all these years as a vast and single Federation holding, under its paramount sovereignty, in different degrees of subordination, the several Provinces and the many States, under its paramount sovereignty, and subjecting them to its irresistible process of unification. Is India now to go back upon that history and precious heritage of the many unities it has so long endeavoured to build up? For, besides political, India has achieved, along with it, several other consequential unities economic, social, and cultural. The Indian National Congress is itself an outstanding product of India's integral unity. The Congress has been serving equally the cause of all parts of India, of all her peoples and social classes, in a spirit of nationalism which knows of no barriers of caste or creed, so that it may represent India as a whole in which are comprehended all its religions and other divisions, Hindu, Moslem, Christian, Sikh Jain, Parsi, Buddhist, or the aboriginal races.

The communal problem is a passing problem of Indian politics, a problem of artificial origin, and recent growth and kept alive by the agitation of a particular group. Such a passing problem should not be allowed to make India's history on new lines on the basis of its vivisection and partition, splitting it up into any number of warring States and Federations.

The communal Problem, in fact, is only as old as 1907 when it was first officially recognised by Lord Minto in his reply to the demand for separate electorate presented to him by a Deputation which was led by the Right Hon. His Highness the Aga Khan. That Deputation was described and condemned as a "command performance" by the late Maulana Mohammad Ali, President of the Indian National Congress. This allegation has been admitted in a Government Document, the Report of the Indian Central Committee of the Statutory Simon Commission in which it is stated "that there was no SPONTANEOUS demand by the Muslims at that time for separate electorates, but it was only put forward by them at the instigation of an official whose name is well known". This fact only reveals the ultimate policy of the British Government to divide and rule India.

The value of separate electorate as an obstacle to the growth of Indian nationalism and as a corresponding aid to the autocracy of British rule has been very frankly and freely explained in a letter written by a high dignitary of Lord Minto's Government to Lady Minto in his letter to her. It states: "I must send Your Excellency a line to say that a very big thing has happened today a work of statesmanship that will affect India and Indian History for many a long years. It is nothing less than the pulling back of 62 millions of people from joining the ranks of the seditious opposition". This remark coming from one in the know shows how a sinister Anglo-Moslem alliance was being planned by Government to combat the Congress, the Hindu Mahasabha and other

organisations in their fight for India's freedom. At the same time, it costs an unmerited slur on a substantial number of nationalist Moslems who have made common cause with the Congress in winning for the Mother country the freedom which is her birthright.

But the Communal Problem thus originated and engineered, the fruit of an unholy alliance between the Government and a loyal group of Moslems soon found a lodgment as a canker in the Indian body-politic which could not absorb its poison. Like a disease, it has been growing ever since on what it feeds on. It began with a limited demand for separate electorate for Moslems where they were in a Minority. But this concession did not solve or end the problem, as was expected. It could not satisfy the communal demand which it tended only to increase. It must be said to the credit of Lord Morley, as a Liberal Leader, that he himself washed his hands off this mischievous game of deliberately thwarting India's endeavour after freedom and democracy by introducing to her Constitution something that was the very negation of democracy and a potent antidote to freedom, the provision for separate Communal electorates, which has no parallel or precedent in any of the Democracies of the world. In his RECOLLECTIONS, Lord Morley quotes what he wrote to Lord Minto: "I won't follow you again into our Mahomedan dispute. Only I respectfully remind you once more that it was your early speech about their extra claim, that first started the Muslim Hare."

British rule has made India the happy home of such political devices which under a show of democracy deny it the substance of freedom.

The Minto-Morley Reforms did not grant separate electorate as a general right, but only as a Minority right, and so it was not granted to the Moslems in the Punjab, as they were there in a Majority. It was, however, recognised as a general right in the Montagu-Chelmsford Constitution, which grants it freely to both Minorities and Majorities to foster the spirit of separatism. Separate electorate was accompanied in its train by all its monstrous breed. Separation of Communities at elections led to their separate representation in the Legislature and to these weighted representation until the monster of separatism declares that its appetite cannot be satisfied except by a thorough going separation of communities by territories. The progress of the evolution of the Muslim Communal demand may be traced in several stages. It began with separate electorates, separate representation in legislature, weightage of representation without any reference to quantity or quality equality of representatives with the Hindu majority in both legislature and administration and lastly this demand for Pakistan, or appropriation of territories under total Muslim sovereignty. The demand for Pakistan is a natural consequence of the British Government's mischievous plan to divide and rule India on the basis of the Communal Award. The Moslem mind is now possessed by a philosophy of separatism and has worked itself up into the position that the communal Problem cannot be solved except by splitting up the country into separate Communal States and Sovereignities with liberty to form themselves into their own Unions and even to include in them other

countries by separate schemes of confederation. The plan is to subject the Mother country, the good old India of history, to a process of vivisection to which she has to succumb and then to emerge in a new birth as a restricted and contracted India, a new and much smaller country which would have to acquire afresh its status at the Comity of Nations.

The deliberate dismemberment of India as planned by the Moslem League and a sinister Anglo-Moslem alliance is a problem of World-Politics and of concern to the Allied Nations. The modern trend in politics is towards larger and larger Unions and Federations and is entirely against the disintegration of existing Unions. The constitution of U. S. A. and Canada are pointers in this direction while the USSR, which formed itself by giving to it primary & original Units the right to secede, is now moving towards a greater & greater consolidation and centralisation. In the Stalin Constitution the USSR has been described as a multi-national State, as a State made up of as many as 180 different nationalities, which has made short work of its complex and complicated communal problems by its comprehensive scheme of Communal Cultural Autonomy giving to each Community free and full scope to preserve and promote and that is necessary to maintain intact its integrity, individuality, and independence, subject to the common Soviet Citizenship as the large loyalty transcending the narrower Provincial, or sectional loyalties.

Let Joseph Stalin explain the implications of his country's Constitution. "I believe that now, after the overthrow of Tsarism, nine-tenths of our peoples will not desire secessions.

"There are three groups of circumstances which render the amalgamation of the Soviet Republics into a single confederate State inevitable.

"The first group consists of facts relating to the internal economic situation. Firstly, there is the meagreness of the economic resources remaining at the disposal of the Republics after years of war; which obliges us to combine these meagre resources so as to employ them more rationally and to develop the main branches of production, those which form the backbone of Soviet power in each Republic. Secondly, there is the historically determined natural division of labour between the various Regions, and Republics of our Federation. For instance, the North supplies the South and East with textiles, the South and East supply the North with cotton, fuel and so forth. The division of labour thus established between the Regions cannot be eliminated by a mere stroke of the pen; it has been created historically by the whole course of economic development of the Federation. And this division of labour, which renders the full development of individual Regions impossible so long as the Republics lead separate existence, is obliging our Republics to knit themselves into a single economic unit. Thirdly, there is the fact that the principal means of communication in the Federation,

which are the nerve and backbone of any possible Union, constitute a single system. It goes without saying that the means of communication cannot be left in a divided state in the hands of, and subordinated to, the interests of the individual Republics; for that would convert the main nerve of economic-life-transport—into a conglomeration of separate parts utilized without regard to plan. This circumstance also induces the Republics to favour amalgamation into a single State. Finally, there is the meagreness of our financial resources.

"The second group of circumstances rendering the amalgamation of the Republics essential consists of facts relating to our international position.

"The danger of attack from without demands that our military front should be absolutely united, that our army should be an absolutely united army..... There is again a danger of the economic isolation of our Federation. This danger is to be met by the creation of a united economic front of our Soviet Republics in face of the Capitalist encirclement. There is also the danger of an organised diplomatic boycott or isolation of our Federation. Hence the necessity for a united front along diplomatic lines also."

As regards the other senior partner in the Allied Nations' concern, the USA Federation, it went to war on the issue of the right of a part of the State to secede from it. On the eve of the American Civil War, Abraham Lincoln made his historic declaration. "I hold that the Union of these States is perpetual. No State upon its own mere action can lawfully get out of the Union."

Should not India follow the example of these her senior partners in world on politics, by keeping intact the integrity of India as a whole and solve her Communal problems within the framework of the parent State? She should not think of divorce before marriage.

A redeeming feature of Pakistan politics is that it is not followed by all the Muslims of India. The Muslim League is not to be taken as representing the total opinion of Moslem India. The most important body of Moslems who are opposed to Pakistan is the Jamiat-Ui-Ulema Hind. Then there are the Khaksars, the Ahrars of the Punjab, the Khudai Khidmadgars of the N.W.F.P. and the Momins who number 45 millions. At the last session of the Momins Conference held at Delhi, in April, 1943, Master Tajuddin, speaking on the subject of Pakistan, claimed that the majority of Muslims—the Azad Muslims, the Ahrars, the Jamiat-Ui-Ulema Hind, the Khaksars, the Khudai Khidmadgars and other Muslim organisations representing eighty millions of Muslims, were against Pakistan, and "would fight tooth and nail if such a scheme ever came into force."

The Congress case is that Hindu-Muslim compromise is a necessary means for achieving the end of the independence of India, if so, the terms of that compromise must guarantee the existence of India as a whole, and must not mean its extinction. The Lahore Resolution of the Muslim League is frankly out to accomplish the extinction of India as a single sovereign State and construct out of its carcass and its ashes a number of separate States and Federations, so that India as a whole will not be heard of. The end of India's independence will be lost and buried in the means and process of achieving it. I respectfully remind Gandhiji that at the Round Table Conference he was the first to declare even against the Communal Award that it implied a process of vivisection of India out of which she would emerge as a carcass. Pakistan is that vivisection with vengeance. He himself has now pertinently put to Mr. Jinnah the following queries.

1. Please satisfy me that these independent sovereign states (in the Pakistan scheme) will not become a collection of poor States, a menace to themselves, and to the rest of India.

2. Pray show me by facts and figures or otherwise how the independence and welfare of India as a whole can be brought about by the acceptance of the (Lahore) Resolution.

And his conclusion is: "As I imagine the working of this Resolution in practice, I see nothing but ruin for the whole of India."

The Hindus hold him to this conclusion. They hold Mr. C. R. to the first term of his stipulations for a Hindu-Muslim settlement, viz., that it should lead to the independence of India as a whole and not to the creation of a number of smaller Indias, as distinct groups, in which the whole will be lost. It is like curing the patient of his very existence.

Much has been made of the Congress Resolution for self determination as supporting in certain respects the scheme of Pakistan. The Resolution itself is based on a fallacy, a misreading of History and Politics. The principle of self-determination has never been applied in History as a principle of destruction to parts of a State which is already an organised and integral whole for the simple purpose of destroying its established unity. Self-determination is a constructive principle of Politics, applying only to States and countries which come together for the first time to form themselves into a Union, as it was in the case of the constitution of U.S.S.R. The U.S.S.R. was originally formed by its Constituent Sovereign Republics known as the Union or National Republics which merged themselves in a common Federation, while each retained its full sovereign rights including the right of secession. But after the U. S. S. R. had made its start, it went in for a programme of consolidation and expansion in which there was no place for secession. Thus the right of secession was not granted by the U. S. S. R. to the 22 autonomous Republics which came in course of time to the incorporated into it. The right of secession

is not granted as a general right to these constituent units of the Federation. The present trend in the U. S. S. R. is now more and more towards consolidation and centralization. It stands for several united federalized fronts, military, economic and even diplomatic, as was explained by Stalin on the occasion of the inauguration of the 1935 Constitution.

The schedule of federal subjects which that Constitution has prescribed in one of its Articles shows to what extent federation has been given a scope in the Constitution. These subjects even include approval by the Central Government of taxes and other sources of revenue, figuring in the local and provincial budgets. When the U. S. S. R. has been carrying on with more than 180 different nationalities and communities reconciled to a common citizenship and nationals of the same multinational State, why cannot India follow the same path in solving her much less complicated communal problems arising out of supposed differences between only two communities, one of which has recently been magnified into a Nation?

As regards the very recent Muslim claim to be counted as a separate Nation by itself, the Hindu opinion has been correctly expressed by Mahatma Gandhi in his own inimitable language and manner. "I find no parallel in history for a body of converts and their descendants claiming to be a nation apart from the parent stock. If India was one nation before the advent of Islam, it must remain one in spite of the change of faith of a very large body of her children. You seem to have introduced a new test of nationhood. If I accept it, I would have to subscribe to many more claims and face an insoluble problem."

"I am unable to accept the proposition that the Muslims of India are a nation distinct from the rest of the inhabitants of India. Mere assertion is no proof. The consequences of accepting such a proposition is dangerous in the extreme. Once the principle is admitted, there would be no limit to claims for cutting up India into numerous divisions which will spell India's ruin."

It is regrettable that Mr. C. R. has run amok with his principle of self-determination so completely misconceived by him. He is flourishing it as a secret weapon discovered by him and is out with the zeal of a mediaeval Knight-Errant to redress the political wrongs of India by applying self determination for the fun of seeing India once more disintegrated and dissolved into the atoms out of which it has been compounded into a whole by painful political evolution through the ages. He is out on the strange mission of destroying the unity of a Constituted State which has such a glorious part to play in the coming world order, the Federation of Man as his highest destiny. Let him carry his mission to the United Kingdom and try to stir up Wales and Scotland by his principle of self-determination to activities which will result in the creation of Ulsters and Pakistans in the United Kingdom and help in its reconstruction on a new basis. Nowhere in history

is self-determination applied to a constructed State for the mere fun of disintegrating and wrenching from it its different parts that are already welded into a whole and make of them separate States.

He knows the reception that he will have for his scheme in the U. S. A., the present senior partner in the concern of the Allied Nations. He should know how it was drastically treated by one of the makers of the U. S. A. Constitution. I shall only remind him of the above quoted historic declaration of Abraham Lincoln made on the eve of American Civil War; "I hold that the Union of these States is perpetual. No State upon its own mere action can lawfully get out of the Union."

The position of Mr. C. R. that the Congress is committed to self-determination in India is open to grave doubts. These doubts have been, as expected, emphasised by Mr. Jinnah. These arise from the Resolution adopted by the A. I. C. C. in May, 1942 at Allahabad in the following terms. "The A. I. C. C. is of opinion that any proposal to disintegrate India by giving liberty to any component State or territorial unit to secede from the Indian Union or federation, will be highly detrimental to the best interests of the people of the different States and provinces and the country as a whole and the Congress, therefore, cannot agree to any such proposal."

As rightly pointed out by Mr. Jinnah, this Resolution is a "complete bar to any settlement on the basis of the division of India as Pakistan and Hindustan."

It cannot be also explained away by the previous Resolution of the Congress for self-determination, as was sought to be done by Maulana Abdul Kalam Azad and now by Mr. C. R. who regard the later Resolution as a mere expression of opinion on the subject on the part of the Congress. But certainly the Congress ideal is always to make fact correspond to its opinion. In our view the later Resolution supersedes and overrides the previous one and commits the Congress to the preservation of India's integrity and indivisibility. It states definitely that the Congress cannot agree to any proposal to the contrary such as Pakistan.

It is thus clear that Pakistan is a totally unacceptable scheme as a solution of communal problems as it seeks to solve them at the cost of destroying the unity of the Mother Country and the integrity of the parent State. A territorial separation of communities is no solution of communal problems. The communal problems will follow such separation into all the new States to be created by separation. No State can ever be a homogeneous social composition made up of only one community. It is bound to be made up of different communities one of which must naturally be the majority. The process of history has not made possible the evolution of any State as a completely linguistic, religious, racial, or social unity. It has been a physical impossibility that political and national frontiers should also coincide with racial, religious, and social frontiers.

Such coincidence is getting more and more impossible in these days of easy, free and speedy intercourse and communication between different Nations and Peoples, and the expanding facilities for emigration, colonization and settlement.

Seeing that the proposed Pakistan State will not be able to exclude from it the Hindu minority, the Moslem League has been loudly proclaiming and holding out its blandishments that it will make the Hindu minority completely contented by its own scheme of minority protection. It has been making an appeal to the Hindu minority to trust the Moslem majority for its protection. This in my opinion, supplies a very good basis for permanent settlement of the communal problem, without taking recourse to the drastic and revolutionary step of dividing up country into Separate states. The Hindu majority of India is completely ready to accept in toto: and in advance, the Pakistan Scheme for the protection of its minorities. Surely, it stands to reason that the scheme by which the Hindu Minority is to be reconciled to the Moslem majority in the Pakistan State and is invited to join it is good enough to be offered by the Hindu majority to the Moslem minority. There is therefore, no case or any justification for Pakistan if within the framework of the Parent state which has been so long existing and functioning the Moslem minority is guaranteed by the Hindu majority the same protection as is being offered by the Moslem majority, in the Pakistan State to come, to lure into it the Hindu majority.

In fact there are several alternatives to Pakistan, which the Moslem League may very well explore and examine, considering that Pakistan has already been in action in all the four Moslem majority provinces.

These alternatives are based on the assumption that all Indians owe it to their country to maintain its integrity. There are ways and means by which the largest measure of Provincial Autonomy can be made compatible with some kind of federal control. Subject to that control, the units of the Federation may function as sovereign States within their prescribed spheres. This may be effected by so framing the Schedules of Federal and Provincial Subject as to make the most of Provincial Autonomy, and to render each Province a sovereign State for all practical purposes.

Then, again, within the domain of each such provincial sovereignty, every community is to be given complete cultural autonomy on the lines of the Scheme which was so elaborately worked out by the League of Nations and embodied later in international instruments known as Minorities Guarantee Treaties, and is now in actual operation in the U.S.S.R.

The distribution of Federal and provincial subjects for the Indian Federation may follow the lines laid down in the U.S.S.R. Constitution. Indeed the Schedule of Federal subjects as framed by the U.S.S.R. should have its own lessons for those who stand up

for the integrity of India and against its partition into several federations, when a multi-national States like U.S.S.R. has been able to think plan and function in terms of a single Federation on the basis of a scientific synthesis and harmonious combination of the principle of centralisation and that of local autonomy. It is always easy to plan an Indian Union which as Lord Wavell pointed out in his speech before the Central Legislature, should be entrusted with the administration of subjects of common concern to its Constituent State such as "defence, military, foreign policy and many internal economic problems" which may be taken to be Communications, Customs Currency, Monetary policy or Trade Agreements.

It has been already stated that Centralisation and Federalism have developed so far in the U.S.S.R. that the Centre has reserved to itself even the power to approve of the taxes and revenue which go to form the local budgets of all the Constituent States of the Union.

There is however, a case for the reconstructions of Provinces which have been artificial creations with ill-defined boundaries. These should be reconstituted on a more natural basis as linguistic and cultural units such as Orissa, or the Andhra Province to come, provided they are financially self-supporting or more or less self contained economic regions. The case of Bengal urgently calls for a revision. At the time of the annulment of its partition in 1912, the King-Emperor assured Bengal that her boundaries which were then fixed in a haphazard manner would be properly fixed by a Boundaries Commission promised by His Majesty. That Boundaries Commission is still to come, and in the meanwhile, during all these years, Bengal has remained subjected to a partial partition whereby large Bengali-speaking areas have been annexed to the neighbouring Provinces of Bihar and Assam with the consequence that Bengal thus unjustly mutilated is now looming large in the Scheme of Pakistan. A sinister policy has been at work for crippling the power of the Bengal Hindus in Indian politics by distributing them among their neighbouring Provinces so that they may be rendered as a permanent, statutory, and impotent minority in their own homeland. Even Bengal thus artificially contracted is a minority Hindu province on the basis of a Census of adults, though there is a suspicion that the last Census was somewhat influenced by the communal attitude of its Ministry.

Let all communities have their problems solved by a comprehensive scheme of Autonomy and combine to build up India whole and entire as a Democracy whose might and majesty will have to be reckoned with by the Comity of Nations.

This solution is quite feasible, as amply explained above, within the frame-work of the parent State without disintegrating it, as has been done so successfully in U.S.A. and U.S.S.R.

All Indians must agree that in the present fateful conditions of world politics India must emerge out of this local war with her intrinsic strength not decreased but increased

in every sphere of her national life. She must emerge as a strong Political Union to make her power felt at the Comity of Nations as a single Sovereign State. She must also be strong as a Military Union under Central Control. She must emerge as a well planned Economic Union with one fiscal and tariff policy shaping her Trade Agreements with other countries. She must also be organised as a Monetary Union in respect of her currency policy, and financial system in relation to international finance.

There can never be any justification on any grounds whatsoever to divide India into a number of smaller and weaker States with their separate armed forces, and without the federal administration of those vital interests which are common to the whole country. Such a division will imperil the very independence of India which it is proposed to secure while the partition, instead of solving the communal problem will further accentuate it, embitter the mutual relations of communities and loosen entirely the internal cohesion of the country.

When India should function with all the power and prestige that she will command as a single Sovereign State like China and other Allied Nations at the present crisis in human history and in the new world order that is in the making, any programme of constitutional reform which may weaken any of these vital national unities must be ruled out as being totally inconsistent and incompatible with the unique mission which she is appointed to discharge and the singular place which she is destined to fill in the progress in the world.

APPENDIX A

Articles 14 of U. S. S. R. Constitution

Schedule of Federal Subjects:—

The jurisdiction of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as represented by its highest organs of power and organs of State Administration covers:—

- (a) Representation of the Union in international relations, conclusion and ratification of Treaties with other States;
- (b) Questions of War and Peace;
- (c) Admission of new Republics into the USSR;
- (d) Supervision over the observance of the Constitution of the Union Republics and ensuring that the Constitution of the Union Republics conform with the Constitution of the USSR;
- (e) Ratification of alterations of Boundaries between Union Republics;
- (f) Ratification of the formation of new Autonomous Republics within the Union Republics;

- (g) Organisation of the Defence of the USSR and the direction of all the armed forces of the USSR;
- (h) Foreign Trade on the basis of State Monopoly;
- (i) Safeguarding the Security of the State;
- (j) Determining the plans of National Economy of the USSR;
- (k) Approval of the unified State Budget of the USSR, as well as of the taxes and revenues which go to form the Union, Republican, and Local Budgets;
- (l) Administration of the Banks, Industrial and Agricultural Establishments and Enterprises and Trading Enterprises of all Union importance;
- (m) Administration of Transport and Communications;
- (n) Direction of the Monetary and Credit system;
- (o) Organisation of State Insurance;
- (p) Contracting and granting Loans;
- (q) Establishment of the basic principles of Land Tenure as well as of the use of Mineral Deposits, Forests, and Waters;
- (r) Establishment of the basic principles in the spheres of Education and Public Health;
- (s) Organisation of a uniform system of national economic Accounting;
- (t) Establishment of the principles of Labour Legislation;
- (u) Legislation governing the Judicial system and Judicial Procedure, Criminal and Civil Codes;
- (v) Laws governing Citizenship of the Union; laws governing the Rights of Foreigners.
- (w) Issuance of all-Union Acts of Amnesty.

APPENDIX B

Gandhi-Jinnah Correspondence

Extracts from Mahatma Gandhi's letters:—

1. The first condition of the right of self-determination is achieving independence of India by the joint action of all the Parties and Groups composing India. The independence contemplated is of the whole of India as it stands.
2. You have passionately pleaded that India contains two nations i.e. Hindus and Moslems and that the latter have their homelands in India, as the former have theirs. The more our argument progresses, the more alarming your picture appears to me.

I find no parallel in history for a body of converts and their descendants claiming to be a nation apart from the parent stock. If India was one nation before the advent of Islam, it must remain one in spite of change of faith of a very large body of her children.

You do not claim to be a separate nation by right of conquest but by reason of acceptance of Islam.

You seem to have introduced a new test of nationhood. If I accept it, I would have to subscribe to many more claims and face an insoluble problem.

What is it that distinguishes an Indian Muslim from every other Indian, if not his religion?

I am unable to accept the proposition that the Muslims of India are a nation, distinct from the rest of the inhabitants of India. Mere assertion is no proof. The consequences of accepting such a proposition are dangerous in the extreme. Once the principle is admitted, there would be no limit to claims for cutting up India into numerous divisions which would spell India's ruin.

3. In order to achieve the freedom and independence of the people of India, it is essential, in the first instance, that there should be a Hindu-Muslim settlement.

4. As I write this letter and imagine the working of the (Lahore) Resolution in practice, I see nothing but ruin for the whole of India.

5. I aspire to represent all the inhabitants of India.

Why can you not accept my statement that I aspire to represent all the sections that compose the people of India? Do you not aspire? Should not every Indian?

6. Rajaji tells me that absolute majority is used in his formula in the same sense as it is used in ordinary legal parlance, I cling to my own answer.

7. Have you examined the position and satisfied yourself that these "independent" States will be materially and otherwise benefitted by being split up into fragments?

Please satisfy me that these "independent" sovereign States will not become a collection of poor States, a menace to themselves and to the rest of India.

Please satisfy me by facts and figures or otherwise how the Independence and welfare of India as a whole can be brought about by acceptance of the "Resolution".

8. We reach by joint effort Independence of India as it stands, India, becoming free, will proceed to demarcation plebiscite and partition, if the people concerned vote for partition.

9. Can we not agree to differ on the question of two nations and yet solve the problem on the basis of self-determination?

10. You seem to be adverse to a plebiscite. In my opinion there must be clear proof that the people affected desire partition...All the people inhabiting the area ought to express their opinion specifically on the single issue-division.

I can be no willing party to a division which does not provide for the simultaneous safeguarding of common interests, such as defence, foreign policy and the like. There should be no feeling of security in the people of India without a recognition of the natural and mutual obligations arising out of physical continuity.

11. Differing from you on the general basis I can yet recommend to the Congress and to the country their acceptance of the claim for separation contained in the Muslim League Resolution of Lahore on my basis and on the following terms:—

One of these shall be that there shall be treaty of separation which should also provide for the efficient and satisfactory administration of foreign affairs, defence, internal communications, commerce and the like, which must necessarily continue to be matters of common interest between the contracting parties.

The treaty shall also contain terms for safeguarding the rights of minorities in the two States.

12. I cannot accept the Lahore Resolution as you want me to, especially when you seek to introduce into its interpretation theories and claims which I cannot accept and which I cannot ever hope to induce India to accept.

II. EXTRACTS from the letters of Mr. M. A. Jinnah:—

1. I urged you that the only solution of India's problem is to accept the division of India as Hindustan and Pakistan.

2. It is quite clear that you represent nobody else but the Hindus.

3. It is not clear to me what you mean by absolute majority when you say it means a clear majority over non-muslims, as in Sind, Baluchistan or the Frontier Province.

4. We maintain and hold that the Muslims and Hindu are two major nations by any definition or test of a Nation. We are a nation of a hundred million, and what is more, we are a nation with our own distinctive culture and civilisation, language and literature, art and architecture, names and nomenclature, sense of value and proportion, legal laws and moral codes, customs and calendar, history and traditions aptitudes and ambitions. In short, we have our own distinctive out-look on life and of life. By all canons of international law we are a nation.

5. You do not accept that the Mussalmans of India are a nation.

You do not accept that the Muslims have an inherent right of self-determination.

There is a Resolution of Jagat Narain Lal passed by the AICC in May 1942 at Allahabad which in express terms lays down as follows:—

"The A.I.C.C. is of opinion that any proposal to disintegrate India by giving liberty to any component State or territorial unit, to secede from the India Union or Federation should be highly detrimental to the best interests of the people of the different States and provinces and to the country as a whole and the Congress, therefore, cannot agree to any such proposal".

This Resolution is a complete bar to any settlement on the basis of the division of India as Pakistan and Hindustan.

Mr. Savarkar in declaring the Conference open thanked the leaders of all the parties who had responded so willingly to the call. He went on to say that the object of the Conference was to appoint a Committee who will draft a resolution which will be passed by the Conference. In the meantime we shall take leader by leader—leaders of prominence who have rendered services to the country throughout their life and then afterwards we shall take special leaders of parties—parties that will combine to help each other—not parties of opposition. This Conference has been called deliberately for this purpose. We all belong to that party which is called AKHAND HINDUSTAN PARTY. In our discussions today there is no question of difference of opinion whatsoever. This is an Akhand country, has been so from the Puranic days down to the historical days, and down to this time Hindustan is an Akhand country. Only a puritan can think of dividing it into small sections, but this is my mother land and my race has been grown and grew here, is likely to grow here—my ancestors have been here. Every nation fights for its existence and so long as we live in this world, India must be a nation fully united and undivided. Some may differ from you. Be a national. I will go a step further and say that if I meet a national mohamedan I shall call him a friend. We are all a brotherhood, consisting of Arya Samajists, Sanatanists and Hindu Sabhitas, but all these must go together. Here we come from all parts of India. Here you shall hear different views. We must unite and keep together so that our integrity may never be questioned in the years to come, so I will request leaders from the Punjab, Bengal and other provinces to give us their views. I am very pleased to see the younger generation here in large numbers—I mean the students, who have come UNINVITED. They are the real servants—these youngmen, the finest product of the Universities. We depend upon these youngmen and I shall ask them very soon for sacrifices. We of the older generation are all going away. Our lives are passing away. This Hall is now yours, take possession of it and continue the good work. It is for your good to come forward. I call upon my friends the Students to respond to this call of the motherland.

अखिल भारतीय हिन्दू महासभा

केन्द्रीय कार्यालय

नई देहली

निम्नांकित पुस्तक व चित्र अखिल भारतीय हिन्दू महासभा ग्रन्थालय में
विक्रयार्थ उपस्थित हैं।

क्रम-संख्या	पुस्तक का नाम	रचयिता	रु० आ० पा०
१.	हिन्दू महासभा क्या है ?	ज्ञानचन्द्र आर्य	— २ —
२.	पं० चन्द्रगुप्त वेदालंकार का जीवन-परिचय		— १ —
३.	भारत और अन्य देशों का पारस्परिक सम्बन्ध	श्री चन्द्रगुप्त वेदालंकार	— ८ —
४.	विना भूमि की खेती	मदनमोहन वर्मन	— ५ —
५.	लोकमान्य तिलक का चरित्र	नरसिंह चिन्तामणि केलकर	३ — —
६.	श्री वीर गीता	पं० रामचन्द्र शर्मा	— ८ —
७.	हिन्दू महासभा के विधान, उद्देश्य व नियम		— २ —
8.	Awake Hindusthan!—Dr. Syamaprasad Mookerjee		2 8 0
9.	Hindu Politics—Sj. Nirmal Chandra Chatterjee		1 8 0
10.	History of the Bhagalpur Struggle		1 0 0
11.	Mahatma Gandhi, Saviour or Betrayer		0 2 0
12.	Presidential Address at the 19th Session of All India Hindu Mahasabha—Veer V.D. Savarkar (Ahmedabad, 1937)		0 2 0
13.	“ “ “ 22nd “ “ (Madura, 1940)—		0 3 0
14.	“ “ “ 24th “ “ (Cawnpore, 1942)—		0 3 0
15.	“ “ “ 26th “ “ Dr. Syamaprasad Mookerjee		0 4 0

(Bilaspur, 1944)—

16. A Phase of the Indian Struggle	Dr. Syamaprasad Mookerjee	1	0	0
17. Bhairab Singa (Bengali) Poet	Manuj Chandra Sarbadhikari	1	0	0
18. Hindu Mahasabha, (Constitution, Objects and Rules		0	2	0
19. Hindu Rastravad—	Dr. Satya Prakash	4	0	0
20. Life of Manoranjan Chaudhuri—	Karunamoy Ghosh	1	0	0

चित्र सूची

१. (क) वीर सावरकर (छोटा)	—	४	—
(ख) " " (बड़ा)	१	—	—
२. डा० श्यामाप्रसाद मुखर्जी (छोटा)	—	४	—

निवेदकः—

करुणामय घोष, पुस्तकाध्यक्ष,
हिन्दू महासभा भवन,
रीडिंग रोड, नई देहली।