

## APPENDIX A

### BANDE MATARAM

(TRANSLATION IN PROSE BY SRI AUROBINDO GHOSE)

I bow to thee, Mother,  
richly-watered, richly-fruited,  
cool with the winds of the south,  
dark with the crops of the harvests,  
the Mother !  
Her strands rejoicing in the glory of the moonlight,  
her lands clothed beautifully with her trees in flowering bloom,  
sweet of laughter, sweet of speech,  
the Mother, giver of boons, giver of bliss !  
Terrible with the clamorous shout of seventy million throats,  
and the sharpness of swords raised in twice seventy million hands,  
Who saith to thee, Mother, that thou art weak ?  
Holder of multitudinous strength,  
I bow to her who saves,  
to her who drives from her the armies of her foemen,  
the Mother !  
Thou art knowledge, thou art conduct,  
thou our heart, thou our soul,  
for thou art the life in our body,  
in the arm thou art might, O Mother,  
in the heart, O Mother, thou art love and faith.  
It is thy image we raise in every temple.  
For thou art Durga holding her ten weapons of war,  
Kamala at play in the lotuses  
and Speech, the goddess, giver of all lore,  
To thee I bow !  
I bow to thee, goddess of wealth, pure and peerless,  
richly-watered, richly-fruited, the Mother !  
I bow to thee Mother  
dark-hued, candid,  
sweetly smiling, jewelled and adorned,  
the holder of wealth, the lady of plenty  
the Mother !

## APPENDIX B

### PROCLAMATION OF THE KING-EMPEROR TO THE PRINCES AND PEOPLES OF INDIA

THE 2ND NOVEMBER, 1908

It is now fifty years since Queen Victoria, my beloved Mother, and my August Predecessor on the throne of these realms, for divers weighty reasons, with the advice and consent of Parliament, took upon herself the government of the territories theretofore administered by the East India Company. I deem this a fitting anniversary on which to greet the Princes and Peoples of India, in commemoration of the exalted task then solemnly undertaken. Half a century is but a brief span in your long annals, yet this half century that ends to-day will stand amid the floods of your historic ages, a far-shining landmark. The proclamation of the direct supremacy of the Crown sealed the unity of Indian Government and opened a new era. The journey was arduous, and the advance may have sometimes seemed slow ; but the incorporation of many strangely diversified communities, and of some three hundred millions of the human race, under British guidance and control has proceeded steadfastly and without pause. We survey our labours of the past half century with clear gaze and good conscience.

Difficulties such as attend all human rule in every age and place, have risen up from day to day. They have been faced by the servants of the British Crown with toil and courage and patience, with deep counsel and a resolution that has never faltered nor shaken. If errors have occurred, the agents of my Government have spared no pains and no self-sacrifice to correct them ; if abuses have been proved, vigorous hands have laboured to apply a remedy.

No secret of empire can avert the scourge of drought and plague, but experienced administrators have done all that skill and devotion are capable of doing, to mitigate those dire calamities of Nature. For a longer period than was ever known in your land before, you have escaped the dire calamities of War within your borders. Internal peace has been unbroken.

In the great charter of 1858 Queen Victoria gave you noble assurance of her earnest desire to stimulate the peaceful industry of India, to promote works of public utility and improvement, and to administer the government for the benefit of all resident therein. The schemes that have been diligently framed and executed for promoting your material convenience and advance—schemes unsurpassed in their magnitude and their boldness—bear witness before the world to the zeal with which that benignant promise has been fulfilled.

The rights and privileges of the Feudatory Princes and Ruling Chiefs have been respected, preserved, and guarded; and the loyalty of their allegiance has been unswerving. No man among my subjects has been favoured, molested, or disquieted, by reason of his religious belief or worship. All men have enjoyed protection of the law. The law itself has been administered without disrespect to creed or caste, or to usages and ideas rooted in your civilization. It has been simplified in form, and its machinery adjusted to the requirements of ancient communities slowly entering a new world.

The charge confided to my Government concerns the destinies of countless multitudes of men now and for ages to come; and it is a paramount duty to repress with a stern arm guilty conspiracies that have no just cause and no serious aim. These conspiracies I know to be abhorrent to the loyal and faithful character of the vast hosts of my Indian subjects, and I will not suffer them to turn me aside from my task of building up the fabric of security and order.

Unwilling that this historic anniversary should pass without some signal mark of Royal clemency and grace, I have directed that, as was ordered on the memorable occasion of the Coronation Durbar in 1903, the sentences of persons whom our courts have duly punished for offences against the law, should be remitted, or in various degrees reduced; and it is my wish that such wrongdoers may remain mindful of this act of mercy, and may conduct themselves without offence henceforth.

Steps are being continuously taken towards obliterating distinctions of race as the test for access to posts of public authority and power. In this path I confidently expect and intend the progress henceforward to be steadfast and sure, as education spreads, experience ripens, and the lessons of responsibility are well learned by the keen intelligence and apt capabilities of India.

From the first, the principle of representative institutions began to be gradually introduced, and the time has come when, in the judgment of my Viceroy and Governor-General and others of my counsellors, that principle may be prudently extended.

Important classes among you, representing ideas that have been fostered and encouraged by British rule, claim equality of citizenship, and a greater share in legislation and government. The politic satisfaction of such a claim will strengthen, not impair, existing authority and power. Administration will be all the more efficient, if the officers who conduct it have greater opportunities of regular contact with those whom it affects, and with those who influence and reflect common opinion about it. I will not speak of the measures that are now being diligently framed for these objects. They will speedily be made known to you, and will, I am very confident, mark a notable stage in the beneficent progress of your affairs.

I recognize the valour and fidelity of my Indian troops, and at the New Year I have ordered that opportunity should be taken to show in substantial form this my high appreciation of their martial instincts, their splendid discipline, and their faithful readiness of service.

The welfare of India was one of the objects dearest to the heart of Queen Victoria. By me, ever since my visit in 1875, the interests of India, its Princes and Peoples, have been watched with an affectionate solicitude that time cannot weaken. My dear Son, the Prince of Wales, and the Princess of Wales, returned from their sojourn among you with warm attachment to your land, and true and earnest interest in its well-being and content. These sincere feelings of active sympathy and hope for India on the part of my Royal House and Line, only represent, and they do most truly represent, the deep and united will and purpose of the people of this Kingdom.

May divine protection and favour strengthen the wisdom and mutual goodwill that are needed, for the achievement of a task as glorious as was ever committed to rulers and subjects in any State or Empire of recorded time.

## APPENDIX C

### CHITTA RANJAN DAS'S PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS AT FARIDPORE

(BENGAL PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE, 2ND MAY, 1925)

AGAIN and again has India asked, " Which way lies Salvation ? " In the dim past, it was the obstinate questioning of the individual Soul,—weary of shadows and seeking for Reality. In the living present, it is the tortured cry of the Soul of India.

Let me put this question to you again so that we may obtain a clear vision as to what it is that we must accomplish.

As with the individual, so with the Nation, the question is to find out the meaning of deliverance from bondage and, let me add, sin. It is a sin of those who forge the fetters of bondage. It is also a sin of those who allow the fetters to be forged.

Many items have been presented—Self-Government, Home Rule, Independence, and Swaraj—but these are all names unless the full implications are vividly realized and in the process of such realization must come a consideration of the method of attaining the object in view.

There are those who declare in favour of peaceful and legitimate methods. There are others who claim that, without the use of force or violence, Swaraj is impossible of attainment.

I desire to offer only a few suggestions to help you in deciding these momentous questions. Let the Bengal Provincial Conference declare in no uncertain voice what is the national ideal of freedom, and what is the method it calls upon the country to adopt for the fulfilment of that very ideal.

#### INDEPENDENCE DOES NOT NECESSARILY IMPLY SWARAJ.

Independence, to my mind, is a narrower ideal than that of Swaraj. It implies, it is true, the negative of dependence ; but by itself it gives us no positive ideal. I do not for a moment suggest that independence is not consistent with Swaraj. But what is necessary is not mere independence, but the establishment of Swaraj. India may be independent to-morrow in the sense that the British people may leave us to our destiny, but that will not necessarily give us what I understand by " Swaraj ". As I

pointed out in my Presidential address at Gaya, India presents an interesting but a complicated problem of consolidating the many apparently conflicting elements which go to make up the Indian people. This work of consolidation is a long process, may even be a weary process; but without this, no Swaraj is possible. Herein lies the great wisdom of Mahatma Gandhi's constructive programme. . . . With that programme I entirely agree and I cannot but too strongly urge upon my countrymen to give it not merely an intellectual assent, but practical support by working it out to the fullest extent.

Independence, in the second place, does not give you that idea of order which is the essence of Swaraj. The work of consolidation which I have mentioned means the establishment of that order. But let it be clearly understood that what is sought to be established must be consistent with the genius, the temperament and the traditions of the Indian people. To my mind, Swaraj implies, firstly, that we must have the freedom of working out the consolidation of the diverse elements of the Indian people; secondly, we must proceed with this work on National lines, not going back two thousand years ago, but going forward in the light and in the spirit of our national genius and temperament. For instance, when I speak of order, I mean a thing which is totally different from the idea of discipline which obtains in Europe. In Europe, the foundation of society and Government is discipline; and the spirit of discipline upon which everything rests is entirely military; and discipline, which has made England what she is to-day, is also of the same military type. It is not for me to decry European civilization. That is their way and they must fulfil themselves. But our way is not their way and we must also fulfil ourselves. Thirdly, in the work before us, we must not be obstructed by any foreign power.

What then have we to fix upon in the matter of ideal is what I call Swaraj, and not mere independence, which may be the negation of Swaraj. When we are asked as to what is our national ideal of freedom, the only answer which is possible to give is Swaraj. I do not like either Home Rule or Self-Government. Possibly they come within what I have described as Swaraj. But my culture, somehow or other, is antagonistic to the word "rule"—be it Home Rule or Foreign Rule. My objection to the word Self-Government is exactly the same. If it is defined as government by self and for self, my objection may be met; but, in that case, Swaraj includes all those elements.

#### WITHIN OR WITHOUT THE EMPIRE ?

Then comes the question as to whether this ideal is to be realized within the Empire or outside it? The answer which the

Congress has always given is " within the Empire, if the Empire will recognize our rights ", and " outside the Empire ", if it does not. We must have opportunity to live our life,—opportunity for self-realization, self-development, and self-fulfilment. The question is of living our life. If the Empire furnishes sufficient scope for the growth and development of our national life, the Empire idea is to be preferred. If, on the contrary, the Empire, like the Car of Jagannath, crushes our life in the sweep of its imperialistic march, there will be justification for the idea of the establishment of Swaraj outside the Empire.

Indeed, the Empire idea gives us a vivid sense of many advantages. Dominion status to-day is in no sense servitude. It is essentially an alliance by consent of those who form part of the Empire for material advantages in the real spirit of co-operation. Free alliance necessarily carries with it the right of separation. Before the War, a separatist tendency was growing up in several parts of the Empire, but after the War it is generally believed that it is only as a great confederation, that the Empire or its component parts can live. It is realized that under modern conditions no nation can live in isolation, and the Dominion status, while it affords complete protection to each constituent composing the great Commonwealth of Nations called the British Empire, secures to each the right to realize itself, develop itself and fulfil itself, and therefore it expresses and implies all the elements of Swaraj which I have mentioned.

To me, the idea is specially attractive, because of its deep spiritual significance. I believe in world-peace, in the ultimate federation of the world. I think that the great Commonwealth of Nations called the British Empire—a federation of diverse races, each with its distinct life, distinct civilization, its distinct mental outlook—if properly led by wise statesmen at the helm, is bound to make lasting contributions to the great problem,—the problem of knitting the world into the greatest federation the mind can conceive, the federation of the human race. For the development of the idea involves apparent sacrifice on the part of the constituent nations, and it certainly involves the giving up for good the Empire idea with its ugly attribute of domination. I think it is for the good of India, for the good of the world, that India should strive for freedom within the Commonwealth, and so serve the cause of humanity.

#### THE METHOD ; THE CASE AGAINST VIOLENCE

I now come to the question of method. In my judgment, the method is always a part of the ideal. So that, when we are considering the question of method, we cannot forget the larger aspect of the object we have in view.

Viewed in this light, the method of violence is hardly in keeping with our life and culture. I am not suggesting for a moment that the History of India shows no wars, nor the application of violence. Every superficial student of our history knows that it is not so. But sometimes things are forced upon our life which a critical student of our history must know how to separate from the real bent of our genius. Violence is not a part of our being, as it is of Europe. That violence in Europe is checked by a system of law, which in the ultimate resort, is also based on physical force. The Indian people has always been in the habit of following traditions and customs and thus keeping itself free from violent methods. Our village organizations were a marvel of non-violent activities. Our institutions have always grown naturally like the unfolding of a flower. Strifes there have been of the intellect ; cravings there have been of the Soul ; disputes and quarrels have always arisen but only to be settled by peaceful arbitration. Anything contrary or antagonistic to this temperament, is a method which is not only immoral from the highest stand-point, but is bound to fail. I have no hesitation in proclaiming my conviction that our freedom will never be won by revolutionary violence. In the next place, apart from the special psychology of the Indian mind, how is it possible, by offering such violence, as it is possible for a subject race to offer, to contend against the highly organized governmental violence of the present day ? It is no use quoting the incidents of the French and other Revolutions. Those were days when the people fought with spikes and often won. Is it conceivable that at the present moment we can overthrow any organized Government of the modern type by such method ? I venture to think that any such armed revolution would be impossible even in England to-day.

In the next place, the application of violence cuts at the root of that consolidation, without which, as I have said, the attainment of Swaraj is impossible. Violence is sure to be followed by more violence on the part of the Government, and repression may be so violent, that its only effect on the Indian people would be to check their enthusiasm for Swaraj. I ask those young men who are addicted to revolutionary methods : do they think that the people will side with them ? When life and property is threatened, the inevitable result is, that the people who suffer or who think they may suffer, recoil from such activities. This method therefore is impractical. Far be it from me to say one word against the honesty of purpose or the ardour of patriotism which these young men are capable of showing. But, as I said, the method is unsuited to our temperament ; therefore, the application of it is, to quote the words of Mahatma Gandhi, "waste of time and energy". I appeal to the young men of



Bengal who may even in their heart of hearts think in favour of violent methods, to desist from such thought, and, I appeal to the Bengal Provincial Conference to declare clearly and unequivocally, that in its opinion freedom cannot be achieved by such methods.

But if I am against the application of such methods, I feel bound to point out that it is the violence of the Government which has to a great extent helped the revolutionary movement in Bengal. I believe it is Professor Dicey who points out that for the last thirty years there has been a singular decline among modern Englishmen in their respect or reverence for law and order, and he shows that this result is directly traceable to modern legislation, which has had the effect of diminishing the authority of the law courts, and thereby imperilling the rule of law. In other words, violence always begets violence, and if the Government embarks on a career of lawlessness for the purpose of stifling legitimate activities, it cannot but bring into existence, what Dicey calls, "a zeal for lawlessness" in the subject. The history of India, and particularly of Bengal, supports the observation of Professor Dicey.

[After this Chitta Ranjan went on to trace the origin and development of revolutionary activities in Bengal and gave a complete chronology of the leading events in India which occurred from 1905-1924. But as this portion of the speech was written by me for Chitta Ranjan Das, and as I have made use of it in the text of the book I have omitted it at this place.]

#### THE INJUSTICE OF THE ORDINANCE

The new Ordinance Act is a misguided attempt to perpetrate violence upon the people. The whole of India has with one voice condemned it, and I cannot trust myself to express my feeling about it in fitting terms, as I desire to speak with all restraint. I shall content myself by saying that I unhesitatingly condemn it, and I have given the only answer which it is possible for any Indian to give to the recent speech of Lord Birkenhead inviting me to co-operate with the Government in its repressive policy.

You will remember that Lord Birkenhead said that the Ordinance has not hurt anybody but the criminals. May I point out that His Lordship here is begging the whole question? We deny that the men imprisoned under the Ordinance are criminals and the only way to decide as to whether they are criminals or not is to hold an open trial and proceed, not on secret information, but on actual evidence which might be tested in open Court. The insecurity to which eminent writers of Constitutional history in England have referred is the insecurity

to the public by the attempt of the Executive to arrogate to itself the position of a Court of Law.

I will not weary you\* by dealing with each particular case which has been brought forward by the Government as a justification for the policy of repression. . . . I must also point out that it is difficult to believe in the statement put forward in support of the repressive measures by the Government. I shall quote only one instance and I have done. Speaking of the arrest and detention of the nine Bengali gentlemen, including Srijut Krishna Kumar Mitra and the late Aswini Kumar Dutt, on December 11th, 1908, Lord Morley, the then Secretary of State, in his letter to Lord Minto stated as follows :

“ You have nine men locked up a year ago by *lettre de cachet* because you believed them to be criminally connected . . . with these plots.”

But let us hear what Sir Hugh Stephenson has to say on the point. It was only the other day that he said from his place in the Bengal Council :

“ I should like to mention three cases which have been used in the press to throw doubts on the efficiency, if not on the bonafides of our methods. The first two are those of Babu Aswini Kumar Dutt and Babu Krishna Kumar Mitra. It has been said, that no one will believe that they had anything to do with terrorist crime and that, therefore, the secret information of the police must have been false, and Government may equally well be deceived by such false information now. I never knew Babu Aswini Kumar Dutt, but I am glad to think that Babu Krishna Kumar Mitra is a personal friend, and I entirely acquit him of sympathy with terrorist crime. But as far as I know none has ever accused him or Babu Aswini Kumar Dutt of promoting crime, still less of taking part in it. The Bengal Government asked for the use of Regulation III in the case of Babu Aswini Kumar Dutt because of his whirlwind campaign of anti-Government speeches.”

#### “ REPRESSION THE MOST VIOLENT FORM OF VIOLENCE ”

It follows conclusively that the discretionary power which the Government in this country enjoys of promulgating illegal laws is capable of being abused. Indeed, it must be so from the very nature of things. The history of the world shows that bureaucratic governments have always tried to consolidate their power through the process of “ Law and Order ” which is an excellent phrase, but which means, in countries where the rule of law does not prevail, the exercise by persons in authority of wide arbitrary or discretionary powers of constraint.

Repression is a process in the consolidation of arbitrary powers—and I condemn the violence of the Government—for repression is the most violent form of violence—just as I condemn violence as a method of winning political liberty. I must warn the Government that the policy of repression is a short-sighted policy. It may strengthen its hands for the time being, but I am sure Lord Birkenhead realizes that, as an instrument of Government, it is bound to fail.

#### NO CO-OPERATION IN AN ATMOSPHERE OF DISTRUST

I have so far dealt with the question of method in order to show that violence is both immoral and inexpedient,—immoral, because it is not in keeping with our life and culture ; inexpedient, because it is inconceivable that at the present day we can overthrow any organized Government by bombs and revolvers. Then the question arises what method should we pursue in order to win Swaraj ? We have been gravely told that Swaraj is within our grasp if only we co-operate with the Government in working the present Reform Act. With regard to the argument, my position is perfectly clear, and I should like to restate it, so that there may be no controversy about it. If I were satisfied that the present Act has transferred any real responsibility to the people,—that there is opportunity for self-realization, self-development and self-fulfilment under the Act, I would unhesitatingly co-operate with the Government and begin the constructive work within the Council Chamber. But I am not willing to sacrifice the substance for the shadow. I will not detain you to-day with any argument tending to show that the Reform Act has not transferred any responsibility to the people. I have dealt with the question exhaustively in my address at the Ahmedabad Congress, and if further arguments are necessary they will be found in the evidence given before the Muddiman Committee by men whose moderation cannot be questioned by the Government. The basis of the present Act is distrust of the Ministers ; and there can be no talk of co-operation in an atmosphere of distrust. At the same time, I must make clear my position—and I hope of the Bengal Provincial Conference—that, provided some real responsibility is transferred to the people, there is no reason why we should not co-operate with the Government. But to make such co-operation real and effective, two things are necessary. First, there should be a real change of heart in our rulers ; secondly, Swaraj in the fullest sense must be guaranteed to us at once, to come automatically in the near future. I have always maintained that we should make large sacrifices in order to have the opportunity to begin our constructive work at once ; and I think you will realize that a few years are nothing in the history of a nation, provided

the foundation of Swaraj is laid at once and there is a real change of heart both in the rulers and in the subject. You will tell me that "change of heart" is a fine phrase, and that some practical demonstration should be given of that change. I agree. But the demonstration must necessarily depend on the atmosphere created by any proposed settlement. An atmosphere of trust or distrust may be easily felt, and in any matter of peaceful settlement a great deal more depends on the spirit behind the terms than the actual terms themselves. It is impossible to lay down the exact terms of any such settlement at the present moment ; but if a change of heart takes place and negotiations are carried on by both sides in the spirit of peace, harmony and mutual trust, such terms are capable of precise definition.

#### OFFERS TO THE GOVERNMENT

A few suggestions may, however, be made, having regard to what is nearest to the hearts of the people of Bengal.

In the first place, the Government should divest itself of its wide discretionary powers of constraint, and follow it up by proclaiming a general amnesty of all political prisoners. In the next place, the Government should guarantee to us the fullest recognition of our right to the establishment of Swaraj within the commonwealth, in the near future, and in the meantime, till Swaraj comes, a sure and sufficient foundation must necessarily be a matter of negotiation and settlement—settlement not only between the Government and the people as a whole, but also between the different communities, not excluding the European and Anglo-Indian communities, as I said in my presidential speech at Gaya.

#### THE TIME FOR CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

I must also add that we, on our part, should be in a position to give some sort of undertaking that we shall not by word, deed or gesture, encourage the revolutionary propaganda and that we shall make every effort to put an end to such a movement. This undertaking is not needed, for the Bengal Provincial Conference has never identified itself with the revolutionary propaganda. I believe that, with a change of heart on the part of the Government, there is bound to be produced a change in the mental outlook of the revolutionary ; and with a settlement such as I have described, the revolutionary movement will be a thing of the past, and the very power and energy which is now directed against the Government will be devoted to the real service of the people.

If, however, our offer of a settlement should not meet with any response, we must go on with our national work on the lines which we have pursued for the last two years so that it may become impossible for the Government to carry on the administration of the country, except by the exercise of its exceptional powers. There are some who shrink from this step, who point out with perfect logic that we have no right to refuse supplies unless we are prepared to go to the country and advise the subject not to pay the taxes. My answer is that I want to create the atmosphere for national civil disobedience, which must be the last weapon in the hands of the people striving for freedom. I have no use for historical precedent ; but if reference is to be made to English history in our present struggle, I may point out that refusal to pay taxes in England in the time of the Stuarts came many years after the determination of the Parliament to refuse supplies. The atmosphere for civil disobedience is created by compelling the Government to raise money by the exercise of its exceptional powers ; and when the time comes we shall not hesitate to advise our countrymen not to pay taxes which are sought to be raised by the exercise of the exceptional powers vested in the Government.

I hope that time will never come—indeed I see signs of a real change of heart everywhere—but let us face the fact that it may be necessary for us to have recourse to civil disobedience if all hope of reconciliation fails. But let us also face the fact that civil disobedience requires a high stage of organization, an infinite capacity for sacrifice, and a real desire to subordinate personal and communal interest to the common interest of the nation ; and I can see little hope of India ever being ready for civil disobedience until she is prepared to work Mahatma Gandhi's constructive programme to the fullest extent. The end, however, must be kept in view, for freedom must be won.

#### THE GOAL

But, as I have said, I see signs of reconciliation everywhere. The world is tired of conflicts, and I think I see a real desire for construction, for consolidation. I believe that India has a great part to play in the history of the world. She has a message to deliver, and she is anxious to deliver it in the Council Chamber of that great Commonwealth of nations, of which I have spoken. Will British statesmen rise to the occasion ? To them I say : you can have peace to-day on terms that are honourable both to you and to us. To the British community in India, I say : you have come with traditions of freedom, and you cannot refuse to co-operate with us in our national struggle, provided we recognize your right to be heard in the final settlement. To the people of

Bengal I say : you have made great sacrifices for daring to win political freedom, and on you has fallen the brunt of official wrath. The time is not yet for putting aside your political weapons. Fight hard, but fight clean ; and when the time for settlement comes, as it is bound to come, enter the peace conference, not in a spirit of arrogance, but with becoming humility, so that it may be said of you that you were greater in your achievement than in adversity.

Nationalism is merely a process in self-realization, self-development and self-fulfilment. It is not an end in itself. The growth and development of nationalism is necessary, so that humanity may realize itself, develop itself and fulfil itself ; and I beseech you when you discuss the terms of settlement, do not forget the larger claim of humanity in your pride of nationalism. For myself, I have a clear vision as to what I seek. I seek a federation of the states of India—each free to follow, as it must follow, the culture and the tradition of its own people : each bound to each in the common service of all : a great federation within a greater federation, the federation of free nations, whose freedom is the measure of their service to man, and whose unity the hope of peace among the peoples of the earth.

## APPENDIX D

### PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

THIRTY-SEVENTH SESSIONS OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,  
HELD AT GAYA IN DECEMBER, 1922

#### “ LAW AND ORDER.”

GENTLEMEN, the time is a critical one and it is important to seize upon the real issue which divides the people from the Bureaucracy and its Indian allies. During the period of repression which began about this time last year it was this issue which pressed itself on our attention. This policy of repression was supported and in some cases instigated by the Moderate Leaders who are in the Executive Government. I do not charge those who supported the Government with dishonesty or want of patriotism. I say they were led away by the battle cry of Law and Order. And it is because I believe that there is a fundamental confusion of thought behind this attitude of mind that I propose to discuss this plea of Law and Order. “ Law and Order ” has indeed been the last refuge of Bureaucracies all over the world.

It has been gravely asserted not only by the Bureaucracy but also by its apologists, the Moderate Party, that a settled Government is the first necessity of any people and that the subject has no right to present his grievances except in a constitutional way, by which I understand in some way recognized by the constitution. If you cannot actively co-operate in the maintenance of “ the law of the land ” they say “ it is your duty as a responsible citizen to obey it passively. Non-resistance is the least that the Government is entitled to expect from you ”. This is the whole political philosophy of the Bureaucracy—the maintenance of law and order on the part of the Government, and an attitude of passive obedience and non-resistance on the part of the subject. But was not that the political philosophy of every English king from William the Conqueror to James II? And was not that the political philosophy of the Romanoffs, the Hohenzollerns and of the Bourbons? And yet freedom has come, where it has come, by disobedience of the very laws which were proclaimed in the name of law and order. Where the Government is arbitrary and despotic and the fundamental rights of the people are not recognized, it is idle to talk of law and order.

The doctrine has apparently made its way to this country from England. I shall, therefore, refer to English history to find out the truth about this doctrine. That history has recorded that most of the despots in England who exercised arbitrary sway over the people professed to act for the good of the people and for the maintenance of law and order. English absolutism from the Normans down to the Stuarts tried to put itself on a constitutional basis through the process of this very law and order. The pathetic speech delivered by Charles I just before his execution puts the whole doctrine in a nutshell. "For the people," he said, "truly I desire their liberty and freedom as much as anybody whatsoever, but I must tell you that their liberty and freedom consist in having Government, those laws by which their lives and their goods may be their own. It is not their having a share in the Government, that is nothing appertaining to them. A subject and a sovereign are clear different things." The doctrine of law and order could not be stated with more admirable clearness. But though the English kings acted constitutionally in the sense that their acts were in accordance with the letter of law and were covered by precedents, the subject always claimed that they were free to assert their fundamental rights and to wrest them from the king by force or insurrections. The doctrine of law and order received a rude shock when King John was obliged to put his signature to the Magna Charta on the 15th of June, 1215. The sixty-first clause of the Charter is important for our purpose securing as it did to the subject the liberty of rebellion as a means for enforcing the due observance of the Charter by the Crown. Adams, a celebrated writer of the English Constitutional History, says that the conditional right to rebel is as much at the foundation of the English constitution to-day as it was in 1215. But though the doctrine of law and order had received a rude shock, it did not altogether die; for in the intervening period the Crown claimed and asserted the right to raise money, not only by indirect taxes but also by forced loans and benevolences; and frequently exercised large legislative functions not only by applying what are known as suspending and dispensing powers but also by issuing proclamations. The crown claimed, as Hallam says, "not only a kind of supplemental right of legislation to perfect and carry out what the spirit of existing laws might require but also a paramount supremacy, called sometimes the king's absolute or sovereign power which sanctioned commands beyond the legal prerogative, *for the sake of public safety* whenever the council might judge to be that in hazard". By the time of the Stuarts the powers claimed by the Crown were recognized by the courts of law as well founded, and, to quote the words of Adams, "the forms of law became the engines for the perpetration of judicial murders".



It is necessary to remember that it was the process of law and order that helped to consolidate the powers of the Crown ; for it was again and again laid down by the Court of Exchequer that the power of taxation was vested in the Crown, where it was "*for the general benefit of the people*". As Adams says, "the Stuarts asserted a legal justification for everything done by them", and, "on the whole, history was with the king".

But how did the Commons meet this assertion of law and order ? They were strict non-co-operators both within and outside the Parliament. Within the Parliament they again and again refused to vote supplies unless their grievances were redressed. The king retorted by raising Customs duties on his own initiative and the Courts of law supported him. The Commons passed a resolution to the effect that persons paying them "should be reputed betrayers of liberties of England and enemies to the same". There was little doubt that revolution was on the land ; and King Charles finding himself in difficulty gave his Royal Assent to the Bill of Rights on the 17th of June, 1626. The Bill of Rights constitutes a triumph for non-co-operators ; for it was by their refusal to have any part or share in the administration of the country that the Commons compelled the king to acknowledge their rights. The events that followed between 1629 and 1640 made the history of England. In spite of the Bill of Rights the king continued to raise Customs duties, and Elliot and his friends were put on their trial. They refused to plead, and the result was disastrous for the arbitrary power of the king. The king levied ship money on the nation. The chief constables of various places replied that the Sheriffs had no authority to assess or tax any man without the consent of the Parliament. On the refusal on the part of the people to pay the taxes their cattle was distrained, and no purchaser could be found for them. The king took the opinion of the Exchequer Court on the question whether, "*when the good and the safety of the kingdom in general is concerned, and the whole kingdom is in danger*", mark how the formula has been copied verbatim in the Government of India Act, "may not the king . . . command all the subjects of his kingdom, to provide and furnish such number of ships, with men, victuals and munitions, and for such time as he shall think fit, *for the defence and safeguard of the kingdom from such peril*",—again the formula !—"and by law compel the doing thereof in case of refusal and refractoriness ? And whether in such case, is not the king sole judge, both of the danger, and when and how the same is to be prevented ?" The judges answered in the affirmative and maintained the answer in the celebrated case which Hampden brought before them.

I desire to emphasize one point, and that is, that throughout the long and bitter struggle between the Stuarts and Parliament,

the Stuarts acted for the maintenance of law and order, and there is no doubt that both law and history were on their side. On the eve of the civil war, the question that divided the parties was this: could the Crown in the maintenance of law and order claim the passive obedience of the subject, or was there any power of resistance in the subject, though that resistance might result in disorder and in breaches of law? The adherents of the Parliament stood for the power and the majesty of the people, the authority and "independency of Parliament", individual liberty, the right to resist, and the right to compel abdication and secure deposition of the Crown; in a word, they stood for Man against the coercive powers of the State. The adherents of the Crown stood for indefeasible right, a right to claim passive obedience and secure non-resistance on the part of the subject through the process of law and order; in a word, they stood for state coercion and compulsory co-operation against individual liberty.

The issue was decided in favour of Parliament, but, as it must happen in every war of arms, the victory for individual liberty was only temporary. Though the result of civil war was disastrous from the point of view of individual liberty and though it required another revolution, this time a non-violent revolution to put individual liberty on a sure foundation, "the knowledge that the subjects had sat in rude judgment on their king, man to man, speeded the slow emancipation of the mind from the shackles of custom and ancient reverence".

The revolution of 1688—a bloodless revolution—secured for England that rule of law which is the only sure foundation for the maintenance of law and order. It completed the work which the Long Parliament had begun and which the execution of Charles I had interrupted. But how was the peaceful revolution of 1688 brought about? By defiance of authority and by rigid adherence to the principle that it is the inalienable right of the subject to resist the exercise by the executive of wide, arbitrary or discretionary powers of constraint.

The principle for which the revolution of 1688 stood was triumphantly vindicated in the celebrated case of Dr. Sacheverell. In the course of a sermon which he had preached, he gave expression to the following sentiment. "The grand security of our Government and the very pillar upon which it stands, is founded upon the steady belief of the subjects' obligation to an absolute and unconditional obedience to the supreme power in all things lawful, and the utter illegality of resistance on any pretence whatsoever." This is the doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance—the doctrine of law and order which is proclaimed to-day by every bureaucrat in the country, foreign or domestic, and which is supposed to be the last word on the subject's

duty and Government's rights. But mark how they solved the problem in England in 1710. The Commons impeached Dr. Sacheverell giving expression to a view so destructive of individual liberty, and the Lords, by a majority of votes, found him guilty. The speeches delivered in the courses of the trial are interesting. I desire to quote a few sentences from some of those speeches. Sir Joseph Jekyll, in the course of his speech said, " that as the law is the only measure of the Prince's authority, and the people's subjection, so the law derives its being and efficacy from common consent ; and to place it on any other foundation than common consent, is to take away the obligation this notion of common consent puts both prince and people *under*, to observe the laws. . . . My Lords, as the doctrine of unlimited non-resistance was impliedly renounced by the whole nation in the revolution, so divers Acts of Parliament afterwards passed, expressing their renunciation, . . . and, therefore, I shall only say, that it can never be supposed that the laws were made to set up a despotic power to destroy themselves, and to warrant the subversion of a constitution of a Government which they were designed to establish and defend ". Mr. Walpole put the whole argument in a nutshell when he said, " the doctrine of unlimited, unconditional passive obedience was first invented to support arbitrary and despotic power, and was never promoted or countenanced by any Government that had not designs, some time or other of making use of it ". The argument against the doctrine of law and order could not be put more clearly or forcibly : for his argument comes to this, that the doctrine is not an honest one, if law and order is the process by which absolutism consolidates its powers and strengthens its hand. I will make one more quotation, and that is from the speech of Major-General Stanhope. " As to the doctrine itself of absolute non-resistance it should seem needless to prove by argument that it is inconsistent with the law of reason, with the law of nature, and with the practice of all ages and countries. . . . And, indeed, one may appeal to the practice of all churches, and of all States, and of all nations in the world, how they behaved themselves when they found their civil and religious constitutions invaded and oppressed by tyranny."

This, then, is the history of the freedom movement in England. The conclusion is irresistible that it is not by acquiescence in the doctrine of law and order that the English people have obtained the recognition of their fundamental rights. It follows from the survey that I have made, firstly, that no regulation is law unless it is based on the consent of the people ; secondly, where such consent is wanting the people are under no obligation to obey ; thirdly, where such laws are not only not based on the consent of

the people but profess to attack their fundamental rights, the subjects are entitled to compel their withdrawal by force or insurrections ; fourthly, that law and order is, and has always been, a plea for absolutism ; and lastly, there can be neither law nor order before the real reign of law begins.

I have dealt with the question at some length, as the question is a vital one, and there are many Moderates who still think that it is the duty of every loyal subject to assist the Government in the maintenance of law and order. The personal liberty of every Indian to-day depends to a great extent on the exercise by persons in authority of wide, arbitrary or discretionary powers. Where such powers are allowed the rule of law is denied. To find out the extent to which this exploded doctrine of law and order influences the minds of sober and learned men, you have only to read the Report of the Committee appointed to examine the Repressive Laws. You will find in the Report neither the vision of the patriot nor the wisdom of the statesman ; but you will find an excessive worship of that much advertised, but much misunderstood, phrase "Law and Order". Why is Regulation 3 of 1818 to be amended and kept on the Statute Book ? Because for the protection of the frontiers of India and the fulfilment of the responsibility of the Government of India in relation to Indian States, there must be some enactment to arm the Executive with powers to restrict the movements and activities of certain persons who, though not coming within the scope of any criminal law, have to be put under some measure of restraint. Why are the Indian Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1908, and the Prevention of Seditious Meetings Act, 1911, to be retained on the Statute Book ? For the preservation of law and order. They little think, these learned gentlemen responsible for the Report, that these Statutes, giving, as they do, to the Executive, wide, arbitrary and discretionary powers of constraint, constitute a state of things wherein it is the duty of every individual to resist and to defy the tyranny of such lawless laws. These Statutes in themselves constitute a breach of law and order, for law and order is the result of the rule of law ; and where you deny the existence of the rule of law, you cannot turn round and say, " it is your duty as law-abiding citizens to obey the law ".

We have had abundance of this law and order during the last few years of our national history. The last affront delivered to the nation was the promulgation of an executive order under the authority of the Criminal Law Amendment Act making the legitimate work of Congress Volunteers illegal and criminal. This was supported by our Moderate friends on the ground that it is the duty of the law-abiding subject to support the maintenance of law and order. The doctrine, as I said before, has travelled

all the way from the shores of England. But may I ask—is there one argument advanced to-day by the bureaucracy and its friends which was not advanced with equal clearness by the Stuarts? When the Stuarts arrogated to themselves a discretionary power of committing to prison all persons who were on any account obnoxious to the Court, they made the excuse that the power was necessary for the safety of the nation. And the power was resisted in England, not because it was never exercised for the safety of the nation, but because the existence of the power was inconsistent with the existence at the same time of individual liberty. When the Stuarts claimed the right to legislate by proclamations and by wide exercise of suspending and dispersing powers, they did so on the express ground that such legislation was necessary for public safety. That right was denied by the English nation, not because such legislation was not necessary for public safety, but because such right could not co-exist with the fundamental right of the nation to legislate for itself. Is the power of the Governor-General to certify that the passage of a Bill is essential for safety or tranquillity or interest of British India any different from the power claimed by the Stuarts? There is indeed a striking resemblance between the power conferred on the Governor-General and the Governors of the provinces and the powers claimed by the Tudors and the Stuarts. When the Stuarts claimed the right to raise revenue on their own initiative, they disclaimed any intention to exercise such right except “*when the good and safety of the kingdom in general is concerned and the whole kingdom is in danger*”. That right was resisted in England, not because the revenues raised by them were not necessary for the good and safety of the kingdom, but because that right was inconsistent with the fundamental right of the people to pay such taxes only as were determined by the representatives of the people for the people. Is the power conferred on the Governor to certify that the expenditure provided for by a particular demand not assented to by the Legislature is essential to the discharge of his responsibility for the subject any different from the power claimed by the Stuarts? It should be patent to everybody that we do not live under the rule of law, and the history of England has proclaimed that it is idle to talk of the maintenance of law and order when large discretionary powers of constraint are vested in the Executive. The manhood of England triumphantly resisted the pretensions of “*Law and Order*”. If there is manhood in India to-day, India will successfully resist the same pretensions advanced by the Indian bureaucracy.

I have quoted from English history at length because the argument furnished by that history appeals to most people who

are frightened by popular movements into raising the cry of "law and order", and who think that the development of the great Indian nation must follow the lines laid down in that history. For myself I oppose the pretensions of "law and order", not on historical precedent, but on the ground that it is the inalienable right of every individual and of every nation to stand on truth and to offer a stubborn resistance to the promulgation of lawless laws. There was a law in the time of Christ which forbade the people from eating on the Sabbath, but allowed the priests to profane the Sabbath. And how Christ dealt with the law is narrated in the New Testament.

"At that time Jesus went on the Sabbath day through the corn; and his disciples were an hungred, and began to pluck the ears of corn, and to eat.

"But when the Pharisees saw it, they said unto him, Behold, thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do upon the Sabbath day.

"But he said unto them, Have ye not read what David did, when he was an hungred and they that were with him;

"How he entered into the house of God and did eat the shewbread, which was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them which were with him, but only for the priests?"

"Or have ye not read in the law, how that on the Sabbath days the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath, and are blameless?"

The truth is, that law and order is for Man, and not Man for Law and Order. The development of nationality is a sacred task and anything which impedes that task is an obstacle which the very force and power of nationality must overcome. If, therefore, you interpose a doctrine to impede the task, why, the doctrine must go. If you have recourse to law and order to establish and defend the rule of law then your law and order is entitled to claim the respect of all law-abiding citizens; but, as soon as you have recourse to it not to establish and defend the rule of law, but to destroy and attack it, there is no longer any obligation on us to respect it, for a Higher Law, the natural law, the law of God, compels us to offer our stubborn resistance to it. When I find something put forward in the sacred name of law and order which is deliberately intended to hinder the growth, the development, and the self-realization of the nation, I have no hesitation whatever in proclaiming that such law and order is an outrage on man and an insult to God.

But though our Moderate friends are often deluded by the battle cry of law and order, I rejoice when I hear that cry. It means that the Bureaucracy is in danger and that the Bureaucracy has realized its danger. It is not without reason that a false

issue is raised ; and the fact that a false issue has been raised fills me with hope and courage. I ask my countrymen to be patient and to press the charge. Freedom has already advanced when the alarm of law and order is sounded ; that is the history of Bureaucracies all over the world.

In the meantime it is our duty to keep our ideal steadfast. We must not forget that we are on the eve of great changes, that world forces are working all around us and that the battle of freedom has yet to be won.

#### NATIONALISM : THE IDEAL

What is the ideal which we must set before us ? The first and foremost is the ideal of nationalism. Now what is nationalism ? It is, I conceive, a process through which a nation expresses itself and finds itself, not in isolation from other nations, not in opposition to other nations, but as part of a great scheme by which, in seeking its own expression and therefore its own identity, it materially assists the self-expression and self-realization of other nations as well : Diversity is as real as unity. And in order that the unity of the world may be established it is essential that each nationality should proceed on its own line and find fulfilment in self-expression and self-realization. The nationality of which I am speaking must not be confused with the conception of nationality as it exists in Europe to-day. Nationalism in Europe is an aggressive nationalism, a selfish nationalism, a commercial nationalism of gain and loss. The gain of France is the loss of Germany, and the gain of Germany is the loss of France. Therefore French nationalism is nurtured on the hatred of Germany, and German nationalism is nurtured on the hatred of France. It is not yet realized that you cannot hurt Germany without hurting Humanity, and in consequence hurting France ; and that you cannot hurt France without hurting Humanity, and in consequence hurting Germany. That is European nationalism ; that is not the nationalism of which I am speaking to you to-day. I contend that each nationality constitutes a particular stream of the great unity, but no nation can fulfil itself unless and until it becomes itself and at the same time realizes its identity with Humanity. The whole problem of nationalism is therefore to find that stream and to face that destiny. If you find the current and establish a continuity with the past, then the process of self-expression has begun, and nothing can stop the growth of nationality.

Throughout the pages of Indian history, I find a great purpose unfolding itself. Movement after movement has swept over this vast country, apparently creating hostile forces, but in reality stimulating the vitality and moulding the life of the people into

one great nationality. If the Aryans and the non-Aryans met, it was for the purpose of making one people out of them. Brahmanism with its great culture succeeded in binding the whole of India and was indeed a mighty unifying force. Buddhism with its protests against Brahmanism served the same great historical purpose ; and from Magadha to Taxila was one great Buddhistic empire which succeeded not only in broadening the basis of Indian unity, but in creating, what is perhaps not less important, the greater India beyond the Himalayas and beyond the seas, so much so that the sacred city where we have met may be regarded as a place of pilgrimage of millions and millions of people of Asiatic races. Then came the Mahomedans of divers races, but with one culture which was their common heritage. For a time it looked as if here was a disintegrating force, an enemy to the growth of Indian nationalism, but the Mahomedans made their home in India, and, while they brought a new outlook and a wonderful vitality to the Indian life, with infinite wisdom, they did as little as possible to disturb the growth of life in the villages where India really lives. This new outlook was necessary for India ; and if the two sister streams met, it was only to fulfil themselves and face the destiny of Indian history. Then came the English with their alien culture, their foreign methods, delivering a rude shock to this growing nationality ; but the shock has only completed the unifying process so that the purpose of history is practically fulfilled. The great Indian nationality is in sight. It already stretches its hands across the Himalayas not only to Asia but to the whole of the world, not aggressively, but to demand its recognition, and to offer its contribution. I desire to emphasize that there is no hostility between the ideal of nationality and that of world peace. Nationalism is the process through which alone will world peace come. A full and unfettered growth of nationalism is necessary for world peace just as a full and unfettered growth of individuals is necessary for nationality. It is the conception of aggressive nationality in Europe that stands in the way of world peace ; but once the truth is grasped that it is not possible for a nation to inflict a loss on another nation without at the same time inflicting a loss on itself, the problem of Humanity is solved. The essential truth of nationality lies in this, that it is necessary for each nation to develop itself, express itself and realize itself, so that Humanity itself may develop itself, express itself and realize itself. It is my belief that this truth of nationality will endure, although, for the moment, unmindful of the real issue the nations are fighting amongst themselves ; and, if I am not mistaken, it is the very instinct of selfishness and self-preservation which will ultimately solve the problem, not the narrow and the mistaken



selfishness of the present, but a selfishness universalized by intellect and transfigured by spirit, a selfishness that will bring home to the nations of the world that in the efforts to put down their neighbours lies their own ruin and suppression.

We have, therefore, to foster the spirit of Nationality. True development of the Indian nation must necessarily lie in the path of Swaraj. A question has often been asked as to what is Swaraj. Swaraj is indefinable and is not to be confused with any particular system of Government. There is all the difference in the world between Swarayya and Samrayya. Swaraj is the natural expression of the national mind. The full outward expression of that mind covers, and must necessarily cover, the whole life history of a nation. Yet it is true that Swaraj begins when the true development of a nation begins, because, as I have said, Swaraj is the expression of the national mind. The question of nationalism, therefore, looked at from another point of view, is the same question as that of Swaraj. The question of all questions in India to-day is the attainment of Swaraj.

#### NON-VIOLENT NON-CO-OPERATION

I now come to the question of method. I have to repeat that it has been proved beyond any doubt that the method of non-violent non-co-operation is the only method which we must follow to secure a system of Government which may in reality be the foundation of Swaraj. It is hardly necessary to discuss the philosophy of non-co-operation. I shall simply state the different view points from which this question may be discussed. From the national point of view the method of non-co-operation means the attempt of the nation to concentrate upon its own energy and to stand on its own strength. From the ethical point of view, non-co-operation means the method of self-purification, the withdrawal from that which is injurious to the development of the nation, and therefore to the good of humanity. From the spiritual point of view, Swaraj means that isolation which in the language of Sadhana is called *protiyahar*—that withdrawal from the forces which are foreign to our nature—an isolation and withdrawal which is necessary in order to bring out from our hidden depths the soul of the nation in all her glory. I do not desire to labour the point, but from every conceivable point of view, the method of non-violent non-co-operation must be regarded as the true method of “ following in the path of Swaraj ”.

#### FORCE AND VIOLENCE

Doubt has, however, been expressed in some quarters about the soundness of the principle of non-violence. I cannot refuse to

acknowledge that there is a body of Indian opinion within the country as well as outside according to which non-violence is an ideal abstraction incapable of realization, and that the only way in which Swaraj can ever be attained is by the application of force and violence. I do not for a moment question the courage, sacrifice and patriotism of those who hold this view. I know that some of them have suffered for the cause which they believe to be true. But may I be permitted to point out that apart from any question of principle, history has proved over and over again the utter futility of revolutions brought about by force and violence. I am one of those who hold to non-violence on principle. But let us consider the question of expediency. Is it possible to attain Swaraj by violent means? The answer, which history gives is, an emphatic "No". Take all the formidable revolutions of the world.

#### THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

The history of the French Revolution is the history of a struggle at the first instance between the Crown and the nobility on one side and the Representative Assemblies with armed Paris on the other. Both took to violence, one to the bayonet and the other to the pike. The pike succeeded because the bayonet was held with uncertain hands. And then, as is usual after the victory gained with violence, the popular party was sharply divided between two sections—the Girondins and the Jacobins. Again there was an appeal to force. The Girondins asked the provinces to rise in arms, the Jacobins asked Paris to rise in arms. Paris being nearer and stronger, the Girondins were defeated and sent to the guillotine—the Jacobins seized the power. But it did not take them many months to fall out among themselves. First Robespierre and Danton sent Hebert and Chaumette to the guillotine. Then Robespierre sent Danton to the guillotine. Robespierre in his turn was guillotined by Collot Billaud and Tallien. These men, again, were banished by others to the far off South America. If there was a slight difference of views between the Girondins and the Jacobins—there was practically none between the different sections of the Jacobins. The whole question was which of the various sections was to rule France. Force gave way to stronger force and at last under Napoleon France experienced a despotism similar to if not worse than the despotism of Louis XIV. As regards liberty there was not more liberty in France under the terrible Committee of Public Safety and Napoleon than under Louis XIV or Louis XV. The law of Prairial was certainly much worse than Lettres de Cachet. And the people—? On the Pont au Change, on the Place de Greve, in long sheds, Mercier, at the end of the

Revolution, saw working men at their repast. One's allotment of daily bread had sunk to an ounce-and-a-half. "Plates containing each three grilled herrings, sprinkled with shorn onions, wetted with a little vinegar; to this add some morsel of boiled prunes, and lentils swimming in a clear sauce; at these frugal tables I have seen them ranged by the hundred; consuming, without bread, their scant messes, far too moderate for the keenness of their appetite, and the extent of their stomach." "Seine water" remarks Carlyle grimly—"rushing plenteous by, will supply the deficiency." One cannot forget the exclamation of Carlyle in this connection:

"O Man of Toil" "Thy struggling and thy daring, these six long years of insurrection and tribulation, thou hast profited nothing by it, then? Thou consumest thy herring and water, in the blessed gold-red of evening. O why was the Earth so beautiful, becrimsoned with dawn and twilight, if man's dealings with man were to make it a vale of scarcity, of tears, not even soft tears? Destroying of Bastilles, discomfiting of Brunswicks, fronting of Principalities and Powers, of Earth and Tophet, all that thou hast dared and endured,—it was for a Republic of the Saloons? Aristocracy of Feudal Parchment has passed away with a mighty rushing; and now, by a natural course, we arrive at Aristocracy of the Moneybag. It is the course through which all European Societies are, at this hour, travelling. Apparently, a still baser sort of Aristocracy? An infinitely baser; the basest yet known."

Even to-day France is plodding her weary way towards Swaraj.

#### REVOLUTIONS IN ENGLAND.

The history of England proves the same truth. The revolution of the Barons in 1215 took away or purported to take away the power from the King; but the power fell into the hands of the aristocracy, and democracy did not share in the triumphs of the Barons. Thus the great Charter, as a great historian has observed, was not a Charter of Liberty but of Liberties. The revolution in the reign of Charles I produced a new dictator who suppressed freedom. The work which the Long Parliament began was interrupted by the revolution which followed the execution of the King, and it required another revolution, this time a bloodless revolution, to complete the work. I deny that the work is yet complete. The continual class war and the obvious economic injustice do not proclaim that freedom which England claimed for herself. I maintain that no people has yet succeeded in winning freedom by force and violence. The truth is that love of power is a formidable factor to be reckoned with, and those who

secure the power by violence will retain that power by violence. The use of violence degenerates them who use it, and it is not easy for them, having seized the power, to surrender it. And they find it easier to carry on the work of their predecessor, retaining their power in their own hands. Non-violence does not carry with it that degeneration which is inherent in the use of violence.

#### REVOLUTIONS IN ITALY AND RUSSIA.

The Revolutions in Italy and Russia illustrate the same principle. The Italian Revolution inspired by Mazzini and worked out by Garibaldi and Cavour, did not result in the attainment of Swaraj. The freedom of Italy is yet in the making, and the men and women of Italy are to-day looking forward to another revolution. If it results in a war of violence it will again defeat its purpose, but only to allow Freedom and Non-violence to triumph in the end.

The recent revolution in Russia is a very interesting study. The shape which it has now assumed is due to the attempt to force Marxian doctrines and dogmas on the unwilling genius of Russia. Violence will again fail. If I have read the situation accurately I expect a counter revolution. The soul of Russia must struggle to free herself from the socialism of Carl Marx. It may be an independent movement, or it may be that the present movement contains within itself the power of working out that freedom. In the meantime the fate of Russia is trembling in the balance.

#### NON-VIOLENT NON-CO-OPERATION THE ONLY METHOD.

I believe in revolutions, but I repeat, violence defeats freedom. The revolution of non-violence is slower but surer. Step by step the soul of the nation emerges and step by step the nation marches on in the path of Swaraj. The only method by which Freedom can be attained in India at any rate, is the method of non-violent non-co-operation. Those who believe this method to be impracticable would do well to ponder over the Akali movement. When I saw the injuries of the wounded at Amritsar and heard from their lips that not one of them had ever wished to meet violence by violence in spite of such great provocation, I said to myself, here was the triumph of non-violence.

Non-violence is not an idle dream. It was not in vain that Mahatma declared "put up thy sword into the sheath". Let those who are "of the truth" hear his voice as those others heard a mightier voice two thousand years ago.

The attempt of the Indian nation to attain Swaraj by this method was, however, met by severe repression. The time has

come for us to estimate our success as well as our failure. So far as repression is concerned, it is easy to answer the question. I have not the least doubt in my mind that the nation has triumphed over the repression which was started and continued to kill the soul of the movement.

#### SUCCESS OF NON-VIOLENT NON-CO-OPERATION.

But the question, which agitates most minds, is as to whether we have succeeded in our work of non-violent non-co-operation. There is, I am sorry to say, a great deal of confusion of thought behind the question. It is assumed that a movement must either succeed or fail, whereas the truth is that human movements, I am speaking of genuine movements, neither altogether succeed nor altogether fail. Every genuine movement proceeds from an ideal, and the ideal is always higher than the achievement. Take the French revolution. Was it a success? Was it a failure? To predict either would be a gross historical blunder. Was the non-co-operation movement in India a success? Yes, a mighty success when we think of the desire for Swaraj which it has succeeded in awakening throughout the length and breadth of this vast country. It is a great success when we think of the practical results of such awakening, in the money which the nation contributed, in the enrolment of members of the Indian National Congress and in the boycott of foreign cloth. I go further and say that the practical achievement also consists of the loss of prestige suffered by Educational Institutions and the Courts of Law and the Reformed Councils throughout the country. If they are still resorted to, it is because of the weakness of our countrymen. The country has already expressed its strong desire to end these institutions. Yet it must be admitted that from another point of view, when we assess the measure of our success in the spirit of arithmetic, we are face to face with "the petty done" and "the undone vast". There is much which remains to be accomplished. Non-violence has to be more firmly established. The work of non-co-operation has to be strengthened, and the field of non-co-operation has to be extended. We must be firm but reasonable. The spirit of sacrifice has got to be further strengthened, and we must proceed with the work of destruction and creation more vigorously than before. I say to our critics, I admit we have failed in many directions, but will you also not admit our success where we have succeeded?

#### CHARGE OF CORRUPTING THE YOUTHS.

• We have been denounced by the Moderates for having corrupted the youth of the country. It has been asserted that we have taught sons to disobey their fathers, the pupils their teachers,

and the subject the Government. We plead guilty to the charge, and we rely upon every spiritual movement as argument in our support. Christ himself was tried for having corrupted the people, and the answer which He gave in anticipation is as emphatic as it is instructive :

“ Think not that I am come to send peace on earth : I come not to send peace, but a sword.

“ For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law.”

#### CHARGES OF HYPOCRISY.

It has been said that with love on our lips we have been preaching the gospel of hatred. Never was such a vile slander uttered. It may be we have failed to love, it may be we lost ourselves, some of us, in hatred, but that only shows our weakness and imperfectness. Judge us by our ideal, not by what we have achieved. Wherever we have fallen short of that ideal put it down to our weakness. On behalf of the Indian National Congress I deny the charge of hypocrisy. To those who are ever anxious to point out our defects, I say with all humility, “ my friends, if we are weak, come and join us and make us stronger. If the leaders are worthless, come and join us to lead, and the leaders will stand aside. If you do not believe in the ideal, what is the use of always criticising us in the light of that ideal ? ” We need no critic to tell us how far we have fallen short of that ideal. Evidence of weakness has met me from every direction in which I have looked ; but in spite of our defects of human weakness, of human imperfection, I feel bold enough to say that our victory is assured and that the Bureaucracy knows that our victory is assured.

#### HOW TO APPLY THE METHOD OF NON-VIOLENT NON-CO-OPERATION.

But though the method of non-violent non-co-operation is sure and certain, we have now to consider how best to apply that method to the existing circumstances of the country. I do not agree with those who think that the spirit of the nation is so dead that non-violent non-co-operation is no longer possible. I have given the matter my earnest thought, and I desire to make it perfectly clear that there is absolutely no reason for entertaining any feelings of doubt or despair. The outward appearance of the people to-day is somewhat deceptive. They appear to be in a tired condition and a sense of fatigue has partially overcome them. But beneath all this exterior of quietude, the pulse of the nation beats as strongly as before and as hopefully as at the beginning of this movement. We have to consolidate the strength of the

nation, we have to devise a plan of work which will stimulate their energy so that we can accelerate our journey towards Swaraj. I shall place before you one by one the items of work, which, in my opinion, the Indian National Congress should prescribe for the nation..

#### DECLARATION OF THE RIGHTS OF DIFFERENT COMMUNITIES.

It should commence its work for the year by a clearer declaration of the rights of the different communities in India under the Swaraj Government. So far as the Hindus and the Mahomedans are concerned there should be a clearer and emphatic confirmation of what is known as the Lucknow Compact, and along with that there should be an emphatic recognition of each other's rights, and each should be prepared to undergo some kind of sacrifice in favour of the other. Let me give an instance to make my meaning clear. Every devout Musalman objects to any music in front of a mosque, and every devout and orthodox Hindu objects to cows being slaughtered. May not the Hindus and the Musalmans of India enter into a solemn compact so that there may not be any music before any mosque and that no cows may be slaughtered? Other instances may be quoted. There should be a scheme of a series of sacrifices to be suffered by each community so that they may advance shoulder to shoulder in the path of Swaraj. As regards the other communities such as Sikhs, Christians and Parsees, the Hindus and the Mahomedans who constitute the bulk of the people should be prepared to give them even more than their proportional share in the Swaraj administration. I suggest that the Congress should bring about real agreement between all these communities by which the rights of every minority should be clearly recognized in order to remove all doubts which may arise and all apprehensions which probably exist. I need hardly add that I include among Christians not only pure Indians, but also Anglo-Indians and other people who have chosen to make India their home. Such an agreement as I have indicated was always necessary, but such an agreement is specially necessary in view of the work which faces us to-day.

#### FOREIGN PROPAGANDA.

I further think that the policy of exclusiveness which we have been following during the last two years should now be abandoned. There is in every country a number of people who are selfless followers of liberty and who desire to see every country free. We can no longer afford to lose their sympathy and co-operation. In my opinion, there should be established Congress Agencies in America and in every European country. We must keep ourselves in touch

with world movements and be in constant communication with the lovers of freedom all over the world.

### THE GREAT ASIATIC FEDERATION.

Even more important than this is participation of India in the great Asiatic Federation, which I see in the course of formation. I have hardly any doubt that the Pan-Islamic movement, which was started on a somewhat narrow basis, has given way or is about to give way to the great Federation of all Asiatic people. It is the union of the oppressed nationalities of Asia. Is India to remain outside this union? I admit that our freedom must be won by ourselves but such a bond of friendship and love, of sympathy and co-operation, between India and the rest of Asia, nay, between India and all the liberty-loving people of the world is destined to bring about world peace. World peace to my mind means the freedom of every nationality, and I go further and say that no nation in the face of the earth can be really free when other nations are in bondage. The policy which we have hitherto pursued was absolutely necessary for the concentration of the work which we took upon ourselves to perform, and I agreed to that policy whole-heartedly. The hope of the attainment of Swaraj or a substantial basis of Swaraj in the course of the year made such concentration absolutely necessary. To-day that very work demands broader sympathy and a wider outlook.

### SCHEME OF GOVERNMENT.

It is hardly within the province of this address to deal with any detailed scheme of any such government. I cannot, however, allow this opportunity to pass without giving you an expression of my opinion as to the character of that system of Government. No system of Government which is not for the people and by the people can ever be regarded as the true foundation of Swaraj. I am firmly convinced that a parliamentary Government is not a Government by the people and for the people. Many of us believe that the middle class must win Swaraj for the masses. I do not believe in the possibility of any class movement being ever converted into a movement for Swaraj. If to-day the British Parliament grants provincial autonomy in the provinces with responsibility in the central Government, I for one, will protest against it, because that will inevitably lead to the concentration of power in the hands of the middle class. I do not believe that the middle class will then part with their power. How will it profit India, if in place of the white Bureaucracy that now rules over her, there is substituted an Indian Bureaucracy of the middle classes? Bureaucracy is Bureaucracy, and I believe that the very



idea of Swaraj is inconsistent with the existence of a Bureaucracy. My ideal of Swaraj will never be satisfied unless the people co-operate with us in its attainment. Any other attempt will inevitably lead to what European Socialists call the "bourgeois" Government. In France and in England and in other European countries it is the middle class who fought the battle of freedom and the result is that power is still in the hands of this class. Having usurped the power they are unwilling to part with it. If to-day the whole of Europe is engaged in a battle of real freedom it is because the nations of Europe are gathering their strength to wrest this power from the hands of the middle classes. I desire to avoid the repetition of that chapter of European history. It is for India to show the light to the world,—Swaraj by non-violence and Swaraj by the people.

To me the organization of village life and the practical autonomy of small local centres are more important than either provincial autonomy or central responsibility; and if the choice lay between the two, I would unhesitatingly accept the autonomy of the local centres. I must not be understood as implying that the village centres will be disconnected units. They must be held together by a system of co-operation and integration. For the present, there must be power in the hands of the provincial and the Indian Government; but the ideal should be accepted once for all, that the proper function of the central authority, whether in the Provincial or in the Indian Government is to advise, having a residuary power of control only in case of need, and to be exercised under proper safeguards. I maintain that real Swaraj can only be attained by vesting the power of Government in these local centres, and I suggest that the Congress should appoint a Committee to draw up a scheme of Government which would be acceptable to the nation.

The most advanced thought of Europe is turning from the false individualism on which European culture and institutions are based to what I know to be the ideal of the ancient village organization of India. According to this thought modern democracy of the ballot box and large crowds has failed, but real democracy has not yet been tried. What is the real democracy of modern European thought?

The foundation of real democracy must be laid in small centres—not gradual decentralization which implies a previous centralization—but a gradual integration of the practically autonomous small centres into one living harmonious whole. What is wanted is a human state, not a mechanical contrivance. We want the growth of institutions and organizations which are really dynamic in their nature and not the mere static stability of a centralized state.

This strain of European thought found some expression in the philosophy of Hegel according to whom "human institutions belong to the region, not of inert externality, but of mind and purpose, and are therefore dynamic and self-developing".

Modern European thought has made it clear that from the individual to the "unified state," it is one continuous process of real and natural growth. Sovereignty (Swaraj) is a relative notion. "The individual is sovereign over himself"—attains his Swaraj—"in so far as he can develop, control and unify his manifold nature". From the individual we come to "integrated neighbourhood" which is the real foundation of the unified state which again in its turn gives us the true ideal of the world-state. This integrated neighbourhood is a great deal more than the mere physical contiguity of the people who live in the neighbourhood area. It requires the evolution of what has been called "neighbourhood consciousness". In other words, the question is "how can the force generated by the neighbourhood life become part of our whole civic and national life?" It is this question which now democracy takes upon itself to solve.

The process prescribed is the generation of the collective will. The democracy which obtains to-day rests on an attempt at securing a common will by a process of addition. This really means a war of wills, the issue being left to be decided by a mere superiority of numbers. New democracy discountenances this process of addition, and insists on the discovery of detailed means and methods by which the different wills of a neighbourhood entity may *grow* into one common collective will. This process is not a process of addition but of integration, and the consciousness of the neighbourhood thus awakened must express the common collective will of that neighbourhood entity. The collective wills of the several neighbourhood centres must, by a similar process of integration, be allowed to evolve the common collective will of the whole nation. It is only thus, by a similar process of integration that any league of nations may be real and the vision of a world state may be realized.

The whole of this philosophy is based on the idea of the evolution of the individual. The idea is to "release the powers of the individual". Ordinary notions of state have little to do with true individualism, *i. e.*, "with the individual as consciously responsible for the life from which he draws his breath and to which he contributes his all". According to this school of thought "representative government, party organization, majority rule, with all their excrescences are dead wood. In their stead must appear the organization of non-partisan groups for the begetting, the bringing into being, of common ideas, a common purpose and the collective will". This means the true development and extension

of the individual self. The institutions that exist to-day have made machines of men. No Government will be successful, no true Government is possible which does not rest on the individual. "Up to the present moment," says the gifted authoress of the *New State*, "we have never seen the individual yet. The search for him has been the whole long striving of our Anglo-Saxon history. We sought him through the method of representation and failed to find him. We sought to reach him by extending the suffrage to every man and then to every woman and yet he eludes us. Direct Government now seeks the individual." In another place the same writer says: "The group organization releases us from the domination of mere numbers, thus democracy transcends time and space. It can never be understood except as a spiritual force. Majority rule rests on numbers; democracy rests on the well-grounded assumption that society is not a collection of units, but a network of human relations. Democracy is not worked out at the polling booth; it is the bringing forth of a genuine collective will, one to which every single being must contribute the whole of his complex life, as one which every single being must express the whole of at one point. Thus the essence of democracy is creating. The technique of democracy is group organization." According to this school of thought no living state is possible without the development and the extension of the individual self. State itself is no static unit. Nor is it an arbitrary creation. "It is a process; a continual self-modification to express its different stages of growth in which each and all must be so flexible that continual change of form is twin-fellow of continual growth." This can only be realized when there is a clear perception that individuals and groups and the nation stand in no antithesis. The integration of all these into one conscious whole means and must necessarily mean the integration of the wills of individuals into the common and collective will of the entire nation.

The general trend of European thought has not accepted the ideal of this new democracy. But the present problems which are agitating Europe seem to offer no other solution. I have very little doubt that this ideal which appears to many practical politicians as impracticable will be accepted as the real ideal at no distant future. "There is little yet," I again quote from the same author, "that is practical in practical politics."

The fact is that all the progressive movements in Europe have suffered because of the want of a really spiritual basis and it is refreshing to find that this writer has seized upon it. To those who think that the neighbourhood group is too puny to serve as a real foundation of self-government, she says, "is our daily life profane and only so far as we rise out of it do we approach the

sacred life ? Then no wonder politics are what they have become. But this is not the creed of men to-day ; we believe in the sacredness of our life ; we believe that divinity is forever incarnating in humanity, and so we believe in Humanity and the common daily life of all men ”.

There is thus a great deal of correspondence between this view of life and the view which I have been endeavouring to place before my countrymen for the last fifteen years. For the truth of all truths is that the outer *Leela* of God reveals itself in history. Individual, Society, Nation, Humanity are the different aspects of that very *Leela* and no scheme of Self-Government which is practically true and which is really practical can be based on any other philosophy of life. It is the realization of this truth which is the supreme necessity of the hour. This is the soul of Indian thought, and this is the ideal towards which the recent thought of Europe is slowly but surely advancing.

To frame such a scheme of Government regard must, therefore, be had :—

- (1) to the formation of local centres more or less on the lines of the ancient village system of India ;
- (2) the growth of larger and larger groups out of the integration of these village centres ;
- (3) the unifying state which should be the result of similar growth.
- (4) the village centres and the larger groups must be practically autonomous.
- (5) the residuary power of control must remain in the central Government but the exercise of such power should be exceptional and for that purpose proper safeguards should be provided, so that the practical autonomy of the local centres may be maintained and at the same time the growth of the central Government into a really unifying state may be possible. The ordinary work of such central Government should be mainly advisory.

As a necessary corollary to what I have ventured to suggest as the form of Government which we should accept, I think that the work of organizing these local centres should be forthwith commenced. The modern subdivisions or even smaller units may be conveniently taken as the local centres, and larger centres may be conveniently formed. Once we have our local areas—“ the neighbourhood group ”—we should foster the habit of corporate thinking, and leave all local problems to be worked out

by them. There is no reason why we should not start the Government by these local centres to-day. They would depend for their authority on the voluntary co-operation of the people, and voluntary co-operation is much better than the compulsory co-operation which is at the bottom of the bureaucratic rule in India. This is not the place to elaborate the scheme which I have in mind; but I think that it is essentially necessary to appoint a Committee with power, not only to draw up a scheme of Government but to suggest means by which the scheme can be put into operation at once.

#### BOYCOTT OF COUNCILS.

The next item of work to which I desire to refer is the boycott of Councils. Unhappily the question has become part of the controversy of Change or No-Change. To my mind the whole controversy proceeds on a somewhat erroneous assumption. The question is not so much as to whether there should be a change in the programme of the work; the real question is, whether it is not necessary now to change the direction of our activities in certain respects for the success of the very movement which we hold so dear. Let me illustrate what I mean. Take the Bardoli Resolution. In the matter of boycott of schools and colleges the Bardoli Resolution alters the direction of our activity, which does not in any way involve the abandonment of the boycott. During the Swaraj year the idea was to bring the students out of Government schools and colleges, and if National schools were started they were regarded as concessions to the "weakness" of these students. The idea was, to quote the words of Mahatma Gandhi, "political" and not "educational". Under the Bardoli Resolution, however, it is the establishment of schools and colleges which must be the main activity of national education. The idea is "educational", and if it still be the desire of the Congress to bring students out of Government schools and colleges, it is by offering them educational advantages. Here the boycott of schools and colleges is still upheld, but the direction of our activities is changed. In fact, such changes must occur in every revolution, violent or non-violent, as it is only by such changes that the ideal is truly served.

In the next place we must keep in view the fact that according to the unanimous opinion of the members of the Enquiry Committee, Civil Disobedience on a large scale is out of the question because the people are not prepared for it.

I confess that I am not in favour of the restrictions which have been put upon the practical adoption of any system of civil disobedience, and in my opinion the Congress should abolish those restrictions. I have not yet been able to understand why

to enable a people to civilly disobey particular laws, it should be necessary that at least eighty per cent of them should be clad in pure "khadi". I am not much in favour of general mass civil disobedience. To my mind, the idea is impracticable. But the disobedience of particular laws which are eminently unlawful, laws which are the creatures of "Law and Order," laws which are alike an outrage on humanity and an insult to God—disobedience of such laws is within the range of practical politics and in my opinion every attempt should be made to offer disobedience to such laws. It is only by standing on truth that the cause of Swaraj may prevail. When we submit to such laws, we abandon the plank of truth. What hope is there for a nation so dead to the sense of truth as not to rebel against lawless laws, against regulations which insure their national being and hamper their national development ?

I am of opinion that the question of the boycott of the Council which is agitating the country so much must be considered and decided in the light of the circumstances I have just mentioned. There is no opposition in idea between such civil disobedience as I have mentioned and the entry into the Councils for the purpose, and with the avowed object of either ending or mending them. I am not against the boycott of Councils. I am simply of opinion that the system of the Reformed Councils with their steel frame of the Indian Civil Service covered over by a dyarchy of deadlocks and departments, is absolutely unsuitable to the nature and genius of the Indian nation. It is an attempt of the British Parliament to force a foreign system upon the Indian people. India has unhesitatingly refused to recognize this foreign system as a real foundation for Swaraj. With me, as I have often said, it is not a question of more or less ; I am always prepared to sacrifice much for a real basis of Swaraj, nor do I attach any importance to the question as to whether the attainment of full and complete independence will be a matter of seven years or ten years or twenty years. A few years is nothing in the life history of a nation. But I maintain that India cannot accept a system such as this as a foundation of our Swaraj. These Councils must therefore be either mended or ended. Hitherto we have been boycotting the Councils from outside. We have succeeded in doing much—the prestige of the Councils is diminished, and the country knows that the people who adorn those chambers are not the true representatives of the people. But though we have succeeded in doing much, these Councils are still there. It should be the duty of the Congress to boycott the Councils more effectively from within. 'Reformed Councils are really a mask which the Bureaucracy has put on. I conceive it to be our clear duty to tear this mask from off their face. The very idea of boycott implies, to

my mind, something more than mere withdrawal. The boycott of foreign goods means that such steps must be taken that there may be no foreign goods in our markets. The boycott of the Reformed Councils, to my mind, means that such steps must be taken that these Councils may not be there to impede the progress of Swaraj. The only successful boycott of these Councils is either to mend them in a manner suitable to the attainment of Swaraj or to end them completely. That is the way in which I advise the nation to boycott the Councils.

A great deal of discussion has taken place in the country as to whether the boycott of Councils in the sense in which I mean it, is within the principle of non-violent non-co-operation. I am emphatically of opinion that it does not offend against any principle of non-co-operation which has been adopted and applied by the Indian National Congress. I am not dealing with logical or philosophical abstractions. I am only dealing with that which Congress has adopted and called non-co-operation. In the first place, may I point out that we have not up to now non-co-operated with the Bureaucracy? We have been merely preparing the people of this country to offer non-co-operation. Let me quote the Nagpur resolution on non-co-operation in support of my proposition. I am quoting only the portions which are relevant to this point :

“Whereas in the opinion of the Congress the existing Government of India had forfeited the confidence of the country, and, whereas the people of India are now determined to establish Swaraj . . . now this Congress . . . declare that the entire or any part or parts of the scheme of non-violent non-co-operation with the renunciation of voluntary association with the present Government at one end, and the refusal to pay taxes at the other, should be put into force at a time to be determined by either the Indian National Congress, or the All India Congress Committee and that, *in the meanwhile, to prepare the country for it, effective steps should continue to be taken in that behalf.*”

Then follows the effective steps such as, national education, boycott of law courts, boycott of foreign goods, etc., which must be taken ‘in the meanwhile’. It is clear therefore that the Congress has not yet advocated the application of non-co-operation but has merely recommended certain steps to be taken, so that, at some time or other, to be determined by the Congress, the Indian nation may offer non-co-operation. In the second place, let us judge of the character of this principle, not by thinking of any logical idea or philosophical abstraction, but by gathering the principle from the work and the activity which the Congress has enjoined. When I survey that work, it is clear to my mind that the Congress was engaged in a twofold activity. In everything

that the Congress commanded there is an aspect of destruction as there is an aspect of creation. The boycott of lawyers and law courts means the destruction of existing legal institutions ; and the formation of Panchayates means the creation of agencies through which justice may be administered. The boycott of schools and colleges means the destruction of the department of education ; and the establishment of National schools and colleges means the creation of educational institutions for the youth of India. The boycott of foreign goods followed as it was by the burning of foreign cloth means the destruction of the foreign goods already in the country and the preventing, in the future, of foreign goods coming into the country. But on the other hand, the spinning wheel and the looms means creative activity in supplying the people with indigenous cloth. Judged by this principle, what is wrong about the desire either to convert the Councils into institutions which may lead us to Swaraj, or to destroy them altogether ? The same twofold aspect of creation and destruction is to be found in the boycott of Councils in the way I want them to be boycotted.

It has also been suggested that it offends against the morality and spirituality of this movement. Let us take the two points separately. As regards the question of morality apart from the ethics of non-co-operation, it has been urged that entering the Councils for the purpose of ending the Councils is unfair and dishonest. The argument implies that the Reformed Councils belong entirely to the Bureaucracy and the idea is that we should not enter into other people's property with a view to injure it. To my mind, the argument is based on a misconception of facts. Inadequate as the Reforms undoubtedly are, I do not for a moment admit that the Reforms Act was a gift of the British Parliament. It was, to quote the words of Mahatma Gandhi, " a concession to popular agitation ". The fact is that it is the resultant of two contending forces, the desire of the people for freedom and the desire of the bureaucracy to oppose such desire. The result is that it has travelled along lines neither entirely popular nor entirely bureaucratic. The people of India do not like these reforms, but let us not forget that bureaucracy does not like them either. Because it is the result of two contending forces pulling in different directions, the Reforms have assumed a tortured shape. But so far as the rights recognised are concerned, they are our rights—our property—and there is nothing immoral or unfair or dishonest in making use of the rights which the people have extorted from the British Parliament. If the fulfilment of the very forces which have succeeded in securing the reforms require that the Councils should either be ended or mended, if the struggle for freedom compels the adoption of either course,



what possible charge of immorality can be levelled against it? I admit if we had proposed to enter the Councils stealthily with the avowed object of co-operation but keeping within our hearts the desire to break the Councils, such a course would undoubtedly have been dishonest. European diplomacy, let us hope, has been abolished by the Indian National Congress under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. If we play now, we play with all our cards on the table.

But some people say that it is immoral from the point of view of non-co-operation, because it involves an idea of destruction. The work of non-co-operation according to these patriots—I have the highest reverence for them—is only to build our national life, ignoring altogether the existence of the bureaucracy. It may be an honest ideal, and logically speaking, it may be the inner meaning of non-co-operation. But the non-co-operation which the Congress has followed is not so logical and I claim that if the principle of non-co-operation is to be advanced as a test of my programme, let it be the same principle which the Congress has accepted, adopted and applied. As I have already said, that principle countenances destruction as well as creation. As a matter of fact, circumstanced as we are, with the bureaucracy to the right and the bureaucracy to the left, bureaucracy all around us, it is impossible to create without destroying; nor must it be forgotten that if we break, it is only that we may build.

It has also been suggested that the very entry into the Councils is inconsistent with the ideal of non-co-operation. I confess I do not understand the argument. Supposing the Congress had sanctioned an armed insurrection, could it be argued that entry into the fort of the bureaucracy is inconsistent with the principle of non-co-operation? Surely the charge of inconsistency must depend on the object of the entry. An advancing army does not co-operate with the enemy when it marches into the enemy's territory. Co-operation or non-co-operation must therefore depend on the object with which such entry is made. The argument, if analysed, comes to this that whenever the phrase "entry into Councils" is used it calls up the association of co-operation and then the mere idea of this entry is proclaimed to be inconsistent with non-co-operation. But this is the familiar logical fallacy of four terms. Entry into the Councils to co-operate with the Government and entry into the Councils to non-co-operate with the Government are two terms and two different propositions. The former is inconsistent with the idea of non-co-operation, the latter is absolutely consistent with that very idea.

Next let us understand the opposition from the point of view of the spirituality of our movement. The question of spirituality

is not to be confused with the dictates of any particular religion. I am not aware of the injunctions of any religion against entering the Councils with a view either to mend them or end them. I have heard from many Mahomedans that the Koran lays down no such injunction. Other Mahomedan friends have told me that there may be some difficulty on that ground, but that is a matter with regard to which I am not competent to speak. The Khilafat must answer that question with such assistance as they may obtain from the Ulemas. It is needless to point out that should the Ulemas come to the conclusion that under the present circumstances it would be an offence against their religion to enter the Councils, the Congress should unhesitatingly accept their decision, because no work in this country towards the attainment of Swaraj is possible without the hearty co-operation of both Hindus and Mussalmans. But I am dealing with that spirituality which does not affect any particular creed or any particular religion. Judged from the standpoint of such spirituality what objection can there be in removing from our path by all legitimate means any obstacle to the attainment of Swaraj? We burned foreign cloth without a scruple, and the spirituality of the movement did not receive a shock when we burned it. It is as well to start with a clear conception as to what that spirituality is. Apart from any credal or doctrinal injunction and apart from any question of morality the basis of spirituality must be the attainment of freedom and of Swaraj. What is the duty which every human being owes not only to his race, not only to his nation, not only to humanity, but also to his God? It is the right to fulfil oneself. It is the duty of living in the light of God. Shortly after my release from imprisonment I said in a public speech that all our national activities should be based on truth. Ever since that day questions and conundrums have been put to me. I have been asked to define what is truth. It has also been suggested that because I dared not tell the truth that I took refuge under the general expression. I still insist that our national activities must be based on truth. I repeat that I do not believe in politics, or in making water-tight compartments of our national life which is an indivisible organic whole. I repeat that as you cannot define life, you cannot define truth. The test of truth is not logical definition. The test of truth lies in its all-compelling force in making itself felt. You know truth when you have felt it. God cannot be defined, nor can truth, because truth is the revelation of God. Two thousand years ago, a jesting judge asked the same question of the Son of God. He made no answer by word of mouth; but he sacrificed himself and Truth was revealed. When I speak of spirituality I speak of the same truth. I look upon history as the revelation of God. I

look upon human individual personality, nationality and humanity each contributing to the life of the other as the revelation of God to man. I look upon the attainment of freedom and Swaraj as the only way of fulfilling oneself as individuals, as nations. I look upon all national activities as the real foundation of the service of that greater humanity which again is the revelation of God to man. The Son of God brought to the world not peace but a sword—not the peace of death and immorality and corruption but the “ separating sword ” of Truth. We have to fight against all corruptions and all immorality. It is only thus that freedom can be attained. Whatever obstacles there may be in the path of Swaraj either of the individual or of the nation, or humanity at large, these obstacles must be removed by the individual if he desires his freedom, by the nation if that nation desires to fulfil itself, by all the nations of the world if the cause of humanity is to prosper. That being the spirituality of the movement as I understand it I am prepared to put away all obstacles that lie between that Indian nation and the attainment of its freedom, not stealthily but openly, reverently in the name of truth and God. Judged from this ideal of spirituality the entry into the Councils for the purpose I have stated is necessary to advance the cause of truth. Everything in connection with the controversy must be judged by that standard.

At present the question before the country put by those members of the Civil Disobedience Enquiry Committee who are in favour of Council entry is simply that the members of the Congress should stand as candidates. It is unnecessary, therefore, to go into other questions raised, such as in the matter of taking oath, the probability or otherwise of securing a majority and so on. With regard to the question of oath all that I need say at present is this, that apart from the dictates of any particular religion which I do not propose to deal with, the question does not present any difficulty at all. The oath is a constitutional one. The king stands for the constitution. Great changes in the constitution have taken place in England under that very oath. Now, what is the oath? It binds those who take it,—first not to make any use of powers which are not allowed by the Reforms Act; secondly to discharge their duties faithfully. So far as the first point is concerned, there is nothing in my suggestion which militates against it. So far as the second point is concerned, I am aware that a forced interpretation has been sought to be put upon it, namely, that a member taking the oath is bound to discharge his duties faithfully to the bureaucracy. All that I need say is, that there is no constitutional authority of any kind to justify that interpretation. To my mind the words mean a faithful discharge of a member's duties to his constituency by

the exercise of powers recognized under the Reforms Act. I do not therefore understand what possible objection there may be to take the oath. But there again the question does not arise at present.

Various other questions have been asked as to whether it is possible to secure a majority and as to what we should do supposing we were in a majority. I think it possible that having regard to the present circumstances of the country, the Non-co-operators are likely to get the majority. I am aware of the difficulty of the franchise, I am aware of the rules which prevent many of us from entering the Councils; but making every allowance for all these difficulties, I believe that we shall be in the majority. But here also the question doesn't arise till we meet in the Congress of 1923 when the matter may be discussed not on suppositions but on actualities.

As regards the question as to what we should do if we have the majority, the answer is clear. We should begin our proceedings by a solemn declaration of the existence of our inherent right, and by a formal demand for a constitution which would recognize and conserve those rights and give effect to our claims for the particular system of government which we may choose for ourselves. If our demands are accepted, then the fight is over. But, as I have often said, if it is conceded that we are entitled to have that form of Government which we may choose for ourselves, and the real beginning is made with that particular form of Government in view, then it matters nothing to me whether the complete surrender of power is made to us to-day, or in five years or even in twenty years. If, however, our demand is not given effect to, we must non-co-operate with the bureaucracy by opposing each and every work of the Council. We must disallow the entire Budget. We must move the adjournment of the House on every possible occasion; and defeat every Bill that may be introduced. In fact we must so proceed that the Council will refuse to do any work unless and until our demands are satisfied. I am aware of the large powers of certification which Governors can exercise under the Reforms Act. But Government by certification is just as impossible as Government by veto. Such procedure may be adopted on a few occasions. The time must soon come when the bureaucracy must yield or withdraw the Reforms Act. In either case it is a distinct triumph for the nation, and either course if adopted by the bureaucracy will bring us nearer to the realization of our ideal.

Another question is often asked: suppose we end these Reformed Councils—what then? Could not the same question be asked with regard to every step the Congress has hitherto undertaken in the way of breaking, or destroying institutions.

If we had succeeded in destroying the Educational Department, might not somebody ask—what then? If we had succeeded in destroying the legal institutions, might not the question be put with equal relevance? The fact is, destruction itself will never bring us Swaraj. The fact further is that no construction is possible without destruction. We must not forget that it is not this activity or that activity which by itself can bring Swaraj. It is the totality of our national activity in the way of destruction and in the way of creation, that will bring Swaraj. If we succeed in demolishing these Reformed Councils you will find the whole nation astir with life. Let them put other obstacles in our way; we shall remove them with added strength and greater vitality.

It has also been suggested that the bureaucracy will never allow the non-co-operators to enter the Councils—they will alter the rules to prevent such entry. I cannot conceive of anything better calculated to strengthen the cause of non-co-operation than this. If any such rule is framed I should welcome it and again change the direction of our activity. The infant nation in India requires constant struggle for its growth and development. We must not forget that a great non-violent revolution is on the land, and we shall change the direction of our activities as often as circumstances require it. To-day the Councils are open and we must attack them—to-morrow, if the Councils are closed, we must be prepared to deal with the contingency when it arises. What do we do when it pours with rain? We turn our umbrellas in the direction from which the water comes. It is in the same way that we must turn the direction of our activities whenever the fulfilment of our national life demands it.

The work of the Councils for the last two years has made it necessary for non-co-operators to enter the Councils. The bureaucracy has received added strength from these Reformed Councils, and those who have entered the Councils, speaking generally, have practically helped the cause of Bureaucracy.

I warn my countrymen against the policy of allowing these Reformed Councils to work their wicked will. There will undoubtedly be a further increase of taxation and there is an apprehension in my mind, I desire to express it with all the emphasis that I can command, that if we allow this policy to drift to continue the result will be that we shall lose the people who are with us to-day. Let us break the Councils if the bureaucracy does not concede to the demands of the people. If there is fresh taxation, as there is bound to be, let the responsibility be on the bureaucracy. Then you and I and the people will jointly fight the powers that be.

## LABOUR ORGANIZATION.

I am further of opinion that the Congress should take up the work of Labour and Peasant organization. With regard to labour there is a resolution of the Waggpur Congress, but I am sorry to say that it has not been acted upon. There is an apprehension in the minds of some non-co-operators that the cause of non-co-operation will suffer if we exploit Labour for Congress purposes. I confess again I do not understand the argument. The word "exploitation" has got an ugly association, and the argument assumes that Labour and Peasants are not with us in this struggle of Swaraj. I deny the assumption. My experience has convinced me that Labour and the Peasantry of India to-day are, if anything, more eager to attain Swaraj than the so-called middle and educated classes. If we are "exploiting" boys of tender years and students of colleges, if we are "exploiting" the women of India, if we are "exploiting" the whole of the middle classes irrespective of their creed and caste and occupation, may I ask what justification is there for leaving out Labourers and Peasants? I suppose the answer is that they are welcome to be the members of the Congress Committees but that there should not be a separate organization of them. But Labour has got a separate interest and they are often oppressed by foreign capitalists, and the Peasantry of India is often oppressed by a class of man who are the standard-bearers of the bureaucracy. Is the service of this special interest in any way antagonistic to the service of nationalism? To find bread for the poor, to secure justice to a class of people who are engaged in a particular trade or avocation—how is that work any different from the work of attaining Swaraj? Anything which strengthens the national cause, anything which supports the masses of India is surely as much a matter of Swaraj as any other items of work which the Congress has in hand. My advice is that the Congress should lose no time in appointing a Committee, a strong workable Committee, to organize Labour and the Peasantry of India. We have delayed the matter already too long. If the Congress fails to do its duty, you may expect to find organizations set up in the country by Labourers and Peasants detached from you, disassociated from the cause of Swaraj, which will eventually bring within the arena of the peaceful revolution class struggles and the war of special interests. If the object of the Congress be to avoid that disgraceful issue let us take Labour and Peasantry in hand, and let us organize them both from the point of view of their own special interest and also from the point of view of the higher ideal which demands the satisfaction of their special interests and the devotion of such interest to the cause of Swaraj. Here again we have to make use of the very selfishness of Labourers and Peasants,

as we know that the fulfilment of that very selfishness requires its just and proper contribution to the life of the nation.

#### WORK ALREADY TAKEN UP.

I now turn to the work which the Congress has already taken up. I may at once point out that it is not my desire that any work which the Congress has taken up should be surrendered. The change of direction which I advocate and the other practical change which I have mentioned is not by way of surrendering anything that is already on the plank—but it is simply by way of addition.

#### HINDU-MUSLIM UNITY.

With regard to the questions of Hindu-Muslim unity, untouchability and such matters, I agree with the recommendation of the Enquiry Committee. I desire to point out, however, that true unity of all sections of the Indian nation can only be based on a proper co-operation and the recognition by each section of the rights of the others—that is why I propose that there should be a compact between the different sections, between different communities of India. We will do little good to the section known as Untouchables if we approach them in a spirit of superiority. We must engage them in the work before us, and we must work with them side by side and shoulder to shoulder.

#### KHADDAR.

I now come to the question of Khaddar which I regard as one of the most important questions before us. As I have already said, I am opposed to the manufacture of Khaddar on a commercial basis. I said among other things when I seconded the Bezwada resolution on the 31st of March, 1921, proposed by Mahatma Gandhi :

“ Our reason in asking the people to take to the Charkha was not based upon any desire to enter into any competition with foreign capitalist production either from without or from within. Our idea is to enable the people to understand and fashion for themselves their economic life and utilize the spare time of their families and opportunities with a view to create more economic goods for themselves and improve their own conditions.” The idea is to make the people of this country self-reliant and self-contained. This work is difficult but essential and should be carried on with all our strength. I would much rather that a few families were self-contained than factories were started on a large scale. Such factories represent a short-sighted policy, and there is no doubt that though it would satisfy the present need it will

create an evil which it would be difficult to eradicate. I am naturally opposed to the creation of a new Manchester in India of which we have had sufficient experience. Let us avoid that possibility, if we can.

It is often stated that Khaddar alone will bring us *Ṣwaraj*. I ask my countrymen in what way is it possible for Khaddar to lead us to *Ṣwaraḷ*? It is in one sense only that the statement may be true. We must regard Khaddar as the symbol of *Ṣwaraj*. As the Khaddar makes us self-contained with regard to a very large department of our national life so it is hoped that the inspiration of Khaddar will make the whole of our national life self-contained and independent. That is the meaning of the symbol. To my mind such symbol worship requires the spreading out of all non-co-operation activities in every possible direction. It is thus and only thus that the speedy attainment of *Ṣwaraj* is possible.

#### CONCLUSION.

It remains to me to deliver to you a last message of hope and confidence. There is no royal road to freedom, and dark and difficult will be the path leading to it. But dauntless is your courage, and firm your resolution; and though there will be reverses, sometimes severe reverses, they will only have the effect of speeding your emancipation from the bondage of a foreign government. Do not make the mistake of confusing achievement with success. Achievement is an appearance, and appearances are often deceptive. I contend that, though we cannot point to a great deal as the solid achievement of the movement, the success of it is assured. That success was proclaimed by the bureaucracy in the repeated attempts which were made, and are still being made, to crush the growth of the movement, and to arrest its progress, in the refusal to repeal some of the most obnoxious of the repressive legislations, in the frequent use that has been made of the arbitrary or discretionary authority that is vested in the executive government, and in sending to prison our beloved leader who offered himself as a sacrifice to the wrath of the bureaucracy. But though the ultimate success of the movement is assured, I warn you that the issue depends wholly on you, and on how you conduct yourself in meeting the forces that are arrayed against you. Christianity rose triumphant when Jesus of Nazareth offered himself as a sacrifice to the excessive worship of law and order by the Scribes and the Pharisees. The forces that are arrayed against you are the forces, not only of Bureaucracy, but of the modern Scribes and Pharisees whose interest it is to maintain the Bureaucracy in all its pristine glory. Be it yours to offer yourselves as sacrifices in the



interests of truth and justice, so that your children and your children's children may have the fruit of your sufferings. Be it yours to wage a spiritual warfare so that the victory, when it comes, does not debase you, nor tempt you to retain the power of government in your own hands. But if yours is to be a spiritual warfare, your weapons must be those of the spiritual soldier. Anger is not for you, hatred is not for you ; nor for you is pettiness, meanness or falsehood. For you is the hope of dawn and the confidence of the morning, and for you is the song that was sung of Titan, chained and imprisoned, but the Champion of Man, in the Greek fable :

To suffer woes which Hope thinks infinite ;  
To forgive wrongs darker than death or night ;  
To defy Power, which seems omnipotent ;  
To love, and bear ; to hope till Hope creates  
From its own wreck the thing it contemplates ;  
Neither to change, nor falter, nor repent ;  
This, like thy glory, Titan, is to be  
Good, great and joyous, beautiful and free ;  
This is alone Life, Joy, Empire and Victory.

BANDE MATARAM.

## APPENDIX E.

The following is the memorandum which was submitted in October, 1916, to H.E. the Viceroy by nineteen elected additional members of the Imperial Legislative Council with regard to post-war reforms :—

There is no doubt that the termination of the war will see a great advance in the ideals of government all over the civilized world and especially in the British Empire, which entered into the struggle in defence of the liberties of weak and small nationalities and is pouring forth its richest blood and treasure in upholding the cause of justice and humanity in the international relations of the world. India has borne her part in this struggle and cannot remain unaffected by the new spirit of change for a better state of things. Expectations have been raised in this country and hopes held out that, after the war, the problems of Indian administration will be looked at from a new angle of vision. The people of India have good reasons to be grateful to England for the great progress in her material resources and the widening of her intellectual and political outlook under British rule, and for the steady if slow advance in her national life, commencing with the Charter Act of India of 1833. Up to 1909, the Government of India was conducted by a bureaucracy almost entirely non-Indian in its composition and not responsible to the people of India. The reforms of 1909 for the first time introduced an Indian element in the direction of affairs in the administration of India. This element was of a very limited character. The Indian people accepted it as an indication on the part of the Government of a desire to admit the Indians into the inner counsels of the Indian Empire. So far as the Legislative Councils are concerned, the number of non-official members were merely enlarged with increased facilities for debate and interpellation. The Supreme Legislative Council retained an absolute official majority, and in the Provincial Legislative Councils, where a non-official majority was allowed, such majority included nominated members and the European representatives. In measures largely affecting the people, whether of legislation or taxation, by which Europeans were not directly affected, the European members would naturally support the Government and the nominated members, being nominees of Government, would be inclined to take the same side.

Past experience has shown that this has actually happened on various occasions. The non-official majorities, therefore, in the Provincial Councils have proved largely illusory and give no real power to the representatives of the people. The Legislative Councils, whether Supreme or Provincial, are at present nothing but advisory bodies, without any power of effective control over the Government, Imperial or Provincial. The people or their representatives are practically as little associated with the real government of the country as they were before the reforms, except for the introduction of the Indian element in the Executive Councils, where again the nomination rests entirely with the Government, the people having no voice in the selection of the Indian members.

The object which the Government had in view in introducing the reforms of 1909 was, as expressed by the Prime Minister in his speech in the House of Commons on the second reading of the Indian Councils Bill (1st April 1909), that "it was most desirable in the circumstances to give to the people of India the feeling that these Legislative Councils are not mere automatons, the wires of which are pulled by the official hierarchy." This object, it is submitted, has not been attained. Apart from this question of the constitution of the Legislative and Executive Councils, the people labour under certain grave disabilities, which not only prevent the utilization, but also lead to the wastage, of what is best in them, and are positively derogatory to their sense of national self-respect. The Arms Act, which excludes from its operations Europeans and Anglo-Indians and applies only to the pure natives of the country, the disqualification of Indians for forming or joining Volunteer corps, and their exclusion from the commissioned ranks of the army, are disabilities which are looked upon with an irritating sense of racial differentiation. It would be bad enough if these were mere disabilities. Restrictions and prohibitions regarding the possession and use of arms have tended to emasculate the civil population in India and expose them to serious danger. The position of Indians in India is practically this, that they have no real part or share in the direction of the government of the country, and are placed under very great and galling disabilities from which the other members of the British Empire are exempt, and which have reduced them to a state of utter helplessness. The existence, moreover, of the system of indentured emigration gives to the British Colonies and the outside world the impression that Indians, as a whole, are no better than indentured coolies, who are looked upon as very little, if at all, above the slave. The present state of things makes the Indians feel that, though theoretically they are the equal subjects of the King, they hold a very inferior position

in the British Empire. Other Asiatic races also hold the same, if not a worse, view about India and her status in the Empire. Humiliating as this position of inferiority is to the Indian mind, it is almost unbearable to the youth of India, whose outlook is broadened by education and travel in foreign parts where they come in contact with the other free races. In the face of these grievances and disabilities, what has sustained the people is the hope and faith inspired by promises and assurances of fair and equal treatment which have been held out from time to time by our Sovereigns and British statesmen of high standing. In the crisis we are now going through, the Indian people have sunk domestic differences between themselves and the Government and have faithfully and loyally stood by the Empire. The Indian soldiers were eager to go to the battlefields of Europe, not as mercenary troops but as free citizens of the British Empire which required their services, and her civilian population was animated by one desire, namely, to stand by England in the hour of her need. Peace and tranquillity reigned throughout India when she was practically denuded of British and Indian troops. The Prime Minister of England, while voicing the sentiments of the English people in regard to India's part in this great war, spoke of Indians as "the joint and equal custodians of one common interest and future." India does not claim any reward for her loyalty, but she has a right to expect that the want of confidence on the part of Government, to which she not unnaturally ascribes her present state, should now be a thing of the past and that she should no longer occupy a position of subordination but one of comradeship. This would assure the Indian people that England is ready and willing to help them to attain self-government under the aegis of the British Crown, and thus discharge the noble mission which she has undertaken and to which she has so often given voluntary expression through her rulers and statesmen. What is wanted is not merely good government or efficient administration, but government that is acceptable to the people because it is responsible to them. This is what, India understands, would constitute the changed angle of vision.

If, after the termination of the war, the position of India practically remains what it was before and there is no material change in it, it will undoubtedly cause bitter disappointment and great discontent in the country, and the beneficent effects of participation in common danger, overcome by common effort, will soon disappear, leaving no record behind save the painful memory of unrealized expectations. We feel sure that the Government is also alive to the situation and is contemplating measures of reform in the administration of the country. We feel that we should avail ourselves of this opportunity to

respectfully offer to Government our humble suggestions as to the lines on which these reforms should proceed. They must in our opinion go to the root of the matter. They must give to the people real and effective participation in the government of the country, and also remove those irritating disabilities as regards the possession of arms and a military career, which indicates want of confidence in the people and place them in a position of inferiority and helplessness. With this view, we would take the liberty to suggest the following measures for consideration and adoption :—

1. In all the Executive Councils, Provincial and Imperial, half the number of members should be Indians ; the European element in the Executive Councils should, as far as possible, be nominated from the ranks of men trained and educated in the public life of England, so that India may have the benefit of a wider outlook and larger experience of the outside world. It is not absolutely essential that the members of the Executive Councils, Indians or Europeans, should have experience of actual administration, for, as in the case of ministers in England, the assistance of the permanent officials of the departments is always available to them. As regards Indians, we venture to say that a sufficient number of qualified Indians, who can worthily fill the office of members of the Executive Council and hold portfolios is always available. Our short experience in this direction has shown how Indians like Sir S. P. Sinha, Sir Syed Ali Imam, the late Mr. Krishnaswami Iyer, Sir Shams-ul-Huda and Sir Sankaran Nair have maintained a high level of administrative ability in the discharge of their duties. Moreover, it is well known that the Native States, where Indians have opportunities, have produced renowned administrators like Sir Salar Jang, Sir T. Madhava Rao, Sir Sheshadri Ayer, Dewan Bahadur Raghunath Rao, not to mention the present administrators in the various Native States, of India. The statutory obligations, now existing, that three of the members of the supreme Executive Council shall be elected from the public services in India and similar provisions with regard to Provincial Councils should be removed. The elected representatives of the people should have a voice in the selection of the Indian members of the Executive Councils and for that purpose a principle of election should be adopted.

2. All the Legislative Councils in India should have a substantial majority of elected representatives. These representatives, we feel sure, will watch and safeguard the interests of the masses and the agricultural population with whom they are in closer touch than any European officer, however sympathetic, can possibly be. The proceedings of the various Legislative Councils and the Indian National Congress and the Moslem League bear ample testimony

to the solicitude of the educated Indians for the welfare of the masses and their acquaintance with their wants and wishes. The franchise should be broadened and extended directly to the people, Mahomedans or Hindus, wherever they are in a minority, being given proper and adequate representation having regard to their numerical strength and position.

3. The total number of the members of the Supreme Council should not be less than 150, and of the Provincial Councils not less than 100 for the major provinces, and not less than sixty to seventy-five for the minor provinces.

4. The Budget should be passed in the shape of money bills, fiscal autonomy being conceded to India.

5. The Imperial Legislative Council should have power to legislate on, and discuss and pass resolutions relating to, all matters of Indian administration, and the Provincial Councils should have similar powers with regard to Provincial administrations, save and except that the direction of military affairs, of foreign relations, declarations of war, the making of peace, and the entering into treaties, other than commercial, should be vested in the Government of India. As a safeguard the Governor-General-in-Council or the Governor-in-Council, as the case may be, should have the right of veto which, however, should be exercised subject to certain conditions and limitations.

6. The Council of the Secretary of State should be abolished. The Secretary of State should, as far as possible, hold in relation to the Government of India a position similar to that which the Secretary of State for the Colonies holds in relation to the Colonies. The Secretary of State should be assisted by two permanent Under-Secretaries, one of whom should be an Indian. The salaries of the Secretary and Under-Secretaries should be placed on the British estimates.

7. In any scheme of Imperial Federation, India should be given through her chosen representatives a place similar to that of the self-governing dominions.

8. The Provincial Governments should be made autonomous, as stated in the Government of India's despatch dated 25th August 1911.

9. The United Provinces, as well as the other major provinces, should have a Governor brought from the United Kingdom and should have an Executive Council.

10. A full measure of local self-government should be immediately granted.

11. The right to carry arms should be granted to Indians on the same conditions as to Europeans.

12. Indians should be allowed to enlist as volunteers and units of a territorial army established in India.

13. Commissions in the army should be given to Indian youths under conditions similar to those applicable to Europeans.

MANINDRA CHANDRA NANDY OF  
KASIMBAZAR.

D. E. WACHA.

BHUPENDRANATH BASU.

BISHAN DUTT SHUKUL.

MADAN MOHAN MALAVIYA.

K. V. RANGASWAMIENGAR.

MAZHARUL HAQUE.

V. S. SRINIVASAN.

TEJ BAHADUR SAPRU.

IBRAHIM RAHIMTOOLA.

B. NARASIMHESWARA SARMA.

MIR ASAD ALI.

KAMINI KUMAR CHANDA.

KRISHNA SAHAY.

R. N. BHANJA DEO OF KANIKA.

M. B. DADABHOY.

SITA NATH ROY.

MOHAMED ALI MOHAMED.

M. A. JINNAH.

## APPENDIX F.

### RESOLUTION OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS ON SELF-GOVERNMENT.\*

(a) That having regard to the fact that the great communities of India are the inheritors of ancient civilizations and have shown great capacity for government and administration, and to the progress in education and public spirit made by them during a century of British Rule, and further having regard to the fact that the present system of Government does not satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the people and has become unsuited to existing conditions and requirements, the Congress is of opinion that the time has come when His Majesty the King-Emperor should be pleased to issue a Proclamation announcing that it is the aim and intention of British policy to confer self-government on India at an early date.

(b) That the Congress demands that a definite step should be taken towards self-government by granting the reforms contained in the scheme prepared by the All-India Congress Committee in concert with the Reform Committee appointed by the All-India Muslim League (detailed below).

(c) That in the re-construction of the Empire, India shall be lifted from the position of a Dependency to that of an equal partner in the Empire with the self-governing Dominions.

#### THE REFORM SCHEME.

##### *I.—Provincial Legislative Councils.*

1. Provincial Legislative Councils shall consist of four-fifths elected and of one-fifth nominated members.

2. Their strength shall be not less than 125 members in the major provinces, and from fifty to seventy-five in the minor provinces.

3. The members of the Council should be elected directly by the people on as broad a franchise as possible.

\* This Resolution was unanimously adopted at the session of the Congress which met at Lucknow in December, 1916. A Resolution on exactly similar lines was also adopted at the annual meeting of the All-India Moslem League held in the same city about the same time.—P. C. R.



4. Adequate provision should be made for the representation of important minorities by election and the Mahomedans should be elected through special electorates on the Provincial Legislative Councils in the following proportions :—

Punjab—One half of the elected Indian Members.		
United Provinces—30 per cent.	„	„
Bengal—40 per cent.	„	„
Behar—25 per cent.	„	„
Central Provinces—15 per cent.	„	„
Madras—15 per cent.	„	„
Bombay—one-third	„	„

Provided that no Mahomedan shall participate in any of the other elections to the Imperial or Provincial Legislative Councils, save and except those by electorates representing special interests.

Provided further that no bill, nor any clause thereof, nor a resolution introduced by a non-official member affecting one or the other community, which question is to be determined by the members of that community in the Legislative Council concerned, shall be proceeded with, if three-fourths of the members of that community in the particular Council, Imperial or Provincial, oppose the bill or any clause thereof or the resolution.

5. The head of the Provincial Government should not be the President of the Legislative Council, but he should have the right of electing its President.

6. The right of asking supplementary questions should not be restricted to the member putting the original question, but should be allowed to be exercised by any other member.

7. (a) Except customs, post, telegraph, mint, salt, opium, railways, army and navy, and tributes from Indian States, all other sources of revenue should be Provincial.

(b) There should be no divided heads of revenue. The Government of India should be provided with fixed contributions from the Provincial Governments, such fixed contributions being liable to revision when extraordinary and unforeseen contingencies render such revision necessary.

(c) The Provincial Council should have full authority to deal with all matters affecting the internal administration of the province, including the power to raise loans, to impose and alter taxation, and to vote on the Budget. All items of expenditure, and all proposals concerning ways and means for raising the necessary revenue, should be embodied in Bills and submitted to the Provincial Council for adoption.

(d). Resolutions on all matters within the purview of the Provincial Government should be allowed for discussion in accordance with rules made in that behalf by the Council itself.

(e) A resolution passed by the Provincial Legislative Council shall be binding on the Executive Government, unless vetoed by the Governor-in-Council, provided however that if the resolution is again passed by the Council after an interval of not less than one year, it must be given effect to.

(f) A motion for adjournment may be brought forward for the discussion of a definite matter of urgent public importance, if supported by not less than one-eighth of the members present.

8. A special meeting of the Provincial Council may be summoned on a requisition by not less than one-eighth of the members.

9. A Bill, other than a Money Bill, may be introduced in Council in accordance with rules made in that behalf by the Council itself, and the consent of the Government shall not be required therefor.

10. All Bills passed by Provincial Legislatures shall have to receive the assent of the Government before they become law, but may be vetoed by the Governor-General.

11. The terms of office of the members shall be five years.

## II.—*Provincial Governments.*

1. The head of every Provincial Government shall be a Governor who shall not ordinarily belong to the Indian Civil Service or any of the permanent services.

2. There shall be in every Province an Executive Council which, with the Governor, shall constitute the Executive Government of the Province.

3. Members of the Indian Civil Service shall not ordinarily be appointed to the Executive Councils.

4. Not less than one half of the members of the Executive Council shall consist of Indians to be elected by the elected members of the Provincial Legislative Council.

5. The term of office of the members shall be five years.

## III.—*Imperial Legislative Council.*

1. The strength of the Imperial Legislative Council shall be 150.

2. Four-fifths of the members shall be elected.

3. The franchise for the Imperial Legislative Council should be widened as far as possible on the lines of the electorates for Mahomedans for the Provincial Legislative Councils, and the elected members of the Provincial Legislative Councils should also form an electorate for the return of members to the Imperial Legislative Council.

4. One-third of the Indian elected members should be Mahomedans, elected by separate Mahomedan electorates in the several Provinces, in the proportion, as nearly as may be, in which they are represented on the Provincial Legislative Councils, by separate Mahomedan electorates.

(*Vide* provisos to section I, clause 4.)

5. The President of the Council shall be elected by the Council itself.

6. The right of asking supplementary questions should not be restricted to the member putting the original question, but should be allowed to be exercised by any other member.

7. A special meeting of the Council may be summoned on a requisition by not less than one-eighth of the members.

8. A Bill, other than a Money Bill, may be introduced in Council in accordance with rules made in that behalf by the Council itself, and the consent of the Executive Government should not be required therefor.

9. All Bills passed by the Council shall have to receive the assent of the Governor-General before they become law.

10. All financial proposals relating to sources of income and items of expenditure shall be embodied in Bills. Every such Bill and the Budget as a whole shall be submitted for the vote of the Imperial Legislative Council.

11. The terms of office of members shall be five years.

12. The matters mentioned hereinbelow shall be exclusively under the control of the Imperial Legislative Council:

- (a) Matters in regard to which uniform legislation for the whole of India is desirable.
- (b) Provincial legislation in so far as it may affect inter-provincial fiscal relations.
- (c) Questions affecting purely Imperial Revenue, excepting tributes from Indian States.
- (d) Questions affecting purely Imperial expenditure, except that no resolution of the Imperial Legislative Council shall be binding on the Governor-General in Council in

respect of military charges for the defence of the country.

- (e) The right of revising Indian tariffs and customs-duties, of imposing, altering, or removing any taxes or cess, modifying the existing system of currency and banking, and granting any aids or bounties to any or all deserving or nascent industries of the country.
- (f) Resolutions on all matters relating to the administration of the country as a whole.

13. A Resolution passed by the Legislative Council should be binding on the Executive Government, unless vetoed by the Governor-General in Council, provided however that if the resolution is again passed by the Council after an interval of not less than one year, it must be given effect to.

14. A motion for adjournment may be brought forward for the discussion of a definite matter of urgent public importance, if supported by not less than one-eighth of the members present.

15. When the Crown chooses to exercise its power of veto in regard to a Bill passed by a Provincial Legislative Council, or by the Imperial Legislative Council, it should be exercised within twelve months from the date on which it is passed, and the Bill shall cease to have effect as from the date on which the fact of such veto is made known to the Legislative Council concerned.

16. The Imperial Legislative Council shall have no power to interfere with the Government of India's direction of the military affairs and the foreign and political relations of India, including the declaration of war, the making of peace, and the entering into treaties.

#### *IV.—The Government of India.*

1. The Governor-General of India will be the head of the Government of India.

2. He will have an Executive Council, half of whom shall be Indians.

3. The Indian members shall be elected by the elected members of the Imperial Legislative Council.

4. Members of the Indian Civil Service shall not ordinarily be appointed to the Executive Council of the Governor-General.

5. The power of making all appointments in the Imperial Civil Services shall vest in the Government of India, as constituted under this scheme, due regard being paid to existing

interests, subject to any laws that may be made by the Imperial Legislative Council.

6. The Government of India shall not ordinarily interfere in the local affairs of a province, and powers not specifically given to a Provincial Government shall be deemed to be vested in the former. The authority of the Government of India will ordinarily be limited to general supervision and superintendence over the Provincial Governments.

7. In legislative and administrative matters the Government of India, as constituted under this scheme, shall, as far as possible, be independent of the Secretary of State.

8. A system of independent audit of the accounts of the Government of India should be instituted.

*V.—The Secretary of State in Council.*

1. The Council of the Secretary of State for India should be abolished.

2. The salary of the Secretary of State should be placed on the British Estimates.

3. The Secretary of State should, as far as possible, occupy the same position in relation to the Government of India, as the Secretary of State for the Colonies does in relation to the Governments of self-governing Dominions.

4. The Secretary of State for India should be assisted by two Permanent Under-Secretaries, one of whom should always be an Indian.

*VI.—India and the Empire:*

1. In any Council or other body which may be constituted or convened for the settlement or control of Imperial affairs, India shall be adequately represented in like manner with the Dominions and with equal rights.

2. Indians should be placed on a footing of equality in respect of status and rights of citizenship with other subjects of His Majesty the King throughout the Empire.

*VII.—Military and Other Matters.*

1. *Commissions in the Army.*—The military and naval services of His Majesty, both in their commissioned and non-commissioned ranks, should be thrown open to Indians, and adequate

provision, should be made for their selection, training, and instruction in India.

2. *Volunteering*.—Indians should be allowed to enlist as volunteers.

3. *Separation of judicial and executive functions*.—Executive Officers in India shall have no judicial powers entrusted to them, and the judiciary in every province shall be placed under the highest Court of that province.

## APPENDIX G.

### PROCLAMATION OF KING GEORGE V.

DECEMBER, 1919.

GEORGE V, by the grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the Seas, King, Defender of the Faith, Emperor of India. To my Viceroy and Governor-General, to the Princes of Indian States, and to all my subjects in India, of whatsoever race or creed, greeting.

1. Another epoch has been reached to-day in the annals of India. I have given my Royal Assent to an Act which will take its place among the great historic measures passed by the Parliament of this Realm for the better government of India and for the greater contentment of her people. The Acts of 1773 and 1784 were designed to establish a regular system of administration and justice under the Honourable East India Company. The Act of 1833 opened the door for Indians to public office and employment. The Act of 1858 transferred the administration from the Company to the Crown and laid the foundations of public life which exist in India to-day. The Act of 1861 sowed the seed of representative institutions, and the seed was quickened into life by the Act of 1909. The Act which now has become law entrusts the elected representatives of the people with a definite share in the Government and points the way to full responsible Government hereafter. If, as I confidently hope, the policy which this Act inaugurates should achieve its purpose, the results will be momentous in the story of human progress; and it is timely and fitting that I should invite you to-day to consider the past and to join me in my hopes of the future.

2. Ever since the welfare of India was confided to us, it has been held as a sacred trust by Our Royal House and Line. In 1858 Queen Victoria of revered memory solemnly declared herself bound to her Indian subjects by the same obligations of duty as to all her other subjects; and she assured to them religious freedom and the equal and impartial protection of the law. In his message to the Indian people in 1903, my dear

father, King Edward VII, announced his determination to maintain unimpaired the same principles of humane and equitable administration. Again in his Proclamation of 1908 he renewed the assurances which had been given five years before and surveyed the progress which they had inspired. On my accession to the throne in 1910 I sent a message to the Princes and peoples of India acknowledging their loyalty and homage and promising that the prosperity and happiness of India should always be to me of the highest interest and concern. In the following year I visited India with the Queen-Empress and testified my sympathy for her people and my desire for their well-being.

3. While these are the sentiments of affection and devotion by which I and my predecessors have been animated, the Parliament and the people of this Realm and my officers in India have been equally zealous for the moral and material advancement of India. We have endeavoured to give to her people the many blessings which Providence has bestowed upon ourselves. But there is one gift which yet remains, and without which the progress of a country cannot be consummated—the right of her people to direct her affairs and safeguard her interests. The defence of India against foreign aggression is a duty of common Imperial interest and pride. The control of her domestic concerns is a burden which India may legitimately aspire to take upon her own shoulders. The burden is too heavy to be borne in full until time and experience have brought the necessary strength; but opportunity will now be given for experience to grow and for responsibility to increase with the capacity for its fulfilment.

4. I have watched with understanding and sympathy the growing desire of my Indian people for representative institutions. Starting from small beginnings this ambition has steadily strengthened its hold upon the intelligence of the country. It has pursued its course along constitutional channels with sincerity and courage. It has survived the discredit which at times and in places lawless men sought to cast upon it by acts of violence committed under the guise of patriotism. It has been stirred to more vigorous life by the ideals for which the British Commonwealth fought in the Great War, and it claims support in the part which India has taken in our common struggles, anxiety and victories. In truth the desire after political responsibility has its source at the roots of the British connection with India. It has sprung inevitably from the deeper and wider studies of human thought and history which that connection has opened to the Indian people. Without it the work of the British in India would have been incomplete. It was therefore with a wise judgment that the beginnings of representative institutions



were laid many years ago. Their scope has been extended stage by stage until there now lies before us a definite step on the road to responsible government.

5. With the same sympathy and with redoubled interest I shall watch the progress along this road. The path will not be easy and in the march towards the goal there will be need of perseverance and of mutual forbearance between all sections and races of my people in India. I am confident that those high qualities will be forthcoming. I rely on the new popular assemblies to interpret wisely the wishes of those whom they represent and not to forget the interests of the masses who cannot yet be admitted to franchise. I rely on the leaders of people, the ministers of the future, to face responsibility and endure misrepresentation, to sacrifice much for the common interest of the states, remembering that true patriotism transcends party and communal boundaries and, while retaining the confidence of the legislatures, to co-operate with my officers for the common good in sinking unessential differences and in maintaining the essential standards of a just and generous government. Equally do I rely on my officers to respect their new colleagues and to work with them in harmony and kindness; to assist the people and their representatives in an orderly advance towards free institutions; and to find in these new tasks a fresh opportunity to fulfil, as in the past, their highest purpose of faithful service to my people.

6. It is my earnest desire at this time that so far as possible any trace of bitterness between my people and those who are responsible for my government should be obliterated. Let those who in their eagerness for political progress have broken the law in the past respect it in the future. Let it become possible for those who are charged with the maintenance of peaceful and orderly government to forget the extravagances which they have had to curb. A new era is opening. Let it begin with common determination among my people and my officers to work together for a common purpose. I therefore direct my Viceroy to exercise in my name and on my behalf my Royal clemency to political offenders in the fullest measure which in his judgment is compatible with the public safety. I desire him to extend it on this condition to persons who for offences against the State or under any special or emergency legislation are suffering imprisonment or restrictions upon their liberty. I trust that this leniency will be justified by the future conduct of those whom it benefits, and that all my subjects will so demean themselves as to render it unnecessary to enforce the laws for such offences hereafter.

7. Simultaneously with the new constitutions in British India, I have gladly assented to the establishment of a Chamber of Princes. I trust that its counsel may be fruitful of lasting good to the Princes and the States themselves, may advance the interests which are common to their territories and to British India, and may be to the advantage of the Empire as a whole. I take the occasion again to assure the Princes of India of my determination ever to maintain unimpaired their privileges, rights and dignities.

8. It is my intention to send my dear son, the Prince of Wales, to India next winter to inaugurate on my behalf the new Chamber of Princes and the new constitutions in British India. May he find mutual good-will and confidence prevailing among those on whom will rest the future service of the country, so that success may crown their labours, and progressive enlightenment attend their administration. And, with all my people, I pray to Almighty God that by His Wisdom and under His guidance India may be led to greater prosperity and contentment, and may grow to the fullness of political freedom.

## APPENDIX H.

	Year.	Place.	President.	No. of delegates.
1	1885	Bombay	W. C. Bonnerjee	72
2	1886	Calcutta	Dabadhai Naoroji	436
3	1887	Madras	Buddriddin Tyabji	607
4	1888	Allahabad	George Yule	1,248
5	1889	Bombay	Sir William Wedderburn	1,889
6	1890	Calcutta	Pherozechah Mehta	677
7	1891	Nagpur	Annanda Charlu	817
8	1892	Allahabad	W. C. Bonnerjee	625
9	1893	Lahore	Dadabhai Naoroji	867
10	1894	Madras	Alfred Webb	1,163
11	1895	Poona	Surendra Nath Banerjea	1,584
12	1896	Calcutta	Rahimtulla Muhammad Sayani	784
13	1897	Amraoti	Sankaran Nair	693
14	1898	Madras	Ananda Mohan Bose	614
15	1899	Lucknow	Romes Chandra Dutta	739
16	1900	Lahore	Narayen Chandavarkar	567
17	1901	Calcutta	Dinshaw Wacha	896
18	1902	Ahmedabad	Surendra Nath Banerjea	417
19	1903	Madras	Lalmohon Ghose	538
20	1904	Bombay	Sir Henry Cotton	1,010
21	1905	Benares	Gopal Krishna Gokhale	758
22	1906	Calcutta	Dadabhoy Naoroji	1,663
23	1907	Surat	Rash Behari Ghose	1,300
	1908	Madras	Rash Behari Ghose	626
24	1909	Lahore	Madan Mohan Malaviya	243
25	1910	Allahabad	Sir William Wedderburn	636
26	1911	Calcutta	Pandit Bishan Narayan Dar	446
27	1912	Bankipore	R. M. Madholkar	207
28	1913	Karachi	Nawab Syed Mahmud	550
29	1914	Madras	Bhupendra Nath Basu	866
30	1915	Bombay	Sir S. P. Sinha	—

## APPENDIX

	Year.	Place.	President.	No. of delegates.
31	1916	Lucknow	Ambica Charan Majumdar	—
32	1917	Calcutta	Annie Besant	4,967
33	1918 (Spl.)	Bombay	Syed Hassan Imam	4,967
33	1918	Delhi	Madan Mohan Malaviya	4,869
34	1919	Amritsar	Moti Lal Nehru	—
	1920 (Spl.)	Calcutta	Lala Lajpat Rai	—
35	1920	Nagpur	Vijayaraghava Chariar	—
36	1921	Ahmedabad	Hakim Ajmal Khan	4,726
37	1922	Gaya	Chitta Ranjan Das	—
	1923 (Spl.)	Delhi	Abul Kalam Azad	—
38	1923	Cocanada	Muhammad Ali	—
39	1924	Belgaum	Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi	—
40	1925	Cawnpore	Mrs. Sarojoni Naidu	3,762
41	1926	Gauhati	Srinivasa Ayengar	About 2,000

## INDEX.

- Ali, Mr. Mahomed, 197  
 Asquith, Mr., 135
- Bande Mataram*, commencement, 25, 55  
*Bande Mataram*, the song, 41, 243  
 Banerjee, Dr. Gooroodas, 21  
 Banerjea, Surendra Nath, 13;  
 Presidency College, 22, 39 note 3;  
 crowned head of Bengal, 41;  
 resigns office, 44; *A Nation in the Making*, 51; leader, moderate party, 91-2, 126; on Montagu report, 143-4, 147; supports bureaucracy, 186
- Bengal, early political area, 1; new era, 10; Tenancy Act, 11; Partition of, 38 and note 1; National Proclamation, 40: unrest, 71; annulment of Partition, 76-7; provincial conference, 82, 111; Criminal Law Amendment Bill, 209
- Besant, Mrs. Annie, and "Home Rule," 137, 143; elected President I.N.C., 138; opposes Montagu Report, 143, 147, 222
- Birkenhead, Lord, 210, 219
- Bonnerjee, W. C., President I.N.C., 121, 126
- Bradlaugh, Charles, in India, 130
- Brahmø Samaj, establishment, 7; weekly organ, 16; dislike of C. R. Das, 25
- Budding Youth*, 34
- Carmichael, Lord, first Governor Bengal, 78, 147
- Chamberlain, Sir Austen, Sec. of State for India, 136
- Chandpur riots, 185
- Chatterjee, Sarat Chandra, 171
- Charter Act, 1, 12
- Chelmsford, Lord, Viceroy, 91, 144; resignation, 160
- Crewe, Lord, Sec. of State for India, 76, 146; Committee, 146
- Crimes Act, 69
- Cross. Lord, Sec. of State, 130
- Curtis, Lionel, 137, 147
- Curzon, Marquess, 25; Viceroy of India, 38, 44; indiscretions, 48-49; resignation, 50, 73, 131
- Das, Bhubon Mohan, father of C. R. Das, 15; editor *Brahmo Public Opinion*, 16; bankruptcy, 25
- Das, Chitta Ranjan, birth, 15; parentage, 16-19; early education, 21-2; in England, 23; called to the Bar, 24; return to India, 24; publishes *Malancha*, 24; marriage, 25; bankruptcy, 25; inheritance, 26; poems, 28-36; legal reputation established, 54; advocate, 57; defends Aurobindo Ghose, 59-64; legal success, 65; Bengal Provincial Conference, 82-7; opposition to Montagu Declaration, 92; ideals of self-government, 98-101; Gaya speech on Swaraj, 111; schemes of government, 112-114; Faridpur speech, 115; attempts to overthrow Liberal movement, 120; joins Mr. Gandhi, 158; and the Gandhi movement, 159; volunteer movement, 161; Chandpur riots, 185 note 2; and dyarchy, 188; imprisonment, 191-2; severs from Gandhi, 193; co-operation with Mookerji, 197; elected Bengal Council, 198; illness, 218; anti-revolutionary manifesto, 219; at Faridpore, 220; last days at Darjeeling, 221-4; death, 225; *Sradh*, 227; address at Faridpore, 247
- Das, Durga Mohan, 17-18
- Dufferin, Lord, speech against swaraj, 122-4
- Dyarchy, 137, 141, 147; defects, 183-5, 187; and C. R. Das, 188

- Eden, Sir Ashley, 43  
 Elementary Education Bill, 69  
 Elgin, Lord, 53; appointed Vice-roy, 131  
*Emden*, 80  
 Explosives Act, 69
- Famines, 88-90  
 Fuller, Sir Bamfylde, 41; resignation, 52, 71
- Gandhi, Mr., 66; and swaraj, 110; non-co-operation, 150, 152; opposes Rowlatt Act, 155; and C. R. Das, 158; Indian independence, 160-1; imprisonment, 166; ideals, 168, 170, 174-5; new chances, 177; imprisonment, 192; 222, 226  
*Garden, The*, 28  
*Garland, The*, 30  
 George, Mr. Lloyd, 145  
 Ghose, Aurobindo, Nationalist, 25; revivalist doctrines, 53; chief editor of *Bande Mataram*, 55; arrest, 58-59; acquittal, 64.  
 Ghose, Lal Mohan, 120  
 Ghose, Dr. Rash Behary, 126  
 Gladstone, W. E., Premier, 119, 130  
 Gokhale, Gopal Krishna, 71; Elementary Education Bill, 69; supports the Press Bill, 75; on Royal Commission, 81, 91, 126 and note <sup>1</sup>, 133; in South Africa, 153, 154 note <sup>1</sup>; opposes Rowlatt Bill, 155  
 Government of India, Act of 1919, 91, 148
- Hardinge, Lord, appointed Viceroy, 76; State entry, 77; on Government of India, 134-5  
*Heart Reader, The*, 31  
 Hindu College, p. 2 and notes <sup>1</sup> and <sup>2</sup>.  
*Hindu Patriot*, 13  
 Hobhouse Decentralization Commission, 81, 110  
 Hume, Allan Octavian, 121; quarrel with Lord Dufferin, 122  
 Hunter, Sir William, 21
- Ilbert Bill, 47  
 Ilbert, Sir Courtenay, bill, 119; withdrawal, 121
- Iman, Mr. Ali, succeeds Lord Sinha, 78  
 India Bill, 146; acceptance, 148  
 Indian Councils Act, 13; revision, 47; Amendment Bill, 74, 130  
 Indian National Congress, Lord Sinha president, 82; and non-co-operation, 111; establishment 121 and notes <sup>2</sup> and <sup>3</sup>; Surat split, 125; election disputes, 126; reconciliation, 128; and Indian Councils Act, 130; meeting at Lucknow, 130; Mrs. Besant, president, 137-8; meeting at Bardoli, 161-5; Presidential address, 1922, 257; Resolution on Self-government, 298; Presidential List, 309
- Jallianwalla Bagh, massacres, 158
- Kitchener, Lord, controversy with Marquess Curzon, 50; opposition to Lord Morley, 73, 75, 78
- Lansdowne, Lord, 130  
*Life of a Harlot, The*, 28-9  
 Lytton, Lord, 47, 193, 199, 205, 219
- Manicktolla, 52; revolutionary party, 57-8  
 Meyer, Sir William, 79, 137, 150  
 Minto, Lord, 25, 131; succeeds Lord Curzon, 51; early days, 55, 69; and the Press Bill, 74-5; resignation, 76  
 Montagu, Mr., political mission to India, 91, 138-9; report, 140-3, 145; India Bill, 146, 148, 180  
 Montford Reform Scheme, 176-8, 183  
 Mookerjee, Sir Ashutosh, 22, 170, 193-7  
 Morley, John, Secretary of State for India, 51, 68; appoints Indian Member, 73; resignation, 76, 131  
 Morley-Minto Scheme, 131-4  
 Muddiman Committee Report, 188  
 Muzzaferpore, bomb outrage, 57-8.  
*My God*, 29
- Naidu, Mrs. Sarojini, 147, 173  
 Naoroji, Dadabhoy, 23; on swaraj, 108-10, 125  
 Newspapers Act, 69

- Nineteen Members' Memorandum, The, 136
- Non-co-operation movement, 151 ; collapse, 165-6 ; influence on Bengal art, 171 ; and the position of women, 173
- Norman, Sir Henry, nominated Viceroy, 130
- Peel, Lord, Sec. of State for India, 180
- Press Bill, 74 ; repeal, 178
- Proclamation of Edward VII, 68 ; Text, 244
- Proclamation of King George V, Text, 305
- Public Services Commission, 110
- Racial Distinctions Bill, 179
- Rai, Lala Lajpat, deportation, 53, 126, 159
- Reading, Lord, Viceroy, 160, 180
- Ripon, Lord, Viceroy, 19 ; repeals Vernacular Press Act, 47, 119 ; resignation, 121
- Ronaldshay, Lord, 9, 81, 83 ; on unrest, 213-15
- Rowlatt Bill, 155 and note 1 ; resistance to, 157
- Rowlatt Committee, 80
- Roy, Raja Ram Mohan, 3-6 ; establishes Brahma Samaj, 7 ; and education, 8
- "Satyagraha" movement, 156 ; decline, 158, 166
- Selborne, Lord, 149
- Sen, Keshab Chandra, 7 ; editor *Indian Mirror*, 13 ; leader of the Brahma Samaj, 17
- Sepoy Revolt, 1, 11
- "Servants of India Society," 127 note
- Sévres, Treaty of, 158, 167
- Sinha, Satyendra Prasanna, 24, 65 ; appointed Indian Member, 73 ; opposes Press Bill, 75 ; resignation, 78 ; President Indian Nat. Cong., 82, 91 ; on self-government, 128, 135, 145, 148, 150
- Song of the Sea, The*, 31.
- Swadeshi movement, beginnings, 39 ; vow, 40
- Swaraj, beginnings, 93, 102 ; definitions, 108-11, C. R. Das' scheme, 113 ; Mr. Gandhi, 156, 172 ; modified demands, 176 ; party established, 193, 197, 201
- Tagore, Rabindra Nath, influence on Bengal literature, 36, 39 ; national songs, 41 ; 91 and note 1, 171
- Tilak, Bal Gangadhar, extremist, 91-2 ; Indian Nat. Cong., 126 ; memorial fund, 160
- Vikrampur, 15













