

AKHAND  
BHARAT







JUST  
SC

*RMD*

Dr. B. R. AMBEDKAR  
OPEN UNIVERSITY

CALL NO:

ACC. NO:

AUTHOR: *Raddakannus Phokky*

TITLE: *Akhar Bharat*

Dr. B. R. AMBEDKAR  
OPEN UNIVERSITY

L I B R A R Y

HYDERABAD-500 033.

81

rest of the audiences.' —C. Mahajan, *Agra University*

'...highly interesting, informative and thought-provoking. It is to be hoped that the lectures will be printed, for they provide a valuable survey of the problem of science and its relations to Indian society.'

—D. S. Kothari, *Dean, Faculty of Science, University of Delhi*

Dr. B.R. AMBEDKAR OPEN UNIVERSITY

LIBRARY

934  
Call No. RAD

N-20594  
Accession No.

Author: Radhakumud Mookerji

Title: AKhand Bhaat.

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

--	--	--	--

**First Published February 1945**

***Copyright***

**Printed by M. E. Kurien at De Lux Printers, Victoria Garden  
Road, Byculla, Bombay 37 and Published by V. G. Balkarni,  
Hind Kitab, 237, Elphinstone Road, Bombay**

## PREFACE

This Brochure seeks to present the Pakistan problem in a strictly scientific and detached spirit and in the light of the solutions of the communal problem by the two leading Democracies whom India counts as her Allies in the present War. India is following their lead in regard to War-effort. It is to be hoped that their lead would be followed by her in Peace, in the sphere of constitutional reconstruction on which her power and future as a country, and as a member of the Comity of Nations, so much depends. It will be seen that these solutions of the communal problem have been achieved within the framework of the Federation, or the parent state, of which the integrity is carefully maintained and even strengthened. The U.S.S.R. Constitution is a pointer in this direction. Its Schedule of Federal Subjects, reproduced in Appendix I, shows to what extent it aims at consolidation and centralisation.

The Brochure is intended to present before the public some of the political and constitutional data which may be profitably considered in deciding on the vexed problem of Pakistan. I have also added a short Note on the economic aspects of the problem.

I am obliged to the *Hind Kitabs* for publishing this Brochure in response to a widespread demand.

•

Lucknow University  
January, 1945

RADHAKUMUD MOOKERJI  
President  
Akhand Bharat Conference



## POLITICAL<sup>1</sup>

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

<sup>1</sup> Presidential address delivered at Akhand Bharat Conference held at New Delhi, in October 1944.

this continent and breathed into it their very soul.

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

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

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

It is to the eternal credit of Hindu thought that it imparts a touch of the spiritual to the secular, the mundane, and the material. In its intense devotion to the Mother-Country, it has deified the country into a Deity to be worshipped with a Mantram like *Vande Mataram*. It has transformed patriotism into a religion, nationalism into a creed. Mother India, the mighty Mother of all mothers, is to be worshipped by proper prayers prescribed in our *Sastras* which present to the popular mind, the unlettered millions, her visible image and physical form and define precisely the colossal dimensions of her *Viratadeha*. One prayer views her as the land of seven sacred rivers from the Sindhu or Indus to the Cauvery, from the Ganga and Yamuna to the Godavery and the Narmada, the commingling of whose holy waters imparts their collective purity at the indispensable bath before worship. By such a

prayer the South Indian is at once united across the barrier of the Vindhyas with his brethren of the North in worshipping what constitutes their common country. Sacred also are the waters of the Kabul (Kubha), of Gomati (Gomati), of Kuram (Krumu) and of Swat (Suvastu) on whose banks were sung the hymns of the Rigveda. The Hindu mode of worshipping the country, the *Desa-Matrika*, has covered the whole of India with a network of holy places so that every inch of the country is sacred soil to him. Innumerable indeed are these holy places which are distributed evenly throughout the length and breadth of this continent. The Hindu has no holy place outside the sacred limits of his mother country in far-off Mecca or Palestine. He is not even to lose touch with its sacred soil as far as possible. For him "*Janani Janmabhūmicha Svargadapi Gariyasi*:"—"the Mother and Mother Country are greater than Heaven itself." The *Srimadbhagavatam* represents the very gods to be yearning for birth in the *Bharatbhūmi*.

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

Is the Hindu to be now a consenting party to a sacrilege,

to the proposed vivisection and desecration of Mother India for any earthly reason? The mutilation of Mother India is an attack upon his religion, and liberty of worship.

As a student of history, I am anxious that the issue of Pakistan be considered in this background of history and tradition. It is wholly unhistorical to suppose that Hindustan by itself does not comprehend the whole of India or that any part of it is the exclusive homeland of any community. Let me remind our Muslim brethren that the term Hindustan was not coined and invented by the Hindu. It was first applied to India by her neighbours, by foreigners, the Iranians and Persians with whom they are of late so anxious to establish their racial affinity. The Achaemenian Emperor, Darius I of the sixth century B. C. first used the term Ili(n)du in one of his inscriptions to indicate a native of India taken by the Persians as the land of the Sindhu (Indus) which they corrupted into the form Hindu, while the Ionian Greeks (Yavanas) as subjects of the Achaemenian empire dropped the hard aspirate and corrupted the term Hindu into Indus whence India. Thus the term HINDU is not a religious but a territorial term, and any native of India, according to Persians is a HINDU. Historically, every Muslim is a Hindu, and we may give the quietus to all communal problems on this basis by taking India as the country of one Nation called the Hindus.

Not merely did the foreign nations call India as HINDUSTAN, the land of the Hindus. They were busy naming their own countries on that basis, after their respective majority communities. I may count a host of these : Afghanistan, Baluchistan, Turkistan, Tukmanistan, Arabistan, Luristan, Khuzistan, Kohistan, Kurdestan, Kafiristan, Seistan (old Sakasthana), Shahfistan, Faristan, Ardistan, Usbegistan, Tadjikistan, Baltistan, Waziristan,

Dardestan, or even Daghestan and Kazakhstan, some of which are States of U.S.S.R.

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

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

Most of the wars in the history of Europe have arisen out of doubtful and changeable frontiers. India has had no such troubles from disputed frontiers. As an outstanding geographical unit, mountain-guarded in the north and sea-girt in the south, India has been naturally the subject of one sovereignty in several periods of her history under Maurya, Kushan, or Mughal Emperors and, latterly, continuously, for more than a century under British rule. The Government of India has been functioning all these years as a vast and single Federation holding, under its paramount sovereignty, in different degrees of subordination, the several Provinces and the many States, and subjecting them to its irresistible process of unification. Is India now to go back upon that history and precious heritage of the many unities it has so long endeavoured to build up? For, besides political, India has achieved, along with it, several other consequential unities—economic, social, and cultural. The Indian National Congress is itself an outstanding product of India's integral unity. The Congress has been serving equally the cause of all parts of India, of all her peoples and social classes, in a spirit of nationalism which knows of no barriers of caste or creed, so that it may represent India as a whole in which are comprehended all its religious and other divisions, Hindu, Muslim, Christian, Sikh, Jain, Parsi, Buddhist, or the aboriginal races. other divisions, Hindu, Muslim, Christian, Sikh, Jain, Parsi, Buddhist, or the aboriginal races.

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

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

The value of separate electorate as an obstacle to the growth of Indian nationalism and as a corresponding aid to the autocracy of British rule has been very frankly and freely explained in a letter written by a high dignitary of Lord Minto's Government to Lady Minto in his letter to her. It states: "I must send Your Excellency a line to say that a very big thing has happened today, a work of statesmanship that will affect India and Indian History for many a long year. It is nothing less than the pulling back of 62 millions of people from joining the ranks of the sed tious opposition." This remark coming from one in the know shows how a sinister Anglo-Muslim alliance was being planned by Government to combat the Congress, the Hindu Mahasabha and other organisations in their fight for India's freedom. At the same time, it casts an unmerited slur on a substantial number of nationalist Muslims who have made common cause with the Congress

in winning for the Mother country, the freedom which is her birthright.

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

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

The Minto-Morley Reforms did not grant separate electorate as a general right, but only as a Minority right, and so it was not granted to the Muslims in the Punjab, as they were there in a Majority. It was, however, recognised as a general right in the Montagu-Chelmsford Constitution, which grants it freely to both Minorities and Majori-



ties to foster the spirit of separatism. Separate electorate was accompanied in its train by all its monstrous brood. Separation of Communities at elections led to their separate representation in the Legislature and to their weighted representation until the monster of separatism declares that its appetite cannot be satisfied except by a through-going separation of communities by territories. The progress of the evolution of the Muslim Communal demand may be traced in several stages. It began with separate electorate, separate representation in legislature, weightage of representation without any reference to quantity or quality, equality of representation with the Hindu majority in both legislature and administration and lastly, this demand for Pakistan, or appropriation of territories under total Muslim sovereignty. The demand for Pakistan is a natural consequence of the British Government's mischievous plan to divide and rule India on the basis of the Communal Award. The Muslim mind is now possessed by a philosophy of separatism and has worked itself up into the position that the communal Problem cannot be solved except by splitting up the country into separate Communal States and Sovereignities with liberty to form themselves into their own Unions and even to include in them other countries by separate schemes of confederation. The plan is to subject the Mother Country, the good old India of history, to a process of vivisection to which she has to succumb and then to emerge in a new birth as a restricted and contracted India, a new and much smaller country which would have to acquire afresh its status at the Comity of Nations.

The deliberate dismemberment of India as planned by the Muslim League and a sinister Anglo-Muslim alliance, is a problem of World-Politics and of concern to the Allied Nations. The modern trend in politics is towards larger

and larger Unions and Federations and is entirely against the disintegration of existing Unions. The constitution of U.S.A. and Canada are pointers in this direction, while the U.S.S.R., which formed itself by giving to its primary and original Units the right to secede, is now moving towards a greater and greater consolidation and centralization. In the Stalin Constitution, the U.S.S.R. has been described as a multi-national State, a State made up of as many as 180 different nationalities, which has made short work of its complex and complicated communal problems by its comprehensive scheme of Communal Cultural Autonomy, giving to each Community, free and full scope to preserve and promote all that is necessary to maintain intact its integrity, individuality, and independence, subject to the common Soviet Citizenship as the larger loyalty transcending the narrower provincial, or sectional loyalties.

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

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

"The first group consists of facts relating to the internal economic situation. Firstly, there is the meagreness of the economic resources remaining at the disposal of the Republics after years of war, which obliges us to combine these meagre resources so as to employ them more rationally and to develop the main branches of production, those which form the backbone of Soviet power in each Republic. Secondly, there is the historically determined natural division of labour between the various Regions, and Republics of our Federation. For instance, the North supplies the South and East with textiles, the South and East

supply the North with cotton, fuel and so forth. The division of labour thus established between the Regions cannot be eliminated by a mere stroke of the pen; it has been created historically by the whole course of economic development of the Federation. And this division of labour, which renders the full development of individual Regions impossible so long as the Republics lead separate existence, is obliging our Republics to knit themselves into a single economic unit. Thirdly, there is the fact that the principal means of communication in the Federation, which are the nerve and backbone of any possible Union, constitute a single system. It goes without saying that the means of communication cannot be left in a divided state in the hands of, and subordinated to, the interests of the individual Republics; for that would convert the main nerve of economic life—transport—into a conglomeration of separate parts utilized without regard to plan. This circumstance also induces the Republics to favour amalgamation into a single State. Finally, there is the meagreness of our financial resources.

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

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

As regards the other senior partner in the Allied Nations' concern, the U.S.A. Federation, it went to war on

the issue of the right of a part of the State to secede from it. On the eve of the American Civil War, Abraham Lincoln made his historic declaration: "I hold that the Union of these States is perpetual. No State upon its own mere action can lawfully get out of the Union."

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

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

The Congress case is that Hindu-Muslim compromise is necessary as a means for achieving the end of the independence of India. If so, the terms of that compromise must guarantee the existence of India as a whole, and must not mean its extinction. The Lahore Resolution of the Muslim League is frankly out to accomplish the extinction of India as a single sovereign State and construct out of its carcass and its ashes a number of separate States and Federations,

so, that India as a whole will not be heard of. The end of India's independence will be lost and buried in the means and process of achieving it. I respectfully remind Gandhiji that at the Round Table Conference he was the first to declare even against the Communal Award that it implied a process of vivisection of India out of which she would emerge as a carcass. Pakistan is that vivisection with vengeance. He himself has now pertinently put to Mr. Jinnah the following queries.

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

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

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

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

Much has been made of the Congress Resolution for Self-determination as supporting in certain respects the scheme of Pakistan. The Resolution itself is based on a fallacy, a misreading of History and Politics. The principle of Self-determination has never been applied in History as a principle of destruction to parts of a State which is already an organised and integral whole for the

simple purpose of destroying its established unity. Self-determination is a constructive principle of Politics, applying only to States and countries which come together for the first time to form themselves into a Union, as it was in the case of the constitution of U.S.S.R. The U.S.S.R. was originally formed by its Constituent Sovereign Republics known as the Union or National Republics which merged themselves in a common Federation, while each retained its full sovereign rights including the right of secession. But after the U.S.S.R. had made its start, it went in for a programme of consolidation and expansion in which there was no place for secession. Thus the right of secession was not granted by the U.S.S.R. to the 22 autonomous Republics which came in course of time to be incorporated into it. The right of secession is not granted as a general right to these constituent units of the Federation. The present trend in the U.S.S.R. is now more and more towards consolidation and centralization. It stands for several united federalized fronts, military, economic and even diplomatic, as was explained by Stalin on the occasion of the inauguration of the 1935 Constitution.

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

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

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

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

help in its reconstruction on a new basis. Nowhere in history is self-determination applied to a constituted State for the mere fun of disintegrating it, wrench from it its different parts that are already welded into a whole and make separate States of them.

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

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

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

It cannot be also explained away by the previous Resolution of the Congress for Self-determination, as was sought to be done by Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and now by Mr. C. R. who regard the later Resolution as a mere expression of opinion on the subject on the part of the



Congress. But certainly the Congress ideal is always to make fact correspond to its opinion. In our view the later Resolution supersedes and overrides the previous one and commits the Congress to the preservation of India's integrity and indivisibility. It states definitely that the Congress cannot agree to any proposal to the contrary such as Pakistan.

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

Seeing that the proposed Pakistan State will not be able to exclude from it the Hindu minority, the Muslim League has been loudly proclaiming and holding out its blandishments that it will make the Hindu minority completely contented by its own scheme of minority protection. It has been making an appeal to the Hindu minority to trust the Muslim majority for its protection. This, in my opi-

nion, supplies a very good basis for a permanent settlement of the communal problem, without taking recourse to the drastic and revolutionary step of dividing up the country into separate States. The Hindu majority of India is completely ready to accept *in toto* and in advance, the Pakistan Scheme for the protection of its minorities. Surely, it stands to reason that the scheme by which the Hindu minority is to be reconciled to the Muslim majority in the Pakistan State and is invited to join it is good enough to be offered by the Hindu majority to the Muslim minority. There is, therefore, no case or any justification for Pakistan if within the framework of the parent State which has been so long existing and functioning the Muslim minority is guaranteed by the Hindu majority the same protection as is being offered by the Muslim majority in the Pakistan State to come to lure into it the Hindu minority.

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

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

Then, again, within the domain of each such provincial sovereignty, every community is to be given complete

cultural autonomy on the lines of the Scheme which was so elaborately worked out by the League of Nations and embodied later in international instruments known as Minorities Guarantee Treaties, and is now in actual operation in the U.S.S.R.

The distribution of Federal and Provincial Subjects for the Indian Federation may follow the lines laid down in the U.S.S.R. Constitution. Indeed the Schedule of Federal subjects as framed by the U.S.S.R. should have its own lessons for those who stand up for the integrity of India and against its partition into several federations when a multi-national State like the U.S.S.R. has been able to think, plan, and function in terms of a single Federation on the basis of a scientific synthesis and harmonious combination of the principle of centralisation and that of local autonomy. It is always easy to plan an Indian Union which as Lord Wavell pointed out in his speech before the Central Legislature, should be entrusted with the administration of subjects of common and vital concern to its Constituent States such as "Defence, Military, Foreign Policy and many internal economic problems" which may be taken to be Communications, Customs, Currency, Monetary Policy or Trade Agreements.

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

There is, however, a case for the reconstruction of Provinces which have been artificial creations with ill-defined boundaries. These should be reconstituted on a more natural basis as linguistic and cultural units such as Orissa, or the Andhra Province to come, provided they are financially self-supporting or more or less self-contained eco-

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

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

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

All Indians must agree that in the present fateful conditions of world politics India must emerge out of this global war with her intrinsic strength not decreased but increased in every sphere of her national life. She must

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

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

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

## 2

### ECONOMIC<sup>1</sup>

The unity of India may be sought to be destroyed by communal politicians, but Nature has so fashioned the

<sup>1</sup> Reproduced from *Hindustan*, Vol. I, No. 4.

Country as a single entity by itself that her plan cannot be violated with impunity. The unity of India is not merely superficial and geographical. It is laid broad and deep in the underlying rocks of ages, in India's geological foundations, its subterranean mineral resources which cannot be distributed among artificially created regions and zones into which the country may be divided. They are only available in certain continuous stretches of territory and can be exploited for the purpose of the economic progress and prosperity of the country only when it is viewed and administered as a whole. The subterranean rocks of India as the source of her mineral wealth do not acknowledge the artificial boundaries of administrative divisions on the surface. They revel in one fundamental unity which receives its own continuous expression in continental expanses underlying the territories of different Provinces.

India's geographical unity on the surface and her deeper geological unity below the surface must defeat all plans for its partition which will violate these natural unities forming the basis upon which her economic power and prosperity are to be built up

India's political future cannot be more important than her economic future in which are involved the welfare of the masses the greatest good of the greatest number, which alone should count most in politics as its chief concern

The source of India's economic future and, indeed, her total national power depends very largely upon her mineral wealth. India's importance in World Economy, and, consequently, in world politics, is to be built up on the basis of her resources in certain essential materials like coal and petroleum, ores of iron, manganese and chrome, of gold, of bauxite, salt, magnesite, mica, gypsum, various gemstones, monazite, and certain refractory materials. In

the modern world, industrial power rests on the triple resources of coal, iron, and oil. In the present steel age, industry depends on coal and iron which must be found in combination. Oil is not as essential as coal in the production of steel. The best of India's coal and more than 98 per cent of her total coal is found in the Permian rocks concentrated in parts of Bengal, in Bihar and in Orissa. Practically Bihar and Orissa have the monopoly of coal both in quantity and quality. The few coal-fields of present Bengal are only an extension of the fields in Orissa and Bihar. There is a considerable amount of underlying geological unity between Bihar and Bengal, in spite of their political separation. Central India also is rich in coal-fields. Then there are the great coal-fields of the Godavari Valley continuing through Hyderabad and Madras up to the sea at Coconada.

A piece of India's economic good fortune is that the bulk of her vast coal deposits is found in close proximity of great iron deposits in Bihar and Orissa.

Next to coal and iron, manganese and chromium are important for industrial power as sources of alloys required in making high-grade steel. The ores of these are found mostly in the C.P. and in lesser quantities in Madras, Bombay, Bihar, Orissa and Mysore.

India's gold supply comes from the Kolar district in Mysore, and also the Anantapur district of Madras Presidency.

The C.P., Bombay and Bihar are very rich in bauxite as a source of aluminium.

Copper is the monopoly of the Singhbhum district in Orissa.

More than 85 per cent of India's salt comes from the evaporation of sea-water in Bombay and Madras, and of lake-water in Rajputana. Madras has the monopoly in

Magnesite which is used as a refractory in certain cements and also as a source for magnesium.

It will thus appear that India's minerals are so distributed that if the country were divided on a religious basis, the Muslim part will be rendered incomparably poorer. The Hindu portion of India has great reserves of coal and iron, of ferro-alloy metals, of non-metallic minerals, and gold, of bauxite and some copper. If there were a closed trade system, the Pak'istan State of Bengal would cease to be from the point of view of industrial development, and its people would be economically strangled. The call of industrial progress is a call for unity. Industrial progress also depends on capital which a United India can obtain on cheaper terms from outside under international arrangements. But a number of smaller Indias using their new sovereignty to erect tariff walls around their borders can hardly expect such economic aid from outside.

Ultimately, a division of India into economic fragments will only add to the poverty of her masses. Besides, a United India can better command facilities of importing the economic materials she needs, than a fragmented India, by means of Trade Agreements. Thus the Economics of India should be a pointer to her Politics.

## APPENDIX A

### ARTICLE 14 OF THE U.S.S.R. CONSTITUTION *Schedule of Federal Subjects*

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

- (a) Representation of the Union in *international relations*, conclusion and ratification of Treaties with other States;
- (b) Questions of War and Peace;



- (c) Admission of new Republics into the U.S.S.R.;
- (d) Supervision over the observance of the Constitution of the Union Republics and ensuring that the Constitution of the Union Republics conform with the Constitution of the U.S.S.R.;
- (e) Ratification of alterations of *Boundaries* between Union Republics ;
- (f) Ratification of the formation of new Autonomous Republics within the Union Republics;
- (g) Organisation of the Defence of the U.S.S.R. and the direction of all the armed forces of the U.S.S.R.;
- (h) Foreign Trade on the basis of State Monopoly;
- (i) Safeguarding the Security of the State;
- (j) Determining the plans of National Economy of the U.S.S.R.;
- (k) *Approval of the unified State Budget of the U.S.S.R. as well as of the taxes and revenues which go to form the Union Republican, and Local Budgets;*
- (l) Administration of the Banks, Industrial and Agricultural Establishments and Enterprises and *Trading Enterprises* of all-Union importance;
- (m) Administration of *Transport and Communications*;
- (n) Direction of the *Monetary and Credit system*;
- (o) Organisation of *State Insurance*;
- (p) Contracting and granting *Loans*;
- (q) Establishment of the basic principles of *Land Tenure* as well as of the use of *Mineral Deposits, Forests, and Waters*;
- (r) Establishment of the basic principles in the spheres of *Education and Public Health*;
- (s) Organisation of a uniform system of *national economic Accounting*;
- (t) Establishment of the principles of *Labour Legislation*;

- (u) Legislation governing the *Judicial System and Judicial Procedure, Criminal and Civil Codes*;
- (v) Laws governing *Citizenship* of the Union; laws governing the *Rights of Foreigners* ;
- (w) Issuance of all-Union Acts of *Amnesty*.

## APPENDIX B

### GANDHI-JINNAH CORRESPONDENCE

#### 1. *Extracts from Mahatma Gandhi's letters :—*

1. The first condition of the right of self-determination is achieving independence of India by the joint action of all the Parties and Groups composing India. The independence contemplated is of the whole of India as it stands.

2. You have passionately pleaded that India contains two nations i.e., Hindus and Muslims and that the latter have their homelands in India, as the former have theirs. The more our argument progresses, the more alarming your picture appears to me.

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

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

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

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

I am unable to accept the proposition that the Muslims of India are a nation, distinct from the rest of the inhabitants of India. Mere assertion is no proof. The con-

sequences of accepting such a proposition are dangerous in the extreme. Once the principle is admitted, there would be no limit to claims for cutting up India into numerous divisions which would spell India's ruin.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

10. You seem to be adverse to a plebiscite. In my

opinion there must be clear proof that the people affected desire partition . . . All the people inhabiting the area ought to express their opinion specifically on this single issue—division.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. It is not clear to me what you mean by absolute

majority when you say it means a clear majority over non-Muslims, as in Sind, Baluchistan or the Frontier Province.

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

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

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

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

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

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

# THE CHINESE EXODUS

By Prof. J. C. Daruvala. Illustrated and with  
Maps. Demy 8vo. Price Rs. 4-8

In this very informative and stimulating book the author, who was in China for nine months during 1943-4, gives a living picture of war-torn China. During his stay the author travelled intensively and on his own in Free China. Thus this book is the result of sympathetic study of a great Asiatic nation by a competent Asiatic.

## CONTENTS:

China: Unity in Diversity — The Kuomintang: Principles and Administration — Economics, Currency and Inflation — Agriculture, Food and Industries — Education and the War — Philosophy and Religion — National Characteristics — The Emancipation of Women — The Generalissimo: his views — The War and its Effects — Cultural Life and Thought — The Future. Appendices.

## SOME PRESS OPINIONS:

'.....The confusion that confounds outsiders about present-day China due to the paucity of news about China today is dispelled by this opportune publication .....

—*Bombay Chronicle*

'Prof. Daruvala has given us a very informative and stimulating book.'

—*Forum*

'An excellent textbook of facts on Modern China, covering a wide field from the administration, education, religion...down to the illustrations of the Chinese alphabet.'

—*Sunday Standard*

'The book is of absorbing interest.'

—*Independent*

'The Epic resistance which China has put forth and the great developments that are taking place in the various walks of life especially during the trying period of the last seven years are well dealt with.'

—*Dewan Chand Political Information Bureau*

ture on Pakistan is growing, and Hind  
tributions to it are of outstanding  
—*Indian Readers' Digest*

Aspect :

## COMMUNAL SETTLEMENT

By Dr Beni Prasad, M.A., PH.D., D.S.C. Rs. 14

'To be earnestly studied by all' — *Leader*

'Deserves to be carefully read.' — *Tribune*

'One of the sanest books on the question I have come across.'

'It is such literature that may ultimately solve the present deadlock.' — *East India Chronicle*

On the Economic Aspect :

## AN ECONOMIST LOOKS AT PAKISTAN

By Dr Radhakamal Mukerjee, M.A., PH.D. Rs. 1-8

'Deserves the dispassionate consideration of all those interested in the welfare both of Muslims and Hindus.'

'The dangers of Pakistan are thoroughly exposed with all the ability and knowledge of that eminent professor.'

On the Problem in General :

## IS PAKISTAN NECESSARY ?

By V. B. Kulkarni. Rs. 3-12

'If one wants to equip oneself properly for arguing the case against Pakistan, this book would serve the purpose.'

'A scientific approach to the problem of Pakistan.'

'Sheds new light on an old problem.'

'Really admirable.'

'Extensive study of the demand is all its own.'

