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LIFE OF MAULANA ABUL KALAM AZAD
CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS

1888 Birth in Mecca.
1892 Bismillah ceremony.
1898 Return to India.
1898 Started writing poetry.
1899 Death of mother.
1899 Started monthly “Nairang–e–Khayal” form Calcutta.
1900 or 1901 marriage. Married to Zulekha Begum.
1901 Started weekly Al–Misbah 22nd January.
1902 Edited weekly “Ahsan–ul–Akhbar”, Culcutta.
1903 Completed Dars-e-Nizami curriculum of study under his father.
1903 Assistant editor monthly “Khadang–e–Nazar”, Luknow, March.
1903 Editor Edward Gazette, Shahjehanpur.
1904 Attended the annual session of Anjuman Himayat–ul–Islam, Lahore 1st to 3rd April.
1905 Attended annual session of Anjuman Himayat–ul–Islam, Lahore and spoke on “Islam in Future.”
1905 Last issue of “Lisan–ul–Sidq” was printed by the famous “Mufeed–e–Am” press, Agra, April, May.
1905 Visit to Iraq.
1906 Left “Al–Nadwa”, March.
1906 Editor, “Vakil”, published every third day from Amritsar, April.
1906 Death of elder brother Abu Nasr Gulam Yasin Aah.
1906 Left “vakil” and return to Calcutta, November.
1906 Attended the annul session of the All India Muslim Educational Conference at Dacca, December. Presided by Nawab Vaqar–ul–Mulk.
1907 Re-appointed editor of “Vakil”, Amritsar, August.
1908 Resigned from “Vakil” because of father’s graves illness, August.
1908 Death of father Maulana Khairuddin, 15th August.
1908-1909 Tour of West Asia and France.
1912 Started weekly “Al–Halil” from Calcutta, 13th July.
1913 Security of Rs.2000/- demanded by the Govt. from “Al–Hilal” press on 18th September, which was furnished on 23rd September.
1914 The combined issue of 14th and 21st October of “Al–Hilal” was proscribed by the Government of Bengal, October.
1914 Security was forfeited and a fresh security of Rs. 10,000 was demanded. 16th November. Because security could not be furnished Al–Hilal’s publication was discontinued after bringing our the issue of 18th November.
Weekly “Al–Balagh” was started, 12\textsuperscript{th} November. Government of Bengal ordered him, under section 3\textsuperscript{rd} of the Defence Act, to leave Calcutta as also the limits of Bengal within four days. Subsequently this period was extended to one week.

The Government of Delhi, Punjab and U.P. had already banned his entry in their respective provinces. Because he was banished from Calcutta, “Al–Balagh” was discontinued after the 17\textsuperscript{th}, 24\textsuperscript{th} and 31\textsuperscript{st} March issues.

Reached Ranchi(Bihar) and stayed in Morabadi, outside the city. After a few days he was interned there under the order of the Central Government, 7\textsuperscript{th} April.

Wrote “Tuzkirah” and “Jama–ul–Shawalhid fi Dakhul–e–Ghair Muslim fil masajid.”

Released, 1\textsuperscript{st} January.

1920 As President of Bengal Provincial Khilafat Committee, appealed for Non–Cooperation with the Government. 28\textsuperscript{th}, 29\textsuperscript{th} February.

Wrote “Masha–e–Khilafat aur Jazrat–ul–Arab.” English and Pashtu translations of this work were Published respectively from Bombay and Peshawar.

Mirza Abdul Qadir Beg translated it into English and Malik Saida Khan Shanwari into Pashtu. Presided over the session of All India Khilafat Conference, Nagpur.

For the propagation of Non–Cooperation Movement, weekly “Paigham” was started under his supervision, 23\textsuperscript{rd} September.

Presided over the session of Provincial Khilafat Committee, Agra 25\textsuperscript{th} November.

Presided over the session of “Jamiat–ul–Ulema–e–Hind” at Lahore, 18\textsuperscript{th} – 20\textsuperscript{th} November.
1921  Was arrested and sentenced to one year’s imprisonment and was lodged in Presidency Jail, Alipur, 10th December.

1922  The statement given in this case is known as “Qaul-e-Faisal.” Its Arabic translation was published in Cairo and Turkish translation in Constantinople. It was translated into Arabic by Maulana Abdul Razzaq Malihabadi and into Turkish by Umar Raza, Editor, Jahan-e-Islam Constantinople.

1922  Released, 6th January.

1923  To popularise Indian Liberation Movement in the Arab world a fortnightly

   “Al–Jamia” in Arabic was started under his supervision, 1st April.

1923  Presided over the special session of All India National Congress at Delhi, 15th September.

1925  Presided over the special session of All India Khilafat Committee, Kanpur. 29th December.

1927  “Al–Hilal” was re-started, 10th June.

1927  “Al–Hilal” stopped publication after the issue of 9th December.

1929  President, Muslim National party, 27th July.

1930  Officiating President of All India National Congress.

1931  Arrested.


1932  Arrested.


   (Tarjuman–ul–Quran vol. I & vol. II have been translated into English by Syed Abdul Lateef, Published in India and Pakistan)

1939  Officiating president of All India National Congress.
1940 Was elected President of All India National Congress and held this position till 1946.

1940 President over the All India National Congress session, Ramgarh, 19th March.

1940 Arrested, sentenced for two years and transferred to Naini Jail.

1941 Released, 4th December.

1942 Negotiations with Cripps’ Mission, March and April

1942 Arrested and detained in the fort of Ahmednagar, 9th August.

1943 Wife died in Calcutta, 9th April.

1943 Younger sister Hanifa Bagum Abru died in Bhpoal, June.

1945 Transferred from Ahmednagar to Bankura, April.

1945 Released, 15th June.

1945 Attended Simla Conference, 16th June.

1946 “Gulbar–i–Khatir” and “Karwan–i–khayal” Published.

1946 Negotiations with Cabinet Mission, April and June.

1947 Joined Interim Government as Education Minister, 15th January.

1947 Education Minister in the first Government of Independent India, 15th August.

1951 Deputy leader of Congress Parliamentary Party.

1952 Elected Member of Parliament in the first General Elections.

Minister for Education, Natural Resources and Scientific Research.


1956 Good will mission to Europe and west Asia.

Presided over the 9th UNESCO General Conference held in Delhi, May to July.
1957  Elected Member of Parliament in the second General Elections and was again appointed Minister for Education and Scientific Research.

1958  Last speech delivered at the session Anjuman Tarraqi–e–Urdu, held in Delhi, 15th February.

1958  Died Buried in Urdu Park in front of Jama Masjijd, Delhi, 22nd February.

**Source:** *Maulana Abul Kalam Azad (Tributes, Writings, Speeches), Khuda Bakhsh Oriental Public Library, Patna, 2002.*
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PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS TO THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS, 1923

On 15 December 1923, Maulana Azad presided over a Special Session of Congress. At the age of 35, Maulana was the youngest Congress president. At this time, the communal differences between Hindus and Muslims had reached a pitch. Maulana’s speech is emphatic about Hindu-Muslim unity.

It has been necessary for us to meet in this historic moment, prior to the appointed time, because we are at a critical juncture in our struggle for Independence. We need to look for solutions for the difficulties that lie ahead. If I say that the difficulties of the hour and the tasks before us are unprecedented in the history of Congress, I will be voicing the sentiment of every individual in this Assembly. Three years ago, when you had gathered at a similar Assembly in Calcutta, it was an important moment in history, as significant as those occasions at which nations make official declarations of wars for Independence. This day is reminiscent of those times when nations have to deal, not with declarations of war, but with intricate and decisive issues arising from those declarations. When we met on that day, you were concerned about the onset of war, today you are anxious about its outcome. That day you were intent on starting your journey, today you are facing the danger of getting lost. Then you were anxious to lift your anchor and set sail, but now, to quote
Hafiz, “The ship has left one shore, the other gleams in the distance, and the lapping waves have encircled the bark.”

Gentlemen, when I see that you have selected me to deliver the keynote address at this Assembly, I realize that the confidence you have placed in me is attributable to your generosity rather than to any special qualification on my part. I am thankful for the honour you have bestowed on me but I plead your assistance in the responsibility with which you have entrusted me. There is no doubt that the task we have before us is extremely complex. But our faith is unswerving. We may have doubts about our methods, but not about our goals. Our modest efforts are aimed at justice and truth and we believe that what we are doing on this earth is God’s favoured task. Although the arduousness of our journey may cause us anxieties, we should never allow ourselves to become disheartened. We should believe that God’s providence, which started us on our mission and gave us courage when we were weak and helpless, will continue to protect us throughout the balance of the journey, until we finally reach our victory goal.

**Problems of the time**

If I had to comment on the current events and problems, I would have preferred silence to speech. There was a stage when the expression of Indian national sentiment was confined to criticizing the injustices of bureaucracy. Later, criticism turned to complaint, and complaint became protest. At every perpetration of injustice we yelled, we bellowed. Now matters stand at a point
when we have no option other than to make our own decision. Having seen so much injustice we have now become used to it as if it were a part of our daily life. It has become unnecessary to talk of injustice, in fact, even referring to it is an insult to our intelligence. The stark reality has been disclosed to us. We can expect no surprises, no can any further veils be lifted. We have no doubt that whatever has been happening to us will continue to happen, unless we take the initiative to change it. We are not dealing with a government which is blatantly unjust. And if it continues to become stronger, it will not be a result of its intrinsic strength, it will be because our negligence would have strengthened its foundations. Injustice is the essence and not an accident of this system. We should feel neither surprised nor angry; we should try our hardest to terminate it, for once and for all.

**The Great Turkish Victory**

Gentlemen, I am sure that the first thing you expect me to do is to express on your behalf sentiments of joy at an event which has a strange but glorious connection with your national struggle, and which marks a magnificent epoch of your national history. It was God’s will that two distantly placed Eastern nations should be joined together in the name of justice and freedom in a way that once should fell the pain of the other, and the victory of either would be rejoicing of both. Which are these two separate parts of the East which have been brought so close to one another in their common quest for justice and freedom? First India, a country which while asking for her own
independence, demanded freedom and self-determination for Turkey, the Islamic Caliphate, as part of the package of her own national demands. Second, Turkey, a country which is witnessing the dawn of new nationalism. Its revolutionary victories have dazzled the world like the working of a miracle. The spirit of her victories patriotism has spread all over the Eastern world bringing with it a new message of life and hope.

The New East

We have to remember that the importance which certain events acquire in the pages of history is never perceived by the protagonists of those events. We, too, are passing through a revolutionary phase which fulfils those conditions, which, according to the historians, give rise to mighty revolutions. The world is fast heading towards a new era. All things that, until yesterday, were believed to be unassailable truths, are, would are also getting blurred, as are its principles and beliefs. Many heights have fallen down and many depths have raised their levels. Having risen to the maximum height, things have started falling, and the gloomy night of despair has already reached that limit, after which daybreak is imminent. Who can foresee what the immediate future has in store? Even so, whatever is happening makes it abundantly clear (and we don’t need any fortune-teller to tell us), that a new East is emerging from these turbulent mutations. Today, the awakening in the East is going through its successive stages. Ghazi Mustafa Kamal Pasha’s hands have not only shaken up the sleeping destiny of Turkey, they have knocked at all the doors in the
East. The echoes of that knock are resounding in the plains of West Asia, and can be heard through the wilderness of Africa. They are even heard over the lapping waves of the Indian Ocean, and, it would not be surprising if the echoes of this knock reverberate through every nook and corner of the East.

Gentlemen, India cannot ignore or forget its natural and geographical association with this magnificent movement in the East. She has lined her own struggle with this movement, and shares with the Turks the sentiments of togetherness and affinity. In fact, India commends the spirit of every eastern nation which is fighting for freedom, and feels chagrin for every nation which is lagging behind in these endeavors. India assures the patriots of Egypt, Syria, Palestine, Iraq, Morocco and other Eastern countries, that millions of Indian hearts praying for their success, and that their freedom is no less dear to us than our own Independence.

**Constantinople and Yervada Jail**

Gentlemen, when we look towards the magnificent places of the Khalifas of Turkey, and congratulate them on their splendid victories, our mind turns to a tiny cell in India where India’s greatest son is imprisoned. I am certain that if there is anyone outside Turkey who deserves to be congratulated on Turkey’s victory, it is the great leader of India, Mahatma Gandhi, who raised his voice in Turkey’s support at a time when no one, not even Turkey herself, had spoken in her own defence. It were his discerning eyes that grasped the entire scope and depth of this issue at a glance, and invited all Indians to
make it a national issue and not that of the Muslims alone. Gentlemen, the struggle that India waged under the guidance of Mahatma Gandhi for the Khilafat Movement is a very special and significant event of the present times, a debate on its consequences will be carried on for a long time in the pages of history. It is premature for us to assess all the consequences of this struggle. Even so, some of the consequences are so obvious that they admit no doubt or debate; and each one of them it so important and significant that a full-fledged struggle could have been launched to attain it. Due to the Khilafat Movement, the Hindu Muslim unity issue, without which India’s freedom would be a shattered dream, was resolved, and the obstacles, which were blocking its progress for a long time, were overcome.

**Difficulties of the Time**

Gentlemen, right at the start, I had mentioned the difficult times we are passing through. For any national struggle, organized unity is most essential, and any kind of dissent is most dangerous. Our unity has weakened at this moment; therefore the dangers. I want to draw your attention to the nature and the extent of these problems, our inability to make an accurate assessment may result in another crises. Today, we are at mid-point between despair and disappointment. If we underestimate the problem we face, we may become negligent, and if we exaggerated view we may find ourselves plunged in despair. We should neither be negligent nor scared. We must fight overcome, and that can be done only if we correctly estimate the problems that lie ahead.
What we need most of all are scales and measurement, rather than arms and ammunitions.

**The Uniformity of Laws of Social Life**

At this stage we should reflect on the natural laws which govern society. They exist within our range of knowledge, but sometimes strong emotional biases obscure the realities which are otherwise recognized by the intellect.

In this amazing universe of life and movement, we are a minute particle like several other known and unknown particles, which are created during its continuo revolutions. What has happened once, will happen time again, and what one personal has experienced, will be experienced by all who follow a similar course. This is an unvarying and inviolable truth. In the words of the Persian poet-philosopher Omar Khayyam. “Life is the same story, repeated over and over again, with new names and new characters.” To quote victor Hugo, the famous French writer, “Life pattern are continuous, but repetitious.”

This law of universality is as relevant for society as it is for individuals. Just as the action of individuals are attributable not only to their individuality but also to there mental and physical condition, so also the action of society. Societies having the same temperament will react similarly, given similar circumstances. Birth and death of nation, their-rise or fall lethargy or energy, freedom or subjugation, success or failure, all is governed by one law. Whatever has befallen one nation will befall all others which follow in its footsteps. This amazing uniformity of social laws has been expressed in these
words by Abdul Rehman Ibn Khaldoon, a historian-philosopher of the
thirteenth century, who first formulated the principles of the philosophy of
history. He states, “If we omit the date and names’ then the history of one
nation or era can be substituted for any and every nation and time. For men and
dates constitute the only difference in the histories of different nations.”

A similar view has been expressed recently in a more comprehensive manner
by the French author Dr. Gustave Le Bon, “when we have formulated the laws
of social psychology in a manner similar to individual psychology, it would
then be possible for us to write the history of a single nation and civilization,
and use it for every nation and civilization. Its use will become permanent like
a millennium calendar.”

**A Stage of Trial**

Let us pause for a moment and analyses the troubles we face today in
the context of the psychology of collective action. There is no need to repeat
the truism that as in the case of individuals, the real source of the actions of a
nation lies in its collective mind. When the mental development of the
members of a nation reaches the stage at which they feel they can express
themselves, they wait for the right opportunity. Mental preparedness includes a
strong motivation to surmount all difference of views and opinions, and the
desire to mobilize all the diverse elements and bring them to focal point.

When individual minds join together to form a collective mind, they are
motivated by emotion rather than by reason or logic. Consequently, the focal
point, too, is created by emotions and not by logic. When this condition is
fulfilled, active struggle commences, and, depending on the underlining
strength, a confrontation with other emergent and opposing forces takes place.
Thereafter, the struggle may succeed in attaining its goal, or, in accordance
with the natural laws of progression, it advances, but with frequent pauses.
These pauses are of varying length, and are governed by various laws
especially the law of action and reaction. At such junctures we are plunged into
despondency and wariness. The greatest impact of this pause is felt on the ideas
which we have cherished all along. It seems as if a bunch of papers which were
care fully tied in bundles has suddenly become loose. Differences start to
appear. Winds of dissension begin toolbox, and the national struggle runs into
difficult times. Like group dynamics, this too, is a physical-dynamic, and,
therefore, largely uninfluenced by reason or knowledge. No matter how
sensible they are, and how well aware of the past experiences of the ages,
people cannot stop themselves from reacting to these condition. Nevertheless,
if the vital parts of the struggle are sound, then all these physical symptoms do
not constitute any real threat. Often the pause is momentary. Although on
certain occasions it develops into a postponement and that state is fraught with
dangers.

As soon as this stage is over, which was an essential period for the state
of intoxication to wear off, the veil of depression is lifted, and the struggle
begins with its previous favor. It appears more energetic and longer lasting than
before, because this momentary pause was only at the surface, deep down other
forces were at work. In its fresh phase there is the added vigour of a new force along with those previously at work.

At actions of groups, like all changes and alterations in this world, either fade away or persist. They are not born afresh each time; they only rise and fall. We mistakenly feel that the fall is the end, and the rise, a new birth. To regard the suspension of any national activity as its end, is as erroneous as to say that the ebb of the tide means that the sea will never rise again. Our national struggle has arrived at such a suspension or hiatus. The struggle was hurtling along, full steam. Suddenly the decision of Bardoli caused it to pause, and it screeched to a halt.

It was natural that the sudden pause should prove painful. All those effects followed which are the natural results of suspended activities. One such effect is that our organization has been shaken up. It appears that a packed and sealed commodity is being rapidly taken apart. The relative inactivity our movement, the split in the congress, the rupture in Hindu–Muslim unity, the failure of all attempts to bring about a union, all these are the effects of the shock that our movement has received.

Gentlemen, this is a stern trial from which we must emerge triumphant, given our determination to secure victory. I hope you will not take individual incidents to heart. For those who understand the psychology of nations, and the course of history, this condition parallels the case of a runner who has paused for a breath before recommencing his marathon race.
It should not concern us that our opponents and critics are self deceived by our present condition, for their mental state is such that they will recognize power only when they are brought face to face with it. We should, however, have no doubts about the real strength of our positions. What is it that we have lost? He intellectual springs of our efforts are still strong and its foundations are still unshaken. We do not feel any slackening in their forward momentum. Can we doubt the evidence of our own success? Do we not feel it in our heart as an abiding faith, before our eyes as an ideal, and in every vein like the spirit of life itself.

Gentlemen, allow me to take a statement on your behalf which, I hope, will reflect your thinking. With the greatest confidence I wise to announce that our struggle will continue as before. We have simply paused for a moment, a fact which has delayed the process of making a definite decision, but which has not stopped our struggle. Problems of sustaining enthusiasm and exercising caution have, indeed, arisen but we emphatically deny any question of our relinquishing the struggle, or even of temporary despair.

While drawing your attention to the fact that there is not cause for despair, I must add that there is not excuse whatsoever for slacking our efforts. We should not forget the unassailable truth that, however trifling the disease, if neglected, it can prove fatal. The trial before us, today, i.e. the slackening of our activities, is a temporary ailment, but we should not allow it to develop into terminal disease. How can we guard against this? What is the solution to the
current problem? What we need is unity and it is for this reason that we have gathered here today. This memorable day has dawned in order to provide us with a few moments for reflection, which will tide us over the present crisis. We have invited the world to witness the consequences of our trail. Will we maximize the advantage of this opportunity? A few hours should answer this question.

**Non-Violent Non-Cooperation**

It is essential that I base my request on a fundamental premise. For the achievement of our objectives, we have adopted the principle of non-violent non-cooperation. Non-cooperation is based on that simple but universal truth that we should not cooperate with evil, so that is may be stopped from multiplying. All the religious and moral philosophies of the world share this belief. And if we substitute the word “harm” for the word “evil” (in my opinion the two are synonymous), we will find Non-cooperation not only a universal belief of mankind but a natural tendency in the animal world. Here we are reminded of the teachings of all religions. Islam has commanded its followers to adopt the path of non-cooperation with the intention that they should not support or strengthen those individuals or groups whose activities hurt their country. The same doctrine is found in other religions. In the political struggle of nations not only is non-cooperation a commonly accepted principle, but it has even been adopted as the universal principle of action. It is obvious that no community or nation has won freedom through cooperation. Every nation has
struggled for its freedom and struggle means confrontation, not cooperation. Civil Disobedience is the strongest weapon of the weaker nations.

Whenever smaller nations have been unable to offer armed resistance to tyranny they have adopted this method as the only means of attaining their objective. This united voice of nations, religions, and morality is an age-old fact of life. “Suffer as your may but never turn you face away from what you consider to be right.” It is said that in the weak and helpless beginnings of every religion, these principles are the only support and strength offered. We see them reflected in Socrates’ cup of poison. We see them engraved on the cross of Jerusalem. The streets of Mecca have heard their grand appeal. The first two centuries in the history of the Christian faith were chapters that were written on this subject. During the time of the Roman Emperor, sever us, when the weak foundations for the Christian church were being shaken by the storms of tyranny and injustice, it was the in conquerable spirit of this principle that strengthened its tottering structure. A Christian martyr of that period, Tertian, read a statement before the Roman judges, which has been quoted by the American writer, Draper in his book Conflict between Religion and Science: “Our community has not existed for long, but is there a single place where we do not exist? Cities, islands, provinces, forts, barracks of armies, courts of Empires, Chambers of senates, we occupy every high place in your Government. We have left your nothing except your places of worship. Think it over. We can start a civil war if we wish, but our religion teaches us that it is better to be killed than to kill. Consequently, we suffer, we do not fight.” Can
there be a more perfect and more effective expression of passive resistance? Today, after seventeen hundred years, we can use these words as our guiding light.

**Count Leo Tolstoy**

In modern times, the first man who preached passive resistance as a weapon for obtaining political rights, for opposing the injustice of Government, and as a substitute for armed revolution was the great and true Christian teacher of Russia. His name is Count Leo Tolstoy. This principle is enunciated in his world famous teachings. He made a vehement protest against the soulless materialism of the Western civilization, the intolerable inequality of social conditions, the ruthless oppression by capitalism, and the tyranny of the Orthodox Russian Church. His extremist views resulted in an ex-president of America making the following comment: “They (his views) have, without doubt, passed the bounds of moderation and practicability.” But in all the teachings of Tolstoy, passive resistance is explained as a simple and practical doctrine which shows the world the easiest way of fulfilling.

The essential of Tolstoy’s teaching is that war and murder must end, and the forces that are aligned against justice and human rights should not be opposed with arms. Their power is based on the institutions which they have created, and if people stop participating in them, they will not be able to survive for a single moment.
Mahatma Gandhi

The world has always needed Mahatma Gandhi’s practical guidance more than theoretical preaching. There is nothing new or exciting about the concepts of reality and truth, but recognition and pursuit of truth is always as exhilarating experience. We all recognize that, in theory, it is our duty to fight for freedom; but to actually fight for it was known to only a few men like Washington. Though Tolstoy expounded the theory of non-cooperation, but his work waited practical exposition at the hands of another individual. So work personality is he, that he seems to have been selected for this task by Providence itself. His name is Mahatma Gandhi. Even before Tolstoy, the world knew of the Non-cooperation concept, but before Mahatma Gandhi appeared on the scene, no one understood how this force could be applied in actual practice.

The Programme on Non-Cooperation

The methods of Non-cooperation which India adopted under the guidance of Mahatma Gandhi, was, in principle, the same as the world had seen before, although changed in several practical respects. It sued to be ethical course it is now a political program. The beliefs and principles presented by Tolstoy were so expansive that, on the one hand, they clashed with the existing thoughts and beliefs of men as well as with many of their rules of conduct, and, on the other, they presented extreme practical difficulties. The present form of Non-cooperation has acquired a completeness of its own. As it stands now, it
does not clash with religious or political beliefs. It contains no complexity which cannot be rationalized within the proviso that if it is not accepted as an article of faith it be accepted as an expedient and strong policy. To break all ties which bind the bureaucracy to the people of India, is the central beliefs of Non-cooperation, but it has greatly narrowed its potential sphere of activities. It wants to work in a manner that its strictures cause the least possible suffering to those who adopt it as a weapon.

Self-sacrifice, self-restraint and moral strength are the weapons prescribed for use in this combat. But the movement allows us full latitude, and, except from select person who can be held up as an example to the nation, it does not demand anything from the masses which may be difficult for them to do. For all those struggling for their rights, it has become a principle of political action which is extremely simple, and, therefore, practical. It assures a bloodless victory to all the nations of the world, and keeps in mind not only adherence to principles, but also practice of policy.

**Nature of the Programme**

The fundamental principle of this programme is this: We should launch an unarmed and non violent struggle against the present armed bureaucracy of India, and secure a victory which will compel them to lay down arms before the will of then Indian people. For Indian as for any other country the question that begs a decision is, “what should prevail? The will of the people or the rule established by armed force?”
The question arises, how will we launch our unmarred struggle? Our program suggests a course of actions which is not inspired by necessity or expediency, but by firm conviction. It suggests that we detach ourselves from the present system of Government for two important reasons. First, because it is an intrinsically evil force, and second, because our Non-cooperation will drain its strength and render it important. That this is our need as well as our duty, is the unanimous verdict of religion, ethics, experience and history. We should not become and instrument of the injustice which we are being subjected to.

There is not doubt that Indian history can be altered between the rising and setting of a single sun, provided that unanimously and simultaneously, we withdraw from active co-operation. How should this be accomplished? All jur difficulties are summarized in this question. In this war, which is not a war, the answer to this question has to be given on a war-footing.

The Non-cooperation Movement has divided its strategy into two natural parts. First, the collection of war materials, and second, the business of war. War materials mean men inspired by the spirit of passive resistance. War means a confrontation between our passive strength and their bureaucratic power. This trial of strength must come to a head sooner or later.

**The Mentality of Non-Cooperation**

It is clear that misunderstandings which have been propagated about the mentality of the Non-cooperation Movement are quite far-fetched. It believed
that Non-cooperation is a challenge to Western civilization and science, and that it preaches a new code of morals and a new religion instead of politics. There exists the mistaken impression that it advocates complete dissociation from worldly activities, and stands for retrogression rather than for progress. I reject this view as a complete misinterpretation. Non-cooperation has no direct link with educational, social or civic issues.

In India, there are several views about the pros and cons of Western civilization and culture. The mental placidity of Europe and America, too, has been disturbed and new ideas are cropping up. Like Leo Tolstoy, Mahatma Gandhi, too, has his own ideas about Non-cooperation, but the concept itself fairly focused. It has no religion instruction to offer its flowers, nor does it have a new scheme for prayer and renunciation. In e very way it qualifies as a political program, based on truth and fact. Religion, morality and history recognize its existence, and have their own respective names for it. If it preaches the boycott of schools and law courts, it is not motivated to do so because it hates the oppression under which Indians are compelled to work in these institution. Its insistence on the use of khaddar is not due to hostility against expensive Western materials, but rather a preference for home-spun; and also because of the belief that for her political salvation, India needs to adopt simple habits and a rigorous of self discipline.
The Success of the Experiment

I have hesitation in stating that the program has far exceeded the normal degree of success expected from such a program. If three years ago it was a principle, the success of which could be anticipated by reasonable projection, today it is tried experiments, the effectiveness of which is borne out by observation and experience.

National revolutions are not born within the precincts of country, they are first felt in the depths of the human heart and soul. In twelve months, Non-cooperation has completely changed the Indian mentality. It has increased the political capacity of all classes of people. It has brought the message of liberty and patriotism to every single individual on this continent. It has created revolutions in the lives of thousands. The fear of punishment and pain that is natural under these conditions, was so completely rooted out that imprisonment became a sport, and law courts became theatres of public entertainment. There is not one single avenue of the liberty struggle which has not been opened to us. If these events are of recent vintage what more proof do we require of the fact that the program is wise, practical and unerringly effective? Non-cooperation Movement never claimed to work any miracles. Its humble contention was that, provided that country adhered to it, it could, without weapons and violence acquire a degree of spiritual strength which would prove invincible when pitted against bureaucratic power. Aren’t these results a conclusive proof of its success?
Discipline

Just as blind obedience is an impediment to all success and progress, discipline is a prerequisite for all corporate action. A commander may have made a mistake in issuing orders, but a soldier must obey even though he does not agree with his leader. If we receive the wrong commands, we must be prepared for death, like the regiment at Sebastopol for whom Tennyson has written the famous elegy, rather than disobey. Better suffer the consequences of wrong leadership than have the whole army defect on the battlefield.

Today, our leadership is reposed in one single body, the Indian National Congress. We are in state of war. We should give our blind obedience neither to congress, nor to its leadership, at the same time, however, we should not step outside the boundary of discipline.

The Councils

After considering all aspects of the situation, I have reached the conclusion that under the present circumstances, it is useless for us to boycott the councils. During the previous elections, boycott was considered necessary; that necessity has now been reversed. Today it is useful for us to occupy as many seats as possible. We should enter the conceals and assemblies, and follow a plan of action which makes them yet another forum for our activities. I believe that out future programme should be such that one section of our party should enter the council, while the other should continue its activities outside.
Hindu–Muslim Unity

I have taken so much time in describing our superstructure, that the question of the foundation, i.e. Hindu–Muslim unity still needs to be considered. Without this foundation, our freedom and all the factors of our country life and progress will remain a dream. Without it once again, we cannot create, within ourselves, the primary principles of humanism. Today if an angel were to descend from the heaven and declare from the top of the Qutab Minar, that India will get Swaraj within twenty four hours, provided she relinquishes Hindu–Muslim unity, I will relinquish Swaraj rather than give up Hindu–Muslim unity. Delay in the attainment of Swaraj will be a loss to India, but if our unity is lost, it will be a loss for entire mankind.

The Present Condition of the Country

No one who has the slightest love for India can remain unmoved at her present condition. Four years ago we made a grand announcement to the world. In a voice filled with national pride we asked the world to standby and wait for our freedom. But the moment the world’s attention became focused on us, a different story became evident, the story our shamelessness and bloodshed. Instead of Swaraj and Khilafat, slogans of Shuddhi are being raised. “Save the Hindus from Muslim” says one group, “Save Islam from Hinduism,” says another. When the order of the day is, “Protect Hindus” and “Protect Muslims,” who cares about protecting the national? The press and platform are busy fanning bigotry and obscurantism, while a duped and ignorant public is
shedding blood on the streets. Bloody riots have occurred at Ajmer, Palwal, Sharanpur, Agra and Meerut. Who can say where these unfortunate consequences will lead?

**Communal Organizations**

It was not so long ago that the Muslims, as a community, took no part in the activities of the Congress. They felt that being small in number, and deprived of wealth and education, they could not afford to participate in any national struggle. As a result they held aloof from the national movement and confined themselves to communal organizations.

Those of your who have been studying changes in Muslim corporate life during the last twelve years know that mine was the first voice raised in 1912 against this attitude. I invited the attention of my Muslim brethren to the fact that by persisting in the policy of aloofness they were making themselves an impediment to the freedom of the country. I said they should trust their Hindu brothers, abandon the policy of communalism, join Congress, and make the country freedom their ultimate goal. At that time my message was not well received by my Muslim brethren. I found strong opposition to my views. But not long after that the Muslims recognized the truth. In 1916, when I was interred at Ranchi, I heard that a large number of Muslims were entering the fold of congress.

Just as in 1972, I raised my voice against the Muslim and fear of their opposition dud not me from the truth, so also today, I consider it my duty
Tories my voice against my brothers who are hoisting the flag of Hindu sangathan. I am surprised to see that the mentality of the Muslim political circles of Muslim were prompted by the fear of their numerical inferiority, these excitable people are four times the number of Muslims.

I declare, without hesitation, that India wants neither a Hindu nor a Muslim Sangathan. We require one single Sangathan the Indian National Congress.

Some responsible leaders of the Shuddhi movement assert that it is not opposed to Hindu-Muslim unity. Therefore, after preaching opposition, they end on a note of cordiality and love. To these gentlemen I would suggest that having already led us along the wrong path, they hold not now invite us to deny human nature. Jesus Christ asked people to forgive their enemies. But the world to this day, has not even forgiven its friends. Do you believe that having excited the passions of jealousy and revenge, you can continue the business of cordiality and love?

One the subject of Shuddhi, I want to say that while, in theory, we can separate our common struggle for political salvation from our religious quarrels, in practice, we cannot keep them in different compartments. We want composite nationhood. It will, however, be impossible to create an atmosphere of harmony when slogans of Malechh are being raised in our quarter, while other is resounding with cries of kafir.
The National Pact

Let me remind you that we should, without further delay, prepare a National Pact which will not only define our national goal, but will also give a verdict on the daily clashes and future relationships of all the communities that make up our country.

Conclusion

Like the historic days of other nations, this remarkable day may result in diametrically opposite consequences. We can either achieve the greatest possible success or the most dismal failure. This is a time of trial for our patriots, our determination, and our courage. Come, let us overcome every obstacle and devote ourselves to building our common destiny.

APPENDIX – III
Appendix – III

RESIDENTIAL ADDRESS TO THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS, 1940

The 53rd session of Congress was held at Ramgarh (Bihar) on 21 March 1940 during a Second World War days. It was very crucial. Maulana Azad gave clear-cut direction to Congress through this address.

You elected me president of this National Assembly in 1923. Today, after seventeen years, you have, once again, conferred upon me the same honour. In the history of national struggle, seventeen years is not a long period. The pace of events and universal changes occur so rapidly that old standards not apply. During the last seventeen years, in rapid succession, we passed through many stages. A long journey temporary before us, which, inevitably, took us to several temporary posts. We stopped to rest at each post, but never came to a standstill. Although we surveyed and examined every prospect, but, resisting every distraction, we kept moving on. We faced many ups and downs but our feces were always set towards the goal. Others may have doubted our intentions and our determinations but we never had a single moment self-doubt. Our path was uphill; at every step we faced obstacles. Perhaps we could not
proceed as fast as we would have liked to, but we did not flinch from continuing the forward trend.

If we look back at the period between 1923 and now, 1923 will appear a faded landmark in the distance. At that time, we wanted reach our goal, but our goal was so distant that even the milestones were hidden from our eyes. Now just lift up your eyes and glance ahead. Not only will you see the milestones clearly but also the goal itself will appear imminent. It is inevitable that the nearer we get to our goal, the more intense does our struggle becomes. While the rapid race of events has brought us closer to our goal, it has, at the same time, created new troubles and problems. Today our caravan is passing through an arduous path. The essential difficulty of time period such as the present, lies in its conflicting possibilities. It is likely that a correct step may bring us closer to our goal, or a false step may land us miles away from our intended destination.

By electing me president at this critical juncture, you have demonstrated the great confidence you have in once of your fellow workers. For me this is an honor and responsibility. I am grateful for the honour, and crave your support in shouldering the responsibility. I am confident that your faith in me will be measures of the support that I shall continue to receive from you.

**The Real Problem of the Day**

I should, without further delay, come straight to the heart of the matter.

The first and the most important question before us is, where are we going as a
consequence of the step we took following the declaration of war on 3rd September, 1939? And secondly, where do we stand now?

The 1936 Lucknow session of Congress marked the beginning of a new ideological phase. At that time, Congress passed a resolution on the international situation and placed its viewpoint clearly and categorically before the public. After this historical move, a review and integral part of the annual proceedings of the Congress. After full deliberations, the resolutions made on this subject were placed before the worldthese resolutions presented two views. First, the new ideology in Indian politics that despite our presented state of helplessness we would not remain isolated from the outside world. It was essential that while we strode ahead and shaped our future, we do not confine our attention to our own boundaries. Instead, we needed to keep vigil over the outside world. Changing world conditions had brought countries and nations closer to one another. Thoughts and actions, rising like waves in one corner of the world, created ripples in far off places. It was, therefore, impossible for India, to solve her problems while restricting herself to her boundaries. It was inevitable that events in the outside world would have their impact on India; and equally probable that our decisions and conditions would affect the rest of the world.

The realization led to certain decisions at the party level. Our resolutions declared unequivocal condemnation of the growing forces of Fascism and Nazism, which we considered lethal combat weapons pitted against democracy
and individual and national freedom. These resolutions were passed again and again, starting with the Lucknow session of the Congress, right until August, 1939. They were known as War Resolutions. Meanwhile, Fascism and Nazism were gaining momentum day by day. India regarded this a great danger to world progress and peace. Emotionally and intellectually, she aligned herself with the supporters of democracy and freedom.

While India could not endure the prospect of Nazism and Fascism, she was even more repulsed by British Imperialism. No circumstance could compel her to extend a helping hand to promote imperialism. This was the second point emphasized in those resolutions. All the resolutions had been placed before the British Government, when suddenly, in the third week of August 1939, war clouds gathered, and, at the beginning of September, the war broke out.

As this stage I will ask you to pause for a moment and reflect. What were the condition which prevailed last August?

The Government of India Act 1935 was forcibly imposed on India by the British. Restoring to her old tricks, Britain tried to make the world believe that a large proportion of India’s rights had been conferred upon her. The Congress cession to reject this act also became a well-known stand; nevertheless, it decided that a conflict should be avoided at this stage. Congress resolved to form Provincial Governments, provided certain conditions were met. As a consequence, Congress Ministries started functioning successfully in eight out of eleven provinces.
It was in the interest of Britain to maintain these conditions for a long as possible. Another factor was India’s condemnations of Nazi Germany. Her sympathy with the democratic nations was point in Britain’s favor. Under these circumstances, it was natural to expect that if the British Government altered its imperialistic mentality, it would, even as a measure of expediency, change its old methods and allow India to feel that she was breathing in changed environment. But we all know badly the British Government behaved. Not the slightest indication of change was discernible in its attitude. Its policy was exactly in line with the 150 years old story of imperialism. Having decided its course of action, and, without giving India the slightest opportunity to declare her preference, her participation in the war was announced. It was not even considered necessary to give those representative assemblies, imposed upon us in an effort at window-dressing for the benefit of the outside would, an opportunity to express their opinion.

It is common knowledge that all the countries which made up the empire were allowed free decision-making. The representative Assemblies of Canada, Australia, New Zealand’s, South Africa, Ireland, all of them arrived at independent decisions, without any external pressure, with regarded to their participation in the war. Not only this but when Ireland decided to remain neutral, no one expressed surprise, nor was a single voice raised against it is Great Britain. Mr. De Valcra stood up next door to Britain, and refused to help unless the question of Ulster was settled to his satisfaction.
Today, among all the British dominions where is India’s place? India is being told that the generous hand of Britain will confer upon her the precious gift of dominion status in the near but unknown future. But how was here existence recognized/ it was recognized by the gesture that when the war began, a war which will probably by remembered as the greatest catastrophe in history, India was suddenly pushed into it, without her even understanding what she was in for! This fact alone was sufficient to indicate which way the wind was blowing. But there was no need for impatience. Other opportunities were to come and the time was not far when we would seen the ugly reality of British imperialism at closer range.

In 1914, when the first spark was struck in a corner of the Balkans, England and France raised the slogan for the rights of small nations. Later, President Wilson’s fourteen points were flashed before the world. Their fate is well known. At that time the situation was different. After the last war, England and France, intoxicated with victory, adopted a course, which resulted in a counter-reaction. This reaction became an epidemic. It took the form of Fascism in Italy, and Nazism in Germany. Unrestrained dictatorship, based on brute force, challenged the peace and freedom of the entire world. When this happened, the world aligned itself two rival comps: one supporting democracy and freedom; the other filing behind the reactionary forces. In this way a new face of the war began to emerge. Mr. Chamberlain’s Government, which regarded soviet Russia more intolerable than Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany, and a living challenge to British imperialism, continued to watch this situation
for three years. Its attitude towards Nazi ambition was clearly and repeatedly encouraging. One after another, Abyssinia, Spain, Austria, Czecho-slovakia and Albania, Disappeared from the map of the world as free countries and Great Britain waffling overtures, continually assisted in their burial. When this strategy reached its natural climax, and, Nazi Germany hurtled ahead, the British Government was compelled to enter the war. Had it not done so, the power of Germany would have become an intolerable menace for British imperialism. The new slogans of freedom, world peace and democracy, replaced the old cry of “Save the smaller nation”, and the whole world resounded with these cries! On 3rd September, England and France made a declaration if war to the accompaniment of these earth-shattering slogans! People, who had become bewildered and harassed by the new reactionary forces, lent a willing ear to the alluring sounds of these slogans.

The Congress Demand

War was declared on the 3rd September, and, four days later, the All India Congress Working Committee met at Wardha to discuss the situation. What did the Working Committee do? All the declarations the Congress had made since 1936 were on the table. Also placed before it was the British Government’s Indictment of India as a belligerent country. No one would have blamed Congress had it made a decision in accordance with the circumstance. But it continued to keep itself on a tight leash and resisted the natural urge to accelerate the course of events. Having logically and dispassionately
deliberated on every aspect of the matter, it then took the step, which, today, allows India to raise her head and tell the world that his was the only correct step which could have been taken. It agreed to postpone its final decision, and asked the British Government to state its War Aims, for on this depended peace and justice not only for India, but for the entire world. If India was being invited to participate in this war, she had a right to know on what basis was the war being fought? What was its objective? If the result of this great human tragedy was not to be the same as that of the last war and if it was really being fought to safeguard Freedom, Democracy, and Peace, and bring about a new world order, then, in all fairness, India had a right to know, what effect these lofty aims would have on her destiny.

The Working Committee formulated this demand in a statement which was published on 14 September, 1939. If I express the hope that, in time, this statement will occupy an outstanding place in Indian history, I am sure I am not presuming too much of the future historian. The statement was simple and based entirely on truth and reason. Only the arrogant pride of a military force could have had the audacity to reject it. Although this cry originated in India, in fact, it was not exclusively Indian, but the agonized cry of wronged humanity, whose hopes had so often been betrayed before. Twenty-five years ago the world was plunged into one of the biggest infernos of death and destruction known to history, yet, as it turned out, it was only faint reflection of a bigger catastrophe. Slogans such as “Freedom for Small Nations”, “Collective Security” and “International Arbitration” had the effect of magic mantras on
credulous nations. But what was the end result? Every cry proved false, every vision that had seemed real vanished like a dream. Once again nations are being plunged into a blood bath. Should we part with reason and rationality to the extent that we do not ask why this is being done and how this affects our destiny before sinking our nation into this whirlpool of death and destruction?

**The Response of the British Government**

In response to the Congress demand, several statements were made both in England and in India on behalf of the British Government. The first was the Delhi declaration of the viceroy, dated 17 October. This long winded statement is an example of the circumambulating and tiring style which characterizes the official documents of the Government India. Page after page of this statement barely manages to convey the point that if we want to know the War Aims we must read a speech given by Prime Minister of Britain. This speech refers to peace and to international relations only as they pertain to Europe. The words “Freedom” and “Democracy” are nowhere to be found. So far as India is concerned, it reaffirms the policy stated in the Preamble of the 1919 Act, now embodied in the Act of 1935. That policy remains unchanged; nothing is to be added to or subtracted from it.

On 17 October 1939, the statement of the Viceroy was published; and on October 22\textsuperscript{nd}, the Working Committee met at Wardha to deliberate on it. Even without discussion it concluded that this statement could not be considered satisfactory. It further stated that it should now, unhesitatingly, an-
nonuse the decision which had been postponed so far. The decision was follows:

Under the circumstances, the Committee cannot possibly give any support to Great Britain, for it would amount to an endorsement of the imperialistic policy which the Congress has always opposed. As a first step in this direction, the Committee calls upon the Congress Ministries to tender their resignations.

As a result of this decision, the Congress Ministries in eight Provisions resigned.

This was the first in series of events. What did these events lead to? The Viceroy’s communiqué issued on 5th February from Delhi summarizing his talk with Mahatma Gandhi, and Mahatma Gandhi’s statement of 6th February may be regarded as the last in the series. We are aware of the contents of the Viceroy’s statement. It stated that the British Government desired that India should, in the shortest possible time, attain the status of British dominion, and that the transition period should be as brief as possible. At the same time, it expressed its reluctance to concede to India the right for framing her own constitution and deciding her own destiny through her elected representatives, without outside interference. In other words, the British Government denied India the right of self-determinations.

The first brush with reality shattered the illusions held by people all over the world. For the last four years the world had resounded with cries of
democracy and freedom. The statements of the most responsible spokesmen of England and France in this regard are still fresh in our memory. But the moment India raise this question, the hypocrisy and hollowness of these utterances was revealed. Now we were told that, without doubt, safeguarding the freedom of nations was the aim of this war, but that this lofty objective would remain confined to the geographical boundaries of Europe. The peoples of Asia and Africa not dare to have similar aspirations.

Mr. Chamberlain made a categorical statement of this policy in his Birmingham speech of 24th February, though we never had any doubts about the matter. Proclaiming the British War Aims, he stated that they were fighting to ensure the security of the small nations in Europe, and help free them from the constant threat of aggression. Although these War Aims were articulated by a British spokesman, they represent the mentality of entire Europe, which the world was has known for two hundred years. In the 18th and 19th centuries, the principles of individual and collective freedom were regarded the exclusive rights of European countries, and that too, only the Christian nations. Today, in the mid-twentieth century, the world has changed drastically, the thoughts and events of last century read like ancient history, and appear faded landmarks which we have left far behind. There is, however, one distinctive landmark, namely European emphasis on human rights which has not receded to date. We have neither passed it nor achieved it.
The issue is not that India attains dominion status within the shortest possible time or the importance of this issue in the eyes of the British. The straight-forward issue is that of India’s rights, whether or not she is entitled to determine her own fate? This issue is at the base of the Indian problem: India will not allow this base to be tampered with, for its is shaken, the whole structure of Indian nationalism will collapse.

So far as the question of war is concerned, our position is quite clear. For us it reflects the ugly form of British imperialism, as clearly now as did in the last war. We are not prepared to participate in it. Our case is clear. We do not wish to see British imperialism triumph, become stronger, thus prolonging the period of our own slavery. We categorically refuse. Our way lies, patently, in the opposite direction.

WHERE DO WE STAND TODAY?

Let us return to our starting point and consider, once again, where is the path leading us today; the path we took after the declaration of war the 3rd September? Where exactly do we stand? The answer to both these questions has, by now, become apparent to you and is hovering on your lips. It is not even necessary that you should open your lips, for I feel the poignancy of the answer in the beating of your hearts the step of temporary and partial cooperation which we took in 1937, was withdrawn after the declaration of war. Non-cooperation became our preferred alternative. As we stand today, we have to decide whether we should march forward or step back. A step once
taken impels forward momentum. To cry halt is to go back, and we refuse of retreat. We can only go forward. I am sure that each and every one of you will join me when me when I proclaim that we must and will go forward.

**Mutual Settlement**

In this regard, one question comes to mind. Historically, in a struggle between nations, no power willingly relinquishes its territory, unless compelled to do so. Lofty principles of morality may affect the conduct of individuals, but not the selfish pragmatism of oppressor groups. In the mid-twentieth century, we are witnessing how the reactionary forces in Europe have shattered man’s faith in individual and collective human rights. In place of justice and reason, brute force has become the sole argument in the arbitration of rights. But this depressing view of the matter has another, more hopeful, aspect. Millions of men and women are waking up to a new consciousness, which is rapidly spreading all over the world. These people, tried of the hopelessness of their condition, are impatient for a new order based on reason. Justice, and peace. This new awakening, which occurred after the last war, and became firmly, entrenched in the deep recesses of the human soul. Is now reflected in people’s minds and in their utterances. The furious pace at which this awakening has occurred. Has no parallel in history.

During these dark times, it is his faith in the bright side of human nature, which sustains the great soul of Mahatma Gandhi, he is always prepared to take
advantage of every opportunity which might lead to a mutual settlement without feeling that he is weakening his unassailable position.

Since the war began, several members of the British imperialism has ended, and the British Government has no aim other than to establish peace and justice which country could have accorded a warmer welcome to such a declaration than India? But the fact remains that despite these declarations. British imperialism still stand in the way of peace and justice exactly as it did before the war. The Indian demand was the crucible for all such claims; there they were tested and found to be counterfeit and untrue.

The Minorities and the Political Future of India

I have briefly placed before you the vital question of day. It was in relation to this question that last September, after the declaration of war. Not in our wildest imagination could be have believed that a communal question could be raised in this regard. No doubt there are some groups in the country which cannot keep up with Congress struggle for freedom, or go as far as the Congress is prepared to. We know that there are some who disagree with the method of direct action which the great majority of political India has adopted. But no group can dare to oppose. Congress placed before the British Government a clear and simple demand, a demand which no community or group could possibly object. An awakened and impatient India has passed far beyond the early stages when there could have been come dithering on this issue. Even those people have given in to the spirit of these times. Who had
clung to their special interests and feared changes lest it affected them adversely. They have to concede the political goal we have set for India.

If during the last hundred and fifty years of its domination over India British imperialism ha pursued a policy of encouraging internal differences among the inhabitants of this country. Splitting them into new groups, and using these groups to consolidate its power, it has been natural corollary of India’s political subjugation. It would be futile for us to become embittered on this account. A foreign Government whose biggest guarantee of continuance is the internal disharmony in the country, can never allow internal cohesion. At a time when the world was being asked to believe that the British imperialist phase of Indian history was over, it was certainly not too much to expert the British to stop thinking along those lines. But the succession of events during the last five months has proven that such hopes are untimely, and that imperialism is still alive despite assurance to the contrary.

Anyway, whatever the reasons, we realize that like any other country. India, too, has her internal problems. Among them communalism is a serious one. We do not and should not expect that the British Government will not take its fullest advantage. The problem is undoubtedly there, and if we wish to make any progress we must take if fully into account. Any step that ignores it will be a false one. Recognizing the existence of the communal problem should mean precisely that; we should never allow it to be used as a ploy against India’s right as a nation. Britain has always exploited this problem to that end. If it
now wishes to end the past phase of its history in India it must realise that this is where we would like to see the first signs of change.

Where does Congress stand with regard to the communal problem? Since its inception, Congress claimed that it represented India as a whole and every move it makes is in the interest of the entire Indian nation. We must concede that by this assertion, Congress has exposed its ego to the most ruthless criticism of its policies and it must pass this severest. Here I would like to take a fresh look at the Congress policies from this point of view.

As I have said earlier in this respect three things naturally come to mind: the existence of the communal problem, its importance and the ways to deal with it. The entire history of Congress demonstrates that it has accepted the existence of this problem and never tried to underplay its significance. The policy it has adopted in dealing with it is most appropriate, and a more suitable course cannot be conceived. If one were suggested, however, Congress would welcome it. Its impact on our political policy is evident in our stand that a solution to this problem is the first condition in the attainment of our national goal. Undoubtedly, it has been an article of faith with the Congress.

In this regard, Congress has always stood by two basic principles, and every step it has taken has accorded to them clearly and categorically.

1. Any constitution that is framed in future for India must contain the fullest guarantees for the protections of the rights and interests of the minorities.
2. What are the necessary safeguards for the protection of the rights and interests of the minorities? This judgment rest with the minorities and not the majority. The safeguards must, therefore be formulated by their consent, and not by majority vote.

The problem of minorities is not confined to India alone. It has existed elsewhere in the world. Today, I take the liberty to address the world from this platform. I would like to know if a more clear and unambiguous policy than this could have been adopted in this regard. Is there any flaw in this approach which the Congress needs to be remind of? If so, Congress has always been prepared to remedy any shortcoming in its policies.

I have been with the Congress for nineteen years now. During this period there has not been one single important decision of the Congress in the shaping of which I have not had the honour to participate. I might add that during these nineteen years, there was not a single occasion when just been a public pronouncement but a firm and decisive course of action. Several times, during the last fifteen years, this policy stood every severe test to which it was subjected.

The way it has acknowledged this problem in the constituent Assembly, brings these two principles in a clearer perspective. Recognized minorities have been given the right, if they please, to elect their own representatives. Their representatives are not obliged by any opinion other than that of their own communities. The issues pertaining to the minorities would be settled not by the majority opinion in the Assembly, but by the minorities consent. If a
consensus does not emerge on a certain issue, then an impartial tribunal, to which the minorities have also consented, may settle it. This last provision is merely in the nature of a precautionary measure and is most unlikely to be sued. If a more practical proposal is brought in its place it may be accepted as a substitute.

When Congress stand by these principles what is it that obliges the British statesmen to remind us, so very often, of the rights of the minorities? And why do they continue to delude the world that the problem of minorities is an obstacle in the way of settling the Indian issue? If it is so, why doesn’t the British Government take an unambiguous stand on India’s political fate, and provide us an opportunity to resolve this problem once and for all by mutual consent?

First dissension’s are created among us, then we are blamed for them. Opportunities to solve our differences are first denied to us, and then we are solemnly advised to end these differences. Such is the situation deliberately created all around us and such are the chains that bind us on all sides, No matter what the circumstances, nothing can dissuade us from moving forward with courage and fortitude. Our path strewn with difficulties, each of which we will have to over come.

**Indian Muslims and The Future Of India**

This, then, was about problem of India’s minorities. But do the Muslims in India constitute enough of minority to, justifiably, have apprehensions and
fears about their future and nurture misgivings that create agitation in their minds?

I do not know how many of you are familiar with what I wrote in Al-Hilal, some twenty eight years ago. If some of you were readers of Al-Hilal, I request you to refresh your memories. I had expressed this conviction, and, one again, I repeat, that nothing in India’s political has been as blatantly wrong as the assertion that the Muslims constitute a political minority, and that they should be wary of their rights and interests in a democratic India, This one fundamental misconception has led to innumerable misunderstandings. Wrong arguments have been built upon false foundations. On the one hand, it confused the Muslims about their true position in India, and, on the other, it baffled the world so that it could not find the right perspective in India. If I had the time, I would have gone into the details of how, during the last sixty years, an essentially false and artificial image was created; and who were the perpetrators of this falsehood. This was, in fact, a product of the same divisive policy that started taking definite shape in the minds of British officials, after the Congress launched the national movement. The objective of this policy was to use the Muslims to counter this new political awakening. There were two prominent in this design. First, that two different communities, Hindus and Muslims, inhabited India, hence no demand could be made on behalf of a unified nation. Secondly, the Muslims were numerically far less than the Hindus, and, therefore, the establishment of democratic institutions in the Country would essentially lead to rule of the Hindu majority. This would
jeopardize the very existence of the Muslims. I will not go into any further
details; just remind you that if your wish to learn about the genesis of this
policy you should study the times of Lord Dufferin, a former Viceroy of India,
and Sir Auckland Cloven, a former Lieutenant Governor of the North West
Provinces (now United Provinces). This was one among the many seeds of
discord, sown in the Indian soil by the British. It soon grew and spread its
nettles. Even after fifty years, its roots are still firm.

The term “minority”, in political vocabulary does not imply a group
which in simple arithmetical calculation is numerically smaller than any other
group and should, therefore, be given protection. It means a group of people
who find themselves ineffective, both numerically and qualitatively, within a
bigger and stronger group, so that they have no power or confidence to protect
their own rights. It is not enough that a group be small in proportion to another,
but be small by itself in absolute terms so as to be incapable of protecting
interest. Beside, is not merely a question of numbers; the kind also counts.
Takes for instance, a country inhabited by two communities numbering one and
two crores respectively. Thought the first is numerically one-half of the second,
from the political point of view it does not necessarily follow that on the basis
of this proportional difference, we consider the former a minority and accept it
as the weaker entity. For being considered a minority, factors other than the
proportional difference in numbers, are also important.
Considered from this point of view, what is the real position of the Muslims in India? At a glance you will see them spreads out all over the country in a vast concourse. Their heads are held so high that to consider them a ‘minority’ deserving special concessions, makes no sense.

They number between eight and nine crores. Unlike other communities, they are not divided on cultural and racial grounds. The powerful bonds of equity and brotherhood is Islamic life have, to large extent, saved them from the weaknesses that flow from social segmentation. True their ration is no more than one fourth of the total population of the country but the question is not of the ration, but of the number and of its quality can such a vast of humanity have any legitimate reason for the apprehension that in a free and democratic India it may not be able to protect its rights and interests?

They are not confined to a particular area but spread out over different parts of the country. Of the eleven province of India, the Muslims are in a majority in four, where the other religious groups constitute the minorities. If we add British Baluchistan to it there will be five provinces instead of four where Muslims are in a majority. Even if we are compelled to identify ‘majority’ and ‘minority’ purely in terms of religious groupings, the position of the Muslims is not that of a minority; if they constitute a minority purely in seven provinces, they form the majority in five. This being so, there is no reason why they should be distributed by the thought of being a minority.
Whatever may be the details of the future constitution of India, we all know that it will in the fullest sense, be a democratic constitution. Every, unit will be autonomous with regard to its internal affairs, while the federal center will be concerned only with matters of common interest to the nation, such as foreign affairs, defence, customs etc. Given this scenario, is it possible that anyone who has any concept of the actual working of a democratic constitution. will have misgivings on the majority and minority issue? I, for one, cannot believe that even for a single moment, there could be any room for these misgivings in the future course of India. These apprehensions arise because, to quote a British statesman on the subject of Ireland we are still standing on the river bank, and, though we wish to swim, we are unwilling to enter the water! There is only one remedy for such apprehensions; take the plunge fearlessly. No sooner that is done we shall realise that our fears had no basis in reality.

**A Fundamental Question Before The Muslims of India**

It is thirty years since is first tried to probe this issue as an Indian Muslim. Those were the days when the majority of the Muslims in India had kept themselves aloof from the political struggle. They still nurtured the same attitude which, in 1888, had made them adopt an attitude of apathy and antagonism towards the Congress. This ambivalent attitude did no deter me. Before long, I had reached a conclusion which showed me the path of faith and action. I realized that India with all the complexities of her circumstances, was
marching ahead towards its future. We, who were sailing the sane boat, could not remain indifferent to its course. It was, therefore, incumbent upon us to decide a clear and definite course of action. The question arose, ho should we decide? Not by skimming over the surface, but by going deep down to the very root of the matter. I did so and found hat they key lay in the answer to just one question. Do we, the Muslims of India, look at the future of Independent India wit doubt and mistrust, or with courage and confidence? In case of the former attitude, no pronouncement of time, no promise about the future, no safeguard in the constitution, can allay our misgivings and fears. We are obliged to tolerate the presence of a third power. This is already there, and not prepared to withdraw. If we follow the path of fear, we must look forward to its continuance. But if the latter attitude prevails, then we find ourselves in a different world altogether. Doubts, vacillations, apathy, and enervation cannot cast their ominous shadows here. The bright sun of faith, determination, action, and endeavor never sets in this world. No complicity of the times, no imbalances of the situation, no irritants surrounding issues can change our course. We are honor bound to march ahead towards the attainment of India’s national goal. It has taken me no more than a few moments to answer the question posed above. Every fiber of my being revolts against the first position. I do not think it is possible Muslim worth his name, unless he completely rooted out the spirit of Islam from his heart, to subscribe to that position.

I launched the Al-Hilal in 1912 and placed my conclusion before the Muslim of India. I need not remind you that my advice was heard and heeded.
The period from 1912-1916 marked a new phase in the political awakening of the Muslims. Towards the end of 1920 when I was released after four years internment, I found that the political outlook of the Muslims has outgrown its old mould and an new mould was being cast. Twenty years have since passed. During this period many changes have occurred. Events have taken new turns, and new trends of thinking have emerged. Yet, one fact remains unaltered even today; that the Muslim public opinion is not prepared to regress into the past.

Once again, let me say that they are not ready to retrace their steps but their future course has become overcast with misgivings. I would not go into its causes, I will speak only of its effects. I will remind my Muslim brethren that I stand at the same position where I stood when I gave them a call in 1912. Nothing in the ensuing occurrences which have shaped our present circumstances, has gone unnoticed by me. I have been deceived neither by my eyes, my mind. I have watched and felt everything. Events have not just passed before me like a pageant. I have been in the thick of them, a participant, examining each one of them. I cannot help it but I cannot be false to my perceptions. It is impossible for me to deny my convictions; I cannot stifle the voice of my conscience. All this while I have said one thing and reiterate it today; there could have been no course of action for the nine crores Muslims of India other than the one I had called them to in 1912.

I have no grudge against my Muslim brethren who, in 1912, responded to my call, but do not agree with me today. I will not reproach them for
disagreement, but would make one appeal to their sincerity and sense of justice. We are dealing with the destinies of peoples and nations. We cannot allow ourselves to be swayed by momentary passions while we are making such important decisions. We must build the monoliths of our decisions upon the foundations of solid realities of life. Such monoliths cannot be constructed and demolished everyday. I admit that the atmosphere is overcast with ominous sings. But people must step into the circle of the light of reason. Let them even today, examine the issue from beginning to end; they will find no other path open to them but the one indicated by Al-Hilal.

**Muslims and United Nationalism**

I am Muslim and profoundly conscious of the fact that I have inherited Islam glorious traditions of the last thirteen hundred years. I am not prepared to lose even a small part of that legacy. The history and teaching of Islam its arts and letters, its civilization and culture, are part of my wealth and it is my duty to cherish and guard them. As a Muslim I have a special identity within the field of religion and culture and I cannot tolerate any undue interference with it. But, with all these feeling, I have another equally deep realization, born out of my life’s experience, which is strengthened and not hindered by the spirit of Islam. I am equally proud of the fact that I am an Indian, an essential part of the indivisible unity of Indian nationhood, a vital factor in its total make up with out which this noble edifice will remain incomplete. I am never give up this sincere claim.
It was India’s historic destiny that its soil should become the destination of many different caravans of races, cultures and religious. Even before the dawn of history morning they started their trek into India and the process has continued since. This vast and hospitable land welcomed them all and took them to her bosom. The last of these caravans was that of the followers of Islam, who came in the footsteps of their many predecessors and settled down here. This was the meeting point of two different currents of culture. For a time they flowed along their separate courses, but nature immutable law brought them together into a confluence. This fusion was a notable historic event. Since then, destiny, in her own secret ways, began to fashion a new India to take the place of the old. We had brought our treasures with us to this land which was rich with its own great cultural heritage. We handed over our wealth to her and she unlocked for us the door of her own riches. We presented her with something she needed urgently the most precious gift in Islam’s treasury, its message of democracy, human equality and brotherhood.

Eleven centuries have passed by since then Islam has now as valid a claim on this land he Hinduism. If Hinduism has been religion of its people for several thousand years. Islam, too, has been its religion for a thousand years. Just as a Hindu can say with legitimate pride that he is an Indian and a follower of Hinduism, so can a Muslim proudly claim being an Indian and follower of Islam. I would go further and say that an Indian Christian (or the following one of her many religious).
Eleven hundred years of common history have enriched India our common creative and constructive achievements. Our languages, Our poetry, our literature, our culture, our art, our dress, our manners and customs all bear the stamp of this common life. Our languages were different but, we grew to use a common language; our manners and customs were dissimilar, but they acted and reacted on each other and thus produced a new synthesis. Our old dress may be seen only in pictures of bygone days; no one wears it to day. These common riches are the heritage of our common nationality and we do not want to leave them ad go back to the times when this adventure of a joint lie had not begun. If there are any Hindus among us who desire to bring back the Hindu life of a thousand year a ago and more, the are just dreaming and such dreams cannot become real. Likewise, if there are any Muslims who wish to revive their past civilization and culture, which they brought a thousand years ago from Iran and Central Asia, they too dream and the sooner they wake up the better. These are unnatural fancies which cannot take root in the soil of reality. I am one of those whose believe that revivalism may be necessary in religion, but in matters of culture the same revivalism is a denial of progress.

Our shared life of a thousand years has forged a common nationality. Such moulds cannot be artificially constructed. Nature hidden anvils shape them over the centuries. The mould has now been cast and destiny has set here seal up on it. Whether we like it or not, we have become and Indian nation, united and indivisible. No false idea of separatism can break our oneness. We
must accept the inexorable logic of facts and apply ourselves to fashioning our future destiny.

**Conclusion**

Friends! I won’t take much of your time. I would now like to conclude my address. But before I wind up, let me remind that our success depends on three factors: unity, discipline and confidence in the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. This leadership, single handedly, shaped the glorious beginning of our movement and it is this, we must look up to, for our future success.

A critical turn of our trial is upon us. We have already invited the world to witness the grand finale. Let us try to live up to the standards we have set for ourselves.

**Source:** *Maulana Abul Kalam Azad – selected Speeches and Writings Part – 1, Edited by Syed Shabuddin, Abul Kalam Azad Oriental Research Institute, Hyderabad. 2007.*