THE FREEDOM STRUGGLE IN HYDERABAD

Vol. IV

(1921 - 1947)

Edited by

N. RAMESAN

954.8431
HYD--FRE
70,311

PRINTED BY THE COMMISSIONER
ANDHRA PRADESH STATE ARCHIVES & RESEARCH INSTITUTE
GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
TARNAKA, HYDERABAD - 500 007
INDIA

1997

THE FREEDOM STRUGGLE IN HYDERABAD

Vol. IV

(1921 - 1947)

Edited by

N. RAMESAN

PRINTED BY THE COMMISSIONER
ANDHRA PRADESH STATE ARCHIVES & RESEARCH INSTITUTE
GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
TARNAKA, HYDERABAD - 500 007
INDIA

1997

First Published in 1966.

Published by
The Andhra Pradesh State Committee Appointed for the Compilation of a History of the Freedom Struggle in Andhra Pradesh

First Reprint in 1997 (200 Copies)

Price Rs.208/- per copy

C.7U253

954.8431

70,311

508 044.

CONTENTS

		Page
FOREWORD ..	.. .. ..	v
PREFACE ..	.. .. ..	vii
CHAPTER		
I	.. Sir Ali Imam's appointment as President of the Executive Council.	1
II	.. Visit of M. A. Jinnah to Hyderabad and the ban on his re-entry ..	7
III	.. The spread of Gandhian influence in Hyderabad	15
IV	.. The Khilafat Movement ..	29
V	.. Nationalism in Telangana and the Andhra Mahasabha	43
VI	.. The First Hyderabad Political Conference at Kakinada in 1928 ..	56
VII	.. The Second Hyderabad Political Conference at Bombay in 1928 ..	59
VIII	.. The Third Hyderabad Political Conference at Poona in 1928 ..	63
IX	.. The Fourth Hyderabad Political Conference at Akola in 1931 ..	74
X	.. Growth of Journalism and the National spirit in Hyderabad ..	78
XI	.. Activities of the Arya Samaj in Hyderabad	87
XII	.. Gandhiji's visit to Hyderabad, in 1934	99
XIII	.. *Vandemataram*	103
XIV	.. The Hindu Mahasabha, The Prajamandal and the Hindu Civil Liberties Union Satyagraha	116
XV	.. The Maharashtra Parishad ..	120
XVI	.. The Karnataka Parishad ..	126

Chapter		Page
XVII	.. The History of the Hyderabad State Congress	180
XVIII	.. The Cripps Mission and the Hyderabad State..	219
XIX	.. The *Quit India* Movement in Hyderabad, 1942	239
XX	.. Propaganda by Professor Rushbrook Williams	248
XXI	.. Sir Walter Monckton and the Cabinet Mission, 1946	258
XXII	.. Visit of Jayprakash Narayan to Hyderabad in 1947 and the Satyagraha connected with it ..	266
XXIII	.. Sir Mirza Ismail	272
XXIV	.. Hyderabad on the Eve of Indian Independence	279
XXV	.. Conclusion	286
	.. Index to persons	291
	.. Index to place-names	298

FOREWORD

This is the fourth volume of the history of Freedom Struggle in Hyderabad and covers the important period of 1921-1947.

Ever since 1920, the influence of Mahatma Gandhi in Indian politics steadily grew. His personality and his ideals caught the imagination of the people and permeated the Hyderabad State.

The spread of Gandhian influence in the State was carefully watched and measures were adopted to check it. The Secretary to the Government said " It is, of course for the Government after reviewing the conditions within and without the Dominions to decide finally whether prompt measures are necessary to check the movement before it gets out of hands, or to deal with it piecemeal, as it were, as occasion arise." He further remarks "I however feel it my duty to call the attention of the Council to the fact that even a cursory glance at what is happening in British India at this moment would show that the Government of India lost the initiative of effectively controlling the movement by observing the policy of "wait" and "see " from the outset. This is undoubtedly a fear of precipitating events by what might be called premature action, but I respectfully beg to submit that this delicate question should be decided in accordance with the lessons learnt from outside ".

The Hyderabad State had its own problems. The people yearned to fall in line with British India. The Non-Co-operation movement and the Khilafat movement also had affected the people. We find that the Government and the people of Hyderabad moved in opposite direction. The State wanted to assert its power and the people, by the State's policy of represssion were slowly tightening their belts to fight for their rights.

The wearing of Khaddar and Gandhi caps and the use of Charkas became popular. The police was always suspicious of persons who took to these practices. The use of the Charka was reported to the President of the Council who remarked " Yes, the only point to keep in

view is whether the Charkas which is in itself unobjectionable, may not ultimately be the harbinger of Gandhism as a political factor also. We must watch ". On another such report remarked " Seen, no harm will come so long as the Charka movement is allowed to run its course ".

The Khilafat movement also spread in the State. The long correspondence between the Nizam and Lord Chelmsford and the proceedings of the public meetings held in the State are detailed in the volume.

The story of the Hyderabad State Congress—its chequered career—the important part played in it by Madapati Hanumantha Rao, Kashinath Rao Vaidya, G. Ramacharya Joshi, B. Ramakrishna Rao, S.V. Naik, M. Narasing Rao, Swami Ramanand Tirth and a host of others mark the beginning of a new epoch in the history of Hyderabad.

The demand of the Congress of responsible Government—the correspondence between the government and the Congress leaders such as Sir Akbar and Mahatma Gandhi and Sait Jamnalal Bajaj, makes an interesting reading. The struggle for the recognition of the State Congress and the lifting of the ban on it marks the beginning of the success of the people.

The six months which followed the lifting of the ban on the State Congress, was a period of bitter struggle and of great significance. It paved the way for the integration of the State with the Indian Union. The people of Hyderabad responded to the national call and continued the struggle for a year more which culminated in the Police Action.

To the students of history, this volume will prove very useful as a source book.

The first draft of the volume was written by Sri R.M. Joshi, Retired Director of the Hyderabad State Records Office and later on, the editing of the work was entrusted to Sri N. Ramesan, who not only condensed it but made it presentable to the reading public for which he deserves thanks.

Hyderabad,A.P.,
9th July 1966

P. V. G. RAJU,
Minister for Cultural Affairs.

PREFACE

This is the fourth volume of the history of Freedom Struggle in Hyderabad. It consists of twenty-five chapters.

The story begins with the appointment of Sir Ali Imam as the President of the State Executive Council. He was a man of varied experience and was previously a member of the Executive Council, Bihar and Orissa. He however resigned even before the expiry of his period of office and Hyderabad was deprived of his experience, vision and wise counsel. All this is narrated in I chapter.

The visit of Mohammad Ali Jinnah to Hyderabad and his lecture created a furore in the minds of the Government. The Government note and his reply to etc. form II chapter.

The spread of Gandhian influence in Hyderabad and the steps Government took to check it are detailed in III chapter.

The Khilafat movement and the long correspondence between the Nizam and Lord Chelmsford, brings into bold relief the policy of British Government at that time. This is the subject matter of IV chapter.

Chapter V is devoted to the growth of Nationalism in Telangana and the Andhra Mahasabha, while four other chapters *i.e.*, VI, VII, VIII and IX cover the Hyderabad Political Conferences. Mahatma Gandhi wanted to visit Hyderabad in 1934 for the upliftment of Harijans. This question posed a problem to the Government whether to permit him to visit the State with or without any conditions. These are dealt with in this chapter.

The Vandemataram—the history of the Hyderabad State Congress—the formation of the State Congress and the Government ban on it–negotiations between the Congress leaders and Government to lift the ban–satyagraha by the State Congress–the offer of satyagraha by eighteen

batches–the correspondence between Mahatmaji and Sir Akbar and Sir Akbar and Sait Jamnalal Bajaj–the efforts of Sri Kashinath Rao Vaidya to get the ban lifted etc., are dealt at length in XVII chapter.

Sir Mirza Ismail, the then President of the Executive Council was a great statesman and he could have been of immense service to Hyderabad, unfortunately he resigned and thus left a vacuum. On the eve of the Independence of the country, the leading freedom fighters of Hyderabad carried on their struggle. The struggle continued till a Standstill Agreement was signed and some prominent leaders were released. However, Hyderabad was still not freed and the struggle went on for a year more till the Police Action.

I thank Sri R. M. Joshi for writing the draft and Sri N. Ramesan for condensing and finalising it as a labour of love. I am indebted to Sri J. V. Narasing Rao, who inspite of heavy pressure of work had gone through the final draft.

I am grateful to the Chief Minister for evincing keen interest in our work. I thank Sri P. V. G. Raju, Minister for Cultural Affairs for kindly writing the 'Foreword'. I thank Sri M. R. Appa Rao, Minister for Excise for his deep interest in our work.

I am also thankful to the members of the Executive and the State Committees, the Education Secretary, the Director of the State Archives and the Director of the Central Press for their kind co-operation. I thank Sri A. N. Baji, Assistant Director, State Archives for going through the proofs.

Hyderabad
20th July, 1966

K. SAJUN LAL,
Convener.

CHAPTER I

SIR ALI IMAM'S APPOINTMENT AS PRESIDENT OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

The year 1920 was a very momentous one. The currents of political thought generated in the rest of the country permeated Hyderabad also. The Rowlatt Act rudely awakened India, and spread discontent throughout the country. The tragedy at Jalianwalabagh on the 13th of April 1919 and the severity with which the popular risings were suppressed and the atrocities perpetrated under the martial law rule of the Punjab created an intense anti-British feeling throughout the country.

The draft treaty of Sevres was published, in which was set forth the proposals for the liquidation of the Turkish Empire. The Indian Muslims who looked upon the Turkish Emperor as their Khalif, were deeply wounded and injured in their religious sentiments. They started the Khilafat agitation. The hopes created by promises in their hour of peril by Great Britain were shattered when the emergency of war ceased to exist, and public opinion in India came to look upon British promises with a great deal of suspicion. The Khilafat movement, therefore, proved an ideal ground for cementing Hindu-Muslim unity. These great upheavals had their corresponding re-actions on the minds of the people in Hyderabad. To gauge correctly the forces of the freedom struggle and the reactions that they produced, it is necessary to have a clear idea of the constitution of the administration in Hyderabad during this period. The personal rule of the Nizam had come to an end, and was followed by the rule of an Executive Council.

In April 1919, the Nizam had moved in the matter and had written as follows to Sir Ali Imam who was a Member of the Executive Council, Bihar and Orissa :—

"I am thinking of a scheme for the constitution of an Executive Council for the better and more efficient

administration of Hyderabad, and I now propose to offer you the high post of the President of that Council, under the following terms :—

"(1) That you will be the President of the Executive Council which will consist of five to seven members who will be Assistant Ministers, besides yourself.

"(2) That all ordinary routine matters of State will be disposed of by you, according to general instructions that will from time to time be issued by me, it being open to you to consult the other Members of the Council, even on any such routine matters, should you desire to do so.

"(3) All other matters, requiring my express sanction, will be submitted for sanction to me, after they have been placed before and discussed with your colleagues in Council.

"(4) You will place before the Council for deliberation and expression of opinion all such important matters of State as will require their consideration, as also such matters as any other member will refer to the Council for opinion, having regard to its importance or emergency, as also all matters which I may be pleased to direct shall be placed before the Council for their deliberation and opinion, and to submit the result of such discussion and deliberation to me for final orders.

"(5) I shall have the absolute power to veto and to pass my own orders in all matters irrespective and regardless of your own individual opinion or the collective opinion of the Council by a majority of votes or otherwise.

"(6) Your term of office will be for (5) five years after which you will be retired.

"(7) Your remuneration during such term will be on a salary of B.G. Rs. (7,000), seven thousand, per month besides sumptuary allowance of B. G. (Rs. 1,000), one thousand, per mensem—and the free use, for your residence, of one of the houses belonging to my Government and a motor car.

"(8) At the end of your service in this State, you will be granted a pension for life of B.G. Rs. 1,000 per mensem.

"(9) Having regard to the duties now proposed to be entrusted to you, you will have direct access to me, and there will also be a direct access between you and the Resident in such matters of State as on which personal interviews and discussion will be necessary or considered desirable by you or him or which may be deemed necessary by me.

"(10) Your rank will be next to or after the Peshkar but by reason of your position as President of Council, you will take precedence over other nobles of Hyderabad and Sadar-ul-Mahams of my Government.

"Such briefly are the general outlines of your duties, remuneration and position, which I communicate to you subject to the minor details of forms and regulations being hereafter enlarged and amplified, either by correspondence or at your personal interviews with me, if you could make it convenient to come to Hyderabad at your earliest convenience.

"On your informing me, at your earliest possible convenience, that you are prepared to accept the main terms proposed in this letter, my Government will place themselves in communication with the Government of India on the subject.

"However, should these terms be not acceptable to you, please do not think I shall be offended. On the contrary, I will quite understand, and I hope you will not hesitate to let me know."

On 22nd April 1919 Sir Ali Imam sent a reply to the above letter in a very modest and grateful tone. As the letter records the bright vision which had risen before the mind of Sir Ali Imam, it is quoted verbatim below :—

"Your gracious letter of the 10th April reached me here on my return from Puri. May I say that I regard it as a mark of unique honour to be the recipient of such an offer as it contains ? My personal attachment to your Exalted Highness and your Throne has enhanced the value of the confidence you have placed in me by summoning me to assume duties of the highest trust and responsibility in your Government. To have the privilege of serving a Moslem Sovereign is an inestimable

distinction to a man of the same faith and it is my conviction that to serve such a Potentate is to serve Islam. Your Exalted Highness's gracious offer appears to me to be a call from above to which I can give only one response and that is humbly and reverently to consecrate the few closing years of my life to the duties to which you summon me. Should British Government whom I am serving at present permit me to accept your gracious offer I will lose no time to present myself before your Exalted Highness to take up my new duties animated by the single desire to serve you loyally and devotedly to the best of my ability.

"The outlines of the duties, rank and remuneration which Your Exalted Highness has fixed have my dutiful acceptance, should the British Government agree to spare me from my present duties.

"I wish it were possible for me to have the honour of an audience before I come finally to Hyderabad but the post I hold in the British Government is governed by a Statute of Parliament that prohibits grant of any leave excepting on medical certificate. I am, therefore, without such leave debarred from visiting a place outside the province in which I am serving unless, of course, the Government of India by a special order direct otherwise. Perhaps, in these circumstances it will be possible to settle further details by correspondence as suggested in Your Exalted Highness's gracious letter.

"May I express my gratitude for your Exalted Highness's letter generally and also for the cordiality and personal touch in its closing lines ? I can only say that I am overwhelmed by the kindliness of the epistle."

H.E.H. the Nizam had also addressed the Viceroy informing him how he was anxious to effect a change in the administration by introducing an Executive Council with an efficient President for it. He wrote to Lord Chelmsford on 11th June 1919 as follows :—

"When I had the privilege of welcoming Your Excellency to my Capital a short time ago, I informed you that it was my intention to appoint either a Chief Minister or constitute an Executive Council for the better and more efficient administration of my dominions.

"After careful consideration, I have decided upon establishing an Executive Council with a President and five to seven members who will be Assistant Ministers.

"I have further arrived at the conclusion that the officer best suited for the appointment of President would be the Honourable Sir Ali Imam, at present a Member of the Executive Council of Bihar and Orissa, and formerly a member of the Viceroy's Executive Council. Sir Ali Imam is personally known to me, first when he came to Hyderabad a few years ago as my guest, and afterwards when I visited Simla during the Viceroyalty of Lord Hardinge. From my personal knowledge of him, I think that Sir Ali Imam is specially fitted for the appointment of President.

"Prior to moving further in the matter, I wished first to ascertain privately from Sir Ali Imam himself whether he was prepared to accept the proposed office on certain terms and conditions, before my Government placed themselves in communication with the Government of Irdia on the subject.

"In reply to my letter, Sir Ali Imam accepted the terms and conditions laid down by me, provided, of course, that the Government of India whom he is serving at present permitted him to accept the offer I made him.

"My Government are addressing the Honourable the Resident applying for the services of Sir Ali Imam and explaining the conditions and terms of his appointment. I shall feel greatly obliged if Your Excellency will expedite the necessary sanction when the papers on the subject come up before you.

"I feel confident that Your Excellency will kindly assist me in this matter, with a view to materially advancing the prosperity of my country and my people."

When Sir Ali Imam came to occupy the most exalted position in the administration of Hyderabad, there was an enticing halo about his personality. On account of his experience in the British Indian Executive Councils and his thorough education in the West, he was most

adequately qualified to shoulder his onerous responsibilities. Everybody expected great achievement from him. In the whole of his demeanour, there pervaded a sort of confidence which showed that nothing was impossible for him. But with all this, he had to relinquish his job and leave the State within two years, before the expiration of his term of office, and hence his vision and wise counsels were not available to the Government in dealing with the movement for the freedom struggle in Hyderabad.

CHAPTER II

VISIT OF M.A. JINNAH TO HYDERABAD AND THE BAN ON HIS RE-ENTRY

There is an interesting incident during the period of the visit to and banishment from Hyderabad, of Quaide Azam, Mohammed Ali Jinnah, the father of Pakistan, which illustrates the restrictions that were imposed on ordinary civil liberties in Hyderabad, then. It also incidentally shows in clear relief the personality of Sri M.A. Jinnah and his spirit of independence.

Mohammed Ali Jinnah, the father of Pakistan, had been enrolled as an Advocate of the Bombay High Court in 1897. Since then he was the rising star, not only as a successful and prosperous lawyer, but also as a great figure in Indian politics. Enlisting his services for pleading cases ensured success. He was called to Hyderabad in connection with a murder case pending against the Deshmukh of Kuber in Nanded district and had stayed at the Montgomery Hotel, Secunderabad. Naturally the elite of Hyderabad desired to take full advantage of his stay. He was requested to deliver lecture on " India of Tomorrow."

On receipt of this news, the Nizam, in consideration of the unrest that was prevailing in British India in connection with the Rowlatt Act etc., thought it fit to send Jinnah a message through the City Kotwal to refrain from speaking on politics. The Nizam and his advisers were keenly conscious of the independent political career of Jinnah. He had not identified himself with any party as yet. In 1906, he acted as Secretary to Dadabhoy Nowroji when the latter presided over the Calcutta session of the Congress. In 1909, he had been elected by the Muslims of Bombay Presidency to be their representative in the Supreme Legislative Council. He joined the Muslim League in 1918. He had also joined the Home Rule League of Mrs. Besant in 1917. His arrival in Hyderabad was naturally considered to be a matter of far-reaching consequences.

The following is the press report of the above incident :—

Mr. Jinnah's Visit

The most interesting visit, however, at least as far as Hyderabad is concerned, was that of Mr. M.A. Jinnah who was here for more than three days. Mr. Gandhi's visit had been so brief and Mr. Gandhi himself had been so ill that no public reception or lecture could be arranged. Mr. Jinnah, however, was persuaded to treat the people of the City with a lecture which he ultimately gave on the evening of the 15th April. There was a fairly large and representative gathering and also a large sprinkling of the C.I.D. officers and men, who were easily distinguished by the vulture-like glances they cast at the audience and the harshness of demeanour they automatically assumed when Mr. Jinnah said something above the level of their experience. The subject of the lecture was "India of Tomorrow" and a very interesting lecture it was. Mr. Jinnah's whole point was that the States and British India were absolutely linked hand in hand and as the States possessed various advantages over British India they ought to strive and help the people of British India in gaining their independence.

There were no Black Acts and no Defence of India Acts in the States; here any man could aspire to the highest post in the administration; where both Ruler and bureaucracy were fortunately Indians and, therefore, in the heart of hearts identified themselves with Indian interest. There was, on the other hand, a foreign and unsympathetic bureaucracy in British India, which had no scruple to crush the finer feelings and legitimate aspirations of the people. He assured his hearers that the people of British India had always great hopes about the subjects of the Indian States and were united to them by bonds stronger than mere words could testify. It was up to the Rulers of the States to help the country in its dire peril and follow the example of the Maharajah of Bikaner.

The C.I.D. taught a lesson

The lecture as anybody could see was not at all sensational but the C.I.D. here was of a different opinion. On the evening preceding the lecture there was a rushing

about of motor cars in and out of the Residency. Sir Faridoon Mulk, the Political Minister had a two hour interview with the Resident ; and the Resident too, it is believed,had an interview with the Nizam earlier in the evening. On the morning of the lecture, Mr. Venkatrama Reddy of the local C.I.D. waited on Mr. Jinnah and informed him that he was ordered by His Exalted Highness' Government not to speak at the meeting, as arranged. Mr. Jinnah thereupon demanded that the order should be shown to him. Mr. Reddy replied that it would be injudicious to place the order in Mr. Jinnah's hands and asked Mr. Jinnah to accept his word for it. Mr. Jinnah refused to believe it, though he said that Mr. Reddy was perfectly at liberty to stop the meeting if he could and Mr. Jinnah wished him all success and joy in anticipation. Mr. Reddy thus discomfited and shamed tried soft persuasion and cajolery. He said that Mr. Jinnah was requested not to speak on any political subject at the meeting as the crowd was easily stirred to mischief.

This affair was soon known to the public and they showed their indignation at such tactics by mustering strong at the station and giving Mr. Jinnah a hearty send off. This was reported to His Exalted Hghness who ordered to the drafting of a letter to Mr. Jinnah in this connection. His Exalted Highness the Nizam approved the letter dated 18th April 1919, and ordered it to be sent to Mr. Jinnah to his address at Bombay. The following is the text of the letter :—

"During your recent visit to Hyderabad, it came to the knowledge of His Exalted Highness the Nizam that it was your intention to address a public meeting on matters which might possibly involve political topics, the subject of your address being " India of Tomorrow." For many reasons which it is not necessry to detail here, but particularly for one which was uppermost in His Exalted Highness's mind *viz.*, that there were grave events happening, just at present, in many parts of British India, it was His Exalted Highness's serious desire and firm decision that no public meetings should be allowed to be held in connection with matters directly, or indirectly 'political' in his Dominions and consequently, the City Kotwal was commanded to inform you that you should not address the meeting which was

already convened or any other meeting on any 'political' matter or on any matters any one of which was of a 'political' nature. The City Kotwal communicated the said commands to you and you assured him that you were going to address the meeting only on the question of "education" and "social progress," and that on no account would you directly or indirectly touch on "politics" or "political matters." On such assurance being given, you were allowed to address the meeting. But it is to be regretted that, instead of confining yourself to the subjects of education and social progress, you thought fit, in spite of your assurance to the contrary to address the meeting on the question of "Self-Government" and other cognate political questions.

"Under the circumstances, I am to request you that until further orders of His Exalted Highness, you will be good enough to refrain from visiting, without permission, any part of His Exalted Highness's Dominions, on any account whatsoever, professional or otherwise".

The reply letter dated 20th April 1919 sent by Mr. Jinnah speaks for itself:—

"I am in receipt of yours of the 18th instant and I regret to find that the statements contained in your letter are not only incorrect but are a complete misrepresentation of facts.

"A message was brought to me by a man who represented himself to be the 1st Assistant to the Police Commissioner a few hours before the time fixed for the meeting that I was asked by H.E.H. the Nizam not to make any political speech at the meeting. I replied to the gentleman that I had already promised the organisers that I shall speak and that my speech was going to be a political speech and that I could not very well withdraw from that position. But if a written order was served upon me not to address the meeting I shall obey it, or that the meeting might be prohibited by H.E.H. the Nizam, if he so desired, and at the same time I assured him that I was not going to speak about the Rowlatt Act or the situation arising therefrom as that was purely a matter that concerned British India, nor was my speech going to be anything else but a pure historical survey of the problems that interest people in British India and which

to a certain extent affect the Native States and the people who live under various ruling princes.

"If H.E.H. will get a correct report of my speech he will find that it was nothing more than a few reflections on the commercial, social, educational and political problems which face India as a whole and the native States are not uninfluenced nor can be excluded from the considerations of those problems.

"I do not understand why you say that I addressed the meeting on the question of 'Self-Government' and other cognate political questions as if it were some serious crime.

"I am sure such an enlightened ruler like H.E.H. can have no objection to my speech if a full text is placed before him. All other statements made in your letter and specially that I gave any assurance of the kind mentioned in your letter are not true.

"With regard to your request that I should not visit Hyderabad or any part of His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Dominions without permission, I leave H.E.H. to consider whether it is right for him to pass such an order."

H.E.H. the Nizam's Government, in the Political Department wrote to M. A. Jinnah on25th April 1919, as follows :—

"I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 20th instant which reached me on the 23rd and which was submitted to His Exalted Highness the Nizam on the same day.

"In reply, I am to inform you that from further enquiries made of the Commissioner of Police of this City, His Exalted Highness is satisfied that the purport of the conversation which took place between you and the First Assistant to that officer, as reported to His Exalted Highness and as briefly stated in my last letter to you, was substantially correct and that there was no such 'complete misrepresentation of facts' as you allege. Granting, however, for a moment that that officer misunderstood your reply, the fact which you admit that

he did convey to you His Exalted Highness's message that you were not to make any political speech is in the Nizam's opinion, quite sufficient to have suggested to you the desirability of putting yourself in communication with the so-called 'organisers' of the meeting and acquainting them with the wishes of His Exalted Highness which the Nizam is convinced they would have most willingly and loyally obeyed. Instead of adopting this reasonable course, you declined to obey the order and insisted upon making a political speech unless 'you were served with a written order to that effect, or unless the meeting was prohibited by the Nizam.' The desire of His Exalted Highness was not that you should not address the meeting 'on the Rowlatt Act or the situation arising therefrom,' but that you should refrain from addressing any public meeting in his dominions on a political matter of any sort, and thus suggesting to the minds of his loyal and law-abiding people any ideas of agitation or public demonstration from which they have very happily kept themselves aloof.

"I am to say that in the attitude taken up by you, after receiving His Exalted Highness's polite message and sending a reply to him that, notwithstanding his message which you well understood, 'you will speak and that your speech was going to be a political one and that you could not very well withdraw from that position', you did not exercise a wise discretion; but that on the contrary you committed a blunder and deliberately offered a gratuitous insult to His Exalted Highness by refusing to obey his order.

"I am not to enter here into any discussion with you whether "your addressing the meeting on the question of 'Self-Government and other cognate political questions' (in His Exalted Highness's dominions) was a serious crime" or not. It is enough to state that such a " political " speech by any man, and particularly by a man not in any way connected with Hyderabad, by birth or any other tie, addressed to a crowd, consisting chiefly of school-boys, young students and illiterate persons was certainly calculated under the existing circumstances to have a harmful effect.

"Such being the case, His Exalted Highness considers that the order passed by him that you should not visit

Hyderabad or any other part of his dominions without his permission is quite right.

"I am, in conclusion, to remark that this correspondence should now cease."

This is the last letter dated 7th May 1919 that Jinnah addressed to the Nizam's Government in a defiant mood :—

"I am in receipt of yours of the 25th of April 1919. Believe me, I had no intention of showing you any discourtesy.

"I do not wish to discuss the truth of my statement as to what took place between me and the 1st Assistant to the Kotwal. Suffice it to say that only under Hyderabad regime my word would have been questioned.

I never invited H.E.H.'s opinion as to the course I followed. I am sure that the impertinent tone and language of the letter could not have been sanctioned by H.E.H.

"However, since I am advised I feel at liberty to very respectfully suggest that it would have been more meet had H.E.H. communicated his message to the organisers of the meeting. Evidently, H.E.H.'s subjects are not acquainted with their Ruler's enlightened views as to the undesirability of holding any public meeting in his dominions 'on a political matter of any sort and thus suggesting to the minds of his loyal and law-abiding people any ideas of agitation or public demonstration from which they have happily kept themselves aloof'; otherwise, I feel sure they would never have dreamt of convening this meeting and above all requesting me to address it.

"With regard to the allegations as to the character of the audience it is evident that H.E.H. is sadly misinformed. Otherwise such a stereotyped and false description would not have found place in your letter *viz.*, a crowd consisting chiefly of school-boys and young students and illiterate persons.

"H.E.H.'s unfortunate inference of what happened, *viz.*, that I offered a gratuitous insult to him by refusing to obey his orders is unwarranted. I am not accustomed to

receiving verbal messages through the assistants of a Police Commissioner; hence my considering it strange procedure will be understood and I confirm that it was not a 'polite message'. If H.E.H. has framed any final orders such as is indicated in your letter under reply I would request that such orders should be formally served upon me."

These were the days when the Ruler was endeavouring to keep Hyderabad uncontaminated by Indian politics which were of course anti-British. Jinnah was yet to evolve into the greatest leader of his community, it is true; but on this occasion the attitude of the Hyderabad Government was very stiff and cold.

———.

CHAPTER III

THE SPREAD OF GANDHIAN INFLUENCE IN HYDERABAD

Ever since the special Congress session at Calcutta which was held from the 4th to the 9th of September 1920 the influence of Mahatma Gandhi in Indian politics steadily grew. Lala Lajpat Rai who had recently returned from America was requested to preside over the session. Not only the Bengal stalwarts like Deshabandhu Das and Bipinchandra Pal were opposed to the non-co-operation resolution suggested by Mahatma Gandhi but even the President, Lala Lajpat Rai, was not favourably disposed towards it. The meeting was held at Calcutta on Sept. 7,1920 and all the delegates elected to the Sub-Committee numbering about 300 attended it. Mahatma Gandhi took a very strong attitude from the very beginning and he stood by his motion firm, like a rock. His resolution was carried in the Subjects Committee by a majority. At the plenary session also, Mahatma Gandhi moved his resolution which was passed by a majority, notwithstanding all opposition. Gandhiji's victory at the Nagpur session was even more amazing. It is said that the largest number of delegates, *i.e.*, 14,582 attended, out of whom there were 1,050 Muslims and 169 women. The greatest surprise of the hour was that the hesitant President of the Calcutta session, Lala Lajpat Rai, seconded the resolution which was moved by Deshabandhu Das. Sri Vijayaraghavachari, the President of the Congress, fully supported Mahatma Gandhi. Thus was signalled the entry of Mahatma Gandhi into the freedom struggle of India, with the weapon of non-co-operation, non-violence and the boycott of schools, colleges, courts, foreign goods and by the propagation of Truth and Non-violence.

These ideals of Mahatma Gandhi, the moment they were placed before the patriotic men and women of India, caught their imagination. There is, therefore, nothing to wonder at, that these ideals should have permeated the Hyderabad State also. The close vigilance of the administration could not deter the spread of these ideals.

During these momentous days, Sir Ali Imam, Moid-ul-Mulk, was the President of the Executive Council in Hyderabad and Zvlqader Jung, the Judicial and Police Secretary. The note submitted by the Police Secretary and the remarks passed by Sir Ali Imam will show how they viewed the whole movement. Incidentally, they indicate the depth and intensity of the movement in Hyderabad.

"NOTE

"Circumstances make it necessary for me without loss of time to draw the attention of the Government to the rapid growth and progress of the political agitation in its many and varied aspects within the Dominions of His Exalted Highness the Nizam. I acknowledge with many thanks the valuable assistance which Mr. Goad has given me in supplying up-to-date complete notes, herewith attached, which will enable the Government to see at a glance that although, as Mr. Goad says, the movement began with the Khilafat agiuation so far back as the spring of 1920, it is from April or May last becoming increasingly dangerous. These notes refer to the following subjects through which the new political influence has gained supremacy on the minds of the people of Hyderabad State.

(1) Khilafat Notes.

(2) Political speeches.

(3) Photographs and brooches of Mahatma Gandhi and the Ali Brothers.

(4) Gandhi caps.

(5) Swaraj Notes.

(6) Boycott of liquor shops.

(7) Boycott of foreign cloth.

(8) National Schools.

(9) Tilak Swaraj Fund.

(10) Cow Protection.

(11) Charkas.

(12) Non-co-operation.

"Several of these subjects, which in calmer times would have deserved our wholehearted support, owing to their close affinity with current politics have assumed a very sinister aspect.

"It is, of course, for the Government after reviewing the conditions within and without the Dominions to decide finally whether prompt measures are necessary to check the movement before it gets out of hand or to deal with it piecemeal, as it were, as occasion arises. I, however, feel it to be my duty to call the attention of the Hon'ble the President of the Council to the fact that even a cursory glance at what is happening in British India at the moment would show that the Government of India lost the initiative of effectively controlling the movement by observing the policy of 'wait and see' from the very outset. There is undoubtedly a fear of precipitating events by what might be called premature action, but I respectfully beg to submit that this delicate question should be decided in accordance with the lesson learnt from outside. At any rate as the poison is finding its way gradually into the capital itself, both the Kotwal and the Inspector-General of the District Police should forthwith be ordered to keep all political suspects under strict surveillance, keep a separate register of these persons and send a weekly report for Government information.

"Then again, the recent serious disturbances within the Residency limit are not unknown to the Government. Although Shafi, who was responsible for these disturbances, has been externed from these Dominions, it is, however, a sufficient indication of what we should expect in the near future. Gandhism has evidently come to stay and each deportee is bound to be followed by another extremist, perhaps more violent in his method than his predecessor.

"In bringing these facts to the notice of the Government, I do not adovcate the adoption of drastic measures now or in the future, as steps will have to be taken as exigencies of the moment demand. All I respectfully, at present, beg to suggest is that some means should be devised to prevent, if possible, any recurrence of such unpleasant episodes.

"Just as I was about to forward the above note to be placed before the Council, I received from Mr. Goad

fresh items of information in the shape of a translation copy of the report of the District Superintendent of Police, Mahboobnagar. This place, the District Superintendent of Police says, has become a centre of Gandhi's propaganda and that the number of undesirable visitors to this district is constantly increasing. The gravity of the situation is to be gauged from the fact that a Sub-Inspector of Police, in spite of orders, apparently allowed the visitors to leave the place without keeping a strict watch over their movements."

Comments of Sir Ali Imam

"Nawab Zulqadar Jung Bahadur's excellent note is an admirable exposition of the political problem with which the Dominions of the Nizam are confronted and if there is any lesson that the inaction of the Government of India can teach us, it is that we cannot any more afford to sit with folded hands. Mr. Gandhi's movement, whatever spiritual force it may be credited with, by its advocates, is proved to be an insidious one, bringing in its wake lawlessness, pure and simple, in every form and shape it takes. The danger of the cult is all the greater because of the religious incentive behind it. As a political phenomenon it is an object lesson for it is the first time in the history of political agitation in India that there is an alliance between the various religious sections of the disaffected in this land. The policy of drift does not appear to me to be any longer justified if the safety of His Exalted Highness's Dominions has to be consulted. It is true, as Zulqadar Jung Bahadur puts it that, the call for immediate drastic measures may not have been reached but there can be no question that the Executive Government will be guilty of unpardonable blunder if preventive action is delayed or disregarded. It is always a sound policy to prevent a disease before it is allowed to supervene and demands a cure. As to preventive action, the situation is somewhat complicated by the fact that the police administration of the Government as it at present stands is in three detached groups. Firstly, we have the City Police in the hands of the Kotwal ; then there is the District Police under the Inspector-General and thirdly the C. I. D. is run by its own Director. In theory, no doubt, all the three branches of the Police administration are but units that are expected to co-ordinate in the maintenance of peace and detection and

punishment of crime, but experience shows that the particular nature of the Gandhi agitation now spreading in the Dominions calls for some system by which central control over its activities, in the City and the districts is necessary. The question then is what is the line on which an organisation that will give us satisfactory results to be set. Gandhism with all its connected ramifications is a subject of special difficulty to deal with as it is worked and directed with every possible subtlety and in channels that on the face appear to be only social service. Distinct spheres of jurisdiction, therefore, seem to be still more difficult to be fixed. There is also the question of inter-governmental relations in a matter like this to be considered. In short, the problem presents many-sided aspects awaiting solution, nor can it be delayed for the consideration of Government any further. I, therefore, think that before I place this matter before the Executive Council it will be helpful to call a conference of the officers and departments concerned to consider this grave and important matter. Will Zulqadar Jung Bahadur kindly invite:

1. Nawab Vilayat Jung Bahadur,
2. Nawab Nizamat Jung Bahadur,
3. Mr. Abdullah Yusuf Ali,
4. Mr. L. B. Goad,
5. Mr. Muhammad Ali,
6. Major Shah Mirza Beg and
7. Mr. Venkata Rama Reddy

to meet next Sunday in the Council Room at 4-30 p.m.? I will preside. Nawab Zulqadar Jung Bahadur will be Secretary to the conference."

As proposed, a meeting of the responsible officers took place under the presidency of Sir Ali Imam on Sunday, the 28th August 1921, at the Council Hall. The note prepared by the Home Secretary and the comments of the President of the Executive Council were already circulated to the members of the Committee.

The Committee unanimously agreed that the rapid growth of Gandhism in the Dominions of His Exalted Highness was a grave threat to peace and good order and special organisation was necessary for effectively checking the movement in its initial stages.

The Police administration in the State was divided under the three officers, the Commissioner of City Police, the Inspector-General of Police for districts and the Director of Criminal Investigation Department. The Committee opined that there should be whole-hearted co-operation amongst the three units for ensuring utmost efficiency. It was also found necessary that there should be a liaison officer between the British Residency Police and the Nizam's Police. Heads of these three departments were instructed to issue strict circulars to their subordinates with the clause that any relaxation or disobedience would be met with by exemplary punishment. Strict discipline towards immediate superiors was to be faultlessly maintained. It was also realised that as no hard and fast rules were framed for the prohibition of public meetings, the police officers were authorised to exercise their own discretion. The District Magistrates and the First Talukdars were to be instructed to furnish fortnightly reports regarding political movements and suspects in their respective districts. Concrete proposals were made regarding prohibition of extremist, foreign and Indian newspapers entering into the Dominions. A vigilant watch was to be maintained on all National Schools and antecedents of every person starting a National School should be enquired into. No local person or an outsider was to be allowed to preach any political or quasi-political doctrine calculated to excite the public mind. Prior sanction of the District Magistrate should be obtained and the Magistrate should decide on the receipt of a report of the Police. As the teachings of the Christian Missionaries were reported to produce disobedience among the converts, the former should be confidentially requested to be very careful in choosing their teachers.

As illustrations to indicate how Gandhian teachings were disseminated, a few instances can be cited.

At Mahboobnagar, three followers of Gandhian principles seemed to have created a little stir among the people and the Sub-Inspector of Police found them so innocent of any breach of peace that they escaped his attention and a higher police officer approached the place and discovered that they were agents of Khilafat movement come to establish Swarajya Committees. These three persons had put on Khadi shirts and Gandhi caps, of

whom two were Hindus and one was a Musalman. They earnestly advised the people to use Charka for spinning and preached temperance. In Hyderabad, Charkas were installed in several houses and it was reported thàt the Charkas were sold in the shop of one by name Maslekar. The Police Officers considered that to be a terrible contrivance and reported the matter to the President of the Executive Council who passed the following orders on the same. "Yes, the only point to keep in view is whether the Charka, which is in itself unobjectionable, may not ultimately be the harbinger of Gandhism as a political factor also. We must watch."

The C.I.D. officers' report stated that the widowed sister of R. V. Pillay, the Superintendent of the Government Central Press, had started a spinning factory in her house at which several Charkas buzzed and two handlooms worked. This lady had distributed number of Charkas to girls in a school in the Residency limits. This matter was also reported to the President who remarked : "Seen. No harm will come so long as the Charka movement is allowed to run its course." Narsoji, an employee of the Medical Department had opened a Karkhana for spinning yarn while two persons Bhim Rao and Bhujanga Rao were selling home-spun yarn at Hyderabad. They had relinquished their Government service on account of the non-co-operation movement and were being employed in the Karkhana of Narsoji. Lakshminarayan who was also working under the inspiration of Mahatmaji desired to start a school for girls and teach them spinning. Badrul Hasan was also reported to have purchased Charkas at Bombay and brought them to Hyderabad. Mahammad Zahur Ahmad Siddiqi, a vakil of Gosha Mahal, had written articles on Charka and sent them for publication in *Madina* and *Musheer-i-Deccan*. The same gentleman was reported to have said that Keshav Rao, vakil, was sending large amounts of money to the Swarajya Fund and had established committees in the Residency limits. The comments of the President of the Executive Council on this ran as follows : " We should keep strict watch and note all doings of these people on the non-co-operation activities." Lalji Meghji, a timber merchant of Kattal Mandi, was said to have employed several workmen for the construction of Charkas. Similarly, Kanhayyalal of the Accountant-General's Office and Balaprashad were

reported to have efficiently managed two Karkhanas where women worked.

The following two important national schools started in distant places like Paithan and Raichur deserve special mention : Vishnunath, son of Ranganath, of Tuljapur, had started a so-called national school at Paithan, in the Aurangabad district and he had persuaded the students of the Government school to leave their school and to join his own. It was stated that this man had been sent by Mahatma Gandhi and like him several others had been sent to different places in these Dominions. On this matter being reported to the Hon'ble the President of the Executive Council, he was pleased to pass the following orders on 7-9-1330 F. " I have discussed this case with the Nawab. We should closely watch individuals and their doings." On receipt of this order the District Superintendent of Police, Aurangabad, was directed to register Vishnunath as a political suspect and to place him under close secret surveillance.

One Taranath, who was employed in H.E.H. the Nizam's Education Department at Raichur, left Government service in 1329 Fasli, and started a national school called 'Hamdard' in which about 80 students joined. Taranath had since been deported from the State for political reasons and the school was later on run by his brother Amrit Rao who was helped by certain vakils and sahukars of Raichur. Taranath had taken a prominent part recently in non-co-operation meetings in the Madras Presidency and had shown himself to be an extremist of the ' Firebrand ' type.

There are also reports to show that Nerla Narasimha Sahu of the Forest Department prepared several Charkas in his own factory at Warangal and sent them to Bezwada. A person by name Gandham Lakshiminarasimha Rao of Vemanur taluk, Krishna district, had come to Karimnagar under inspiration of Gandhiji. He was reported to have collected subscriptions for the fund and left the place. Vaman Naik and Raghavendra Rao Sharma were said to have made collecting for the Tilak Swarajya Fund with co-operation of Padmaja Naidu (the present Governor of Bengal). A secret society was said to have been formed in the Residency limits for such collections.

Badrul Hasan, it was reported, proceeded to Bombay with a sum of Rs. 23,000 to be credited to the Swarajya Fund.

On the 2nd October, 1921, the 53rd anniversary of Mahatma Gandhiji's birthday had taken place in Hyderbad without any permission from the Government. The opinion of the highest official regarding this matter was: "This is in my opinion a further deliberate attempt by extremists and non-co-operators to insert the cult of Gandhism in His Exalted Highness's Dominions." After this meeting a regular discussion and cross interrogation took place between ce tain authorities to determine what exactly was meant by a political and quasi-political meeting. In the Gandhiji birthday meeting, Pandit Keshav Rao was reported to have spoken that the people in Hyderabad should use only goods made in the Deccan. A remark like that was highly inspiring and could not come under the category of politics anywhere. Another speaker, Abdul Ali, compared the Birthday of Mahatmaji with that of Adam. Inayat Ahmad quoted several instances from the Khilafat regime of Haz at Umar. Vaman Naik paid a high tribute to Mahatmaji and emphasized the necessity of eradicating untouchability. But an intelligent person could hardly fail to realise that a spirit of non-co-operation and anti-British feeling was deeply concealed under all these speeches.

Another meeting took place (19th Azur 1331 Fasli) under the Presidentship of Raja Govinda Pershad Bahadur near Jagannath temple, Chudi Bazaar, on behalf of the Hindi Sabha for propagation of Hindi. Rai Biseshar-nath, High Court pleader, said the study of English enabled a person to earn his bread while the study of Hindi was meant for a proper understanding of their Hindu religion. Madapati Hanumantha Rao also endorsed the same opinion. The other speakers in the meeting were Shrikishan, Barrister, Raghavendra Rao Sharma and Vaman Naik. Fathe Ali recited a poem in which there was a reference to the arrival of the foreigners from overseas to rule over India but the President used his power of veto to stop him.

Non-co-operation, politically construed, meant dissociation of one from the British Institutions which tightened the foreign shackles and enabled the British

power to advertise its all-round goodness and benignity. In Hyderabad, there were no glaring examples of persons who had given up their legal practice. But students who studied in places like Poona, Bombay or Aligarh and who were originally Hyderabadis did give up their schools and colleges. Dr. Jaisoorya Naidu, the son of Devi Sarojini Naidu, is said to have given up studies at the Grant Medical College at Bombay in 1921.

Some Hyderabad students studying in the Muhammedan Anglo-Oriental College, Aligarh, had relinquished the College to join the National University College started by Mohammad Ali. Ghouse Mohiuddin, a Talukdar in Sir Vicar-ul-umra's Paigha is reported to have wired to the Principal of the National College as follows :—"Congratulations National University inauguration stop may it prove successful stop my sons coming shortly".

Vaman Naik is reported to have extended hospitality to all such persons who participated in the non-co-operation movement. He entertained and received persons at his bungalow with a view to advancing the cause of non-co-operation. When this matter was reported to the President of the Executive Council, he remarked (4th April, 1921), "For reasons of expediency the matter may be allowed to stand over. Movements of such persons in the dominions will no doubt be watched and report sent up." Syed Ahmad Ulla Huseni, a student of the Raichur Government School delivered a speech at the anniversary meeting on non-co-operation. Two vakils, Digambardas and Pannalal of Aurangabad, invited two lecturers from Berar who preached no-rent campaign. Mohan Singh Lodha, a pan-seller of Hyderabad, had started a Sabha at which political discussions took place. Ghous-ud-din, a student of Nizam College, had published a book on Hindu-Muslim Unity intending to send its sale proceeds to the Tilak Swarajya Fund.

One Mohammed Usman of Hyderabad is said to have burnt foreign clothes collected from his locality. Badrul Hasan who was taking active part in non-co-operation along with his brother Jaffer Hussain and Dr. M. G. Naidu's son and daughters worked for spreading the cult of Khaddar. The Principal of the Nizam College is said to have taken objection to Jaffer Hussain's Khaddar dress and Gandhi cap. The two brothers Badrul Hasan

and Jaffer Hussain are said to have preferred wearing Dhoti to Paijamas. Ramkishan, auctioneer, Troop Bazar, sold Khaddar and carried on anti-foreign goods propaganda.

Activities relating to prohibition and boycott of liquor were going on. Pestonjee, Abkari Contractor, had shown some high-handedness and therefore the Adilabad district people were leaning towards prohibition. Such influences percolated through Chanda and other border districts. It was reported that Kumesh Saheb and Burhan Saheb, Jagirdars of Baroncha village, had endeavoured to persuade the Kalals not to sell toddy and liquor. Villagers of Poolpad in Warangal district had decided on oath to give up drinking. Chittarpur Narayan Appa Patwari and his sons were trying their utmost to stop the sale of liquor.

Brooches and photographs of Mahatma Gandhi, Shaukat Ali and Mohammad Ali were sold secretly in Aurangabad. Srinivasdas, a merchant in Chowk, and Dule Khan also sold such articles. Khilafat notes of rupees hundred, ten and one were secretly sold in Aurangabad, Osmanabad, Parbhani and Warangal.

An interesting meeting took place at the Viveka Vardhini Theatre under the presidentship of Mohammad Asghar. The following gentlemen spoke on the occasion : Ramachandra Naik, Vaman Naik, Shri Kishan and Guru Rao. A public meeting on behalf of the Sanatana Dharma Sabha took place on the Viveka Vardhini grounds on the 25th of Ardibehist 1331 Fasli to celebrate the Ugadi. Mr. Balagovindadas of Osmanabad district presided over the deliberations. Both Musalmans and Hindus participated in the meeting. The religious significance of the day was explained by Pandit Keshav Rao. Pandit Raghavendra Rao Sharma just blended political sentiment in his speech by saying that Ugadi was a reminder of the great depths to which we had fallen from the heights of our past glory. Barsurur Rama Saheb explained the significance of home spinning and wearing Khaddar from that auspicious day. Ramachandra Rao, Secretary of the Sanatana Dharma Sabha thanked all. The Police Commissioner emphasised the fact that such meetings were apparently social and religious but their political objective was not a secret.

Another meeting took place on the 1st Meher 1331 F. (August 1922) at the VivekaVardhini Theatre to celebrate Iduzzuha and Rakhi Punnam. Mr. Vaman Naik addressing the audience told that it was a very sorry affair that Mahatma Gandhiji, Mohammad Ali and Shaukat Ali were sent to prison because of their struggle and past service for the good of the country. In accordance with the orders of His Exalted Highness, Vaman Naik was given written instructions to send copies of the speeches for meetings that might be held in future. " It might, therefore, kindly be decided whether permission should be given to organise such religious meetings " was the query of the Police Commissioner. On the 3rd Meher 1331 F. (August 1922) a public meeting took place at the Viveka Vardhini Theatre under the presidentship of Giri Rao, pleader. Professor Gyanchandraji was the chief speaker. The Professor inculcated in the minds of his audience the necessity of bringing about an improvement in social, cultural and political fields. He further added that frugality was the greatest virtue and it was the duty of all to live within one's own means. The use of hand-woven Khaddar was the most essential need for the uplift of the motherland.

It is interesting to see how the question of exercising a check on unpleasant public meetings became knotty. There were no special rules regarding such meetings. There were differences of opinion among all the authorities and clarifications issued one after an other created greater confusion.

On 9th Aban 1330 F. an order was published in the Government Gazette Extraordinary No. 52 :—" Any political or social meeting creating political issues should not be held without permission of the Chief Secretary and the Chief Secretary will first seek my permission for it. Failing this the conveners of such meetings will be held solely responsible for the consequences. Besides this, the agenda of such meetings should be submitted to the Chief Secretariat beforehand for information. Until the agenda of a meeting is sanctioned by the Chief Secretariat no action should be taken by the conveners of the meeting."

In the orders that were issued to the Talukdars, Magistrates, Director-General of District Police,

Commissioner of City Police and the Superintendent of C.I.D. Branch it was clearly stated that :—

Any person, whether a resident of this place or an outsider, would be permitted to take part in such political or semi-political meetings that may invoke revolutionary spirit in the minds of the common people or disturb the peace of the country, only with the written permission of the Magistrate.

One of the senior officers asserted his apprehension and stated that the following points deserved consideration and clarification :—

1. The terms 'political, non-political and semi-political meeting' should be defined.

2. What procedure should be adopted if the prohibition orders for particular meetings are not observed.

3. Who should be empowered to give permission for holding non-political meetings.

As for the first point, it may be stated that there was a remarkable difference in the meaning of the terms political, semi-political, and non-political meeting, but it was easily intelligible if a semi-political meeting was regarded as a non-political one. Hence, it would be better to get these terms defined by a legal adviser.

Regarding the second point, it was suggested that in case the prohibitory orders were not observed, action might be taken against the defaulters under section 164 of the Penal Code. The section was as follows:

"If a person knowingly disobeys the prohibitory orders, published and issued by a competent authority against a particular action or arrangement of a property in his possession, and if such action disturbs or affects others in the discharge of their duties or excites or gives harm or becomes a source of danger to others, he will be sentenced to an imprisonment up to one month or fine up to Rs. 200 or awarded both the punishments" etc.

"The measures designed in this section relate to legal orders published. As such, the orders enforced or to be enforced in future relating to ban on meetings may

now be adopted for legal action with the advice of a legal adviser, and the same may be published in the form of an announcement for information of the public after obtaining sanction of competent authority. This will facilitate taking legal action against the defaulters.

With regard to the third point, it is stated that permission may be given for non-political, i.e., religious or social meetings by the Commissioner of Police in Hyderabad City and by the District Magistrate in the Districts, according to the Government orders issued under letter No. 46, dated 6th Dai 1331 F. But in order to ascertain whether the Police Commissioner or the District Magistrate is he competent authority in the city to give permission for such meetings, it is desirable to take the advice of a legal adviser. The proceedings of such meetings may be recorded by the stenographers, or by other means, if they are not available at a particular place. In short, all these questions are to be decided particularly to facilitate the Director-General of District Police and that of the C.I.D. Branch in the discharge of their duties. Until the above points are settled finally the existing orders will not serve the purpose."

The inherent forceful potentiality of Gandhiji's philosophy, whether one called it political or moral, was so truthful and just that it confused all talents. The principles evolved by Gandhiji's profound thoughtfulness were unprecedented. The fearless civil disobedience preached by him provoked the ruling authority but the simplicity, serenity and austerity which invariably accompanied his method humbled his opponents.

CHAPTER IV

THE KHILAFAT MOVEMENT

When the first world war commenced, the Prime Minister of England, Lloyd George, had given an assurance to appease the Mohammvdan feelings in India and had stated as follows:—"We are not fighting to deprive Turkey of its capital or the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor which are predominantly Turkish in race. While we do not challenge the maintenance of the Turkish race with its capital at Constantinople, the passage between the Mediterranean and the Black Sea has to be internationalised." When later, after the close of the war, proposals for dismemberment of Turkey were moved, public opinion in India was intensely excited. The sympathies of the Muslims in Hyderabad were naturally on the side of the Indian Muslims. Hyderabad did not lag behind in giving expression to its feelings.

The British were anxious to study the reactions of the Nizam. Irrespective of his personal sentiments, political strategy demanded that he should exercise moderation and control. The British were anxious that the Nizam should not lose his head, and should not give his moral support towards the Khilafat agitation since Muslim feelings were deeply roused. At the same time, the popular expression of such feeling was also not welcome, since it indicated that public opinion was trying to make itself felt.

Sir Ali Imam and the Nizam were confronted with a dilemma and were put to a great strain in deciding the issue either way. They were reluctant to prevent the display of sentiments. The Nizam was offered a title "Mohiul Millat-e-Waddin" by the Muslims of India to make him take up the Khilafat problem. But his responsibility as a ruler of a State and an ally of Great Britain, forbade him to give free play to his sentiments and he was obliged to issue certain orders against the Khilafat movement.

It is interesting to read the correspondence which took place between the Nizam and Lord Chelmsford, the

Viceroy of India, which incidentally gives us a glimpse of the events that were taking place in Hyderabad.

The first letter was addressed by His Exalted Highness the Nizam to His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General of India on the 16th March 1920:—

"I have watched with close and anxious interest the progress of events with reference to the Turkish Peace terms. I am thankful to think that my Dominions remain unaffected by the developments this vexed question has assumed. My people of all castes and creeds are happy to receive such guidance as I give them and it is my privilege to say that the subjects of the Asifjah are too loyal to chalk out a line of action which had not the sanction of their Ruler. So far, therefore, as my State is concerned, the Turkish question has no political significance beyond a passing and detached interest in a problem that must necessarily arrest the attention of the world. The position, however, outside my Dominions. I regret to say, does not appear to me to be so reassuring. Apart from Moslem communities outside the British Empire, the situation within it, so far as my estimate goes, is full of anxiety. And it is this which impels me to venture upon writing to Your Excellency on the subject.

"When unfortunately the Turkish Government cast in its lot with the enemies of the British Empire the strife had a purely secular aspect. On that occasion, it was my privilege to issue a Manifesto which I may say with pardonable pride had a steadying influence upon the Muhammadans of British India. My own subjects, whether Muhammadan or Hindu did not need, nor do they now need the application of any such ministration. My present anxiety is of an Ally who is deeply concerned at what appears to be maturing into a grave situation not only in British India but over a large part of the Empire. The anxiety is all the greater on account of the action taken by the prelates of the Church in England and Moslem divines in India. This has introduced a dangerous element into the controversy. The secular character of the movement has received metamorphosis and threatens to materialise into a conflict between the Cross and the Crescent within the Empire. The force and potentialities of such an unfortunate eventuality will be a source of incalculable peril predicative of an

internal disorder the magnitude of which may pass beyond all control. I have not the least desire to assume a role of an alarmist, but the proportion that the agitation is assuming in British India shows that Muhammadan sentiment has been deeply stirred and a religious basis has been found to fan the fire of fanaticism. The headship of Islam has been a polemic for years during which it did not rise beyond academic interest, but the present situation has given it a turn which defies sober reasoning and theological examination. Popular psychology is not necessarily logical or answerable to historical verities and in practical politics what counts is fact and not theories. My examination of the present problem tells me that there is a formidable unanimity on the religious concept given to this movement. Here lies the real danger of the situation. It does not appear to me that any pronouncement from however high a quarter on the unsoundness or illogicality of this concept will receive any attention from passions that have been roused. At present, it is no more possible than to arrest the advance of a surging tide. To my mind, the remedy does not lie in this direction. The sentiment of Muhammadans in British India has to be accepted as a fact that has to be reckoned with. The dissatisfaction of the Muhammadans began to find expression with their condemnation of the peace celebrations. Sir Ali Imam, the President of my Executive Council, received numerous telegrams from various parts of India protesting against the celebrations in my Dominions, but I was firm in my resolve to make them worthy of the occasion with the result that the opposition to the celebrations in British India was effectively discouraged and died out. Up till then the movement had not taken the religious colour and complexion which it has unfortunately now. The remedy does not lie, so far as I can judge, in telling the Muhammadans that the Turkish Peace Settlement is purely a secular matter. Such action is more likely to aggravate their feelings than soothe them. I also think their resentment which has a strong religious basis is not less provoked by what they consider will be a breach of faith on the part of the British Govt. if the pledges given during the War were not fulfilled. No doubt it is left on the solemnity of these pledges after what has been authoritatively stated by the Premier and other distinguished statesmen in the House of Commons. These pronouncements have given them every

hope of a favourable treatment of the Turks. The position, therefore, seems to be that any departure now from the strict observance of the promises made will be regarded by them as an outrage. A combination of religious frenzy and indignation at breach of faith will be of an intensity the evil consequences of which may present a political situation of the gravest possibilities. The disaffected non-Moslem sections of the people of British India are only too ready to make capital of a situation like this and evidence is not wanting that they have in all earnestness embarked upon this course. I am perfectly sure Your Excellency has all these considerations before you, but I thought it best to write and convey to you the estimate I made of the present situation. I most earnestly hope that a solution will be found that will win the gratitude of the Muhammadans. I know your Excellency has spared no pains to bring about this result and I can only trust that your wise counsel will prevail and British statesmanship will be saved the exhibition of a breakdown".

Draft copy of a letter from His Exalted Highness the Nizam to His Excellency the Viceroy and Governor-General of India, dated 13th June 1920:—

"My dear Lord Chelmsford,

"Probably you are aware of the recent action taken by me with reference to the Khilafat agitation and its possible introduction into my Dominions. So long as it had not passed out of sober reasoning and judicious restraint, it was entitled to my sympathy. As a Mussalman Ruler it is but natural that I should feel the break up of a Muhammadan power, but it is impossible for me to countenance proceedings that have avowed intentions of resistance, euphemistically called "passive," to British authority—indeed against all authority. This was just as impossible for me to do as not to have sent out my regiments to fight the Turk in Palestine and other places. He was a bitter foe but is a fallen one now, and if with the Khilafat resolutions the Muhammadans in India remained contented with pleading for the Turk and did not degenerate into threats against Your Excellency and Your Government, I would not hesitate for a moment to add my voice to the appeal for lessening the severity in the terms of peace. Indeed, in one of my letters to Your Excellency I had put in the strongest plea

I could in this behalf. Till then the position of entreaty had not changed into one of defiant demands. In my own Dominions up to that time I had not put an embargo upon the holding of Khilafat meetings, engineered though they were by emissaries sent out from British India. But since then has come the cry of " non-co-operation". This is Satyagraha once again, only the more potent and dangerous because of the infusion of religious fanaticism. I am responsible for the peace of my Dominions and in that view of the situation I had no option left but to nip the exotic in the bud. I am glad to say that the lead I have given to my subjects has received appreciative acceptance and so far as my Dominions are concerned, the horizon is clear. Barring a few outsiders who are of little consequence, there is not even a murmur anywhere, but I am much distressed to find that the Khilafat agitation is assuming grave proportions in British India. The impertinence of serving Your Excellency with a notice of a month is an index of the storm that is brewing. The Muhammadan Vernacular press of British India is vociferous and is going to extreme lengths in denunciation and incitement. Your Excellency, Your Government, myself and my Sadr-i-Azam are the chosen targets and a campaign of vilification has been started the irresponsibility of which is beyond measure. So far as I and my Government are concerned, we feel no difficulty in keeping things in order where we are, but you will permit me to say that to allow the situation in India to grow acute by taking no notice of what is happening, is in my judgment not free from peril. So far as I can see, drastic action will have to be taken, but its severity depends on the stage of its application. If the conflagration becomes extensive, very effective processes for extinguishing the fire will have to be needed. It is not for me to lay down a line of policy for British India of which Your Excellency is the best judge, but I cannot help feeling that disorder in British India may possibly reflect on condition of things in my Dominions. My anxiety is, therefore, both of an Ally and a Ruler. If I may venture to say so, time for preventive measures has surely come. The indulgence of Government is not only apt to be abused, but also construed into fear. As a political contingency this must be avoided at all costs. The position, as it strikes me, calls for action in two directions; one is to put down lawlessness or incitement to lawlessness with a strong hand, and the other is publicly to

champion the appeal to the Allied Powers through His Britannic Majesty's Government for reducing of the severity of the Turkish Peace terms. The former is an urgent necessity to maintain peace within the Indian Empire, and the latter a response to sentiments the genuineness of which cannot be questioned, and the justice of which is not altogether undemonstrable. Your Excellency has done your best to help the Muhammadans and boldly advocated the cause which has received no less support from the Secretary of State. To create an atmosphere of unrest in British India by Muhammadans, lured on by Hindu extremists, is a piece of ingratitude, the like of which history furnishes few examples, but this should in no way deter Your Excellency or the Secretary of State, I venture to say, from renewing the charge so long as the peace terms have not been finally concluded. It appears to me that their severity itself gives plenty of scope for reasonable leniency. My excuse for writing in this strain is the intense desire to eschew from within the British Empire the seeds of political dissensions the germs of which lie embedded in religious convictions however artificially roused. Apart from Muhammadan sentiment, on the higher ground of Imperial policy there is much to be said in favour preserving an independent Muhammadan power in the Near East of a sufficient strength to keep in check un-Islamic movements of the Bolshevist type. It is not necessary for me to enter upon this aspect of the question, but I would, if I may, lay the greatest stress on the importance of Your Excellency once more taking up the cudgels for making the peace terms less severe. If on the one hand, drastic action is necessary to control the spread of a mischievous agitation, some soothing remedy is needed as a balm to the wound with which the Muhammadan community in India is at present afflicted.

"My excuse for writing this long letter to Your Excellency is the desire to keep in touch with you at the present juncture which is full of political potentialities."

The following evasive reply of Lord Chelmsford to the Nizam is given below:—

"Viceregal Lodge,
"Simla,
"22nd June 1920.

"My dear Nizam Sahib,

"I write to thank Your Exalted Highness for your letter of the 13th instant and I am glad to have this opportunity of expressing my high appreciation of the wise and statesmanlike policy which Your Exalted Highness has adopted in the matter of the Khilafat agitation, a policy which has had a most beneficial effect not only within your dominions but throughout British India.

"As Your Exalted Highness is aware, I have done everything in my power to support the cause of Musalmans and the sympathy which I feel with them in the misfortunes which have befallen a great Islamic power enables me to appreciate the more the difficulty of Your Exalted Highness as a Muhammadan and as a ruler. But you have in your letter so admirably distinguished between your duty to Islam and your duty to the subjects of your State that I have no fear that Your Exalted Highness will allow the one to interfere with the other.

"In your letter you put forward two concrete suggestions: first that the time has come for the Government of India to adopt stronger measures and secondly that the Secretary of State and myself should continue to press for a revision of the peace terms. I welcome this frank expression of Your Exalted Highness's views and I will endeavour to meet you with equal frankness. The policy which the Government of India have followed towards the present agitation has, I need hardly assure, been adopted after the most anxious consideration and in close conformity with the views of Local Governments. It is, I think, the general experience that while repression brings bitterness in its train, license in the long run begets its own corrective and signs have not been wanting during the last few weeks that the present violence of speech is defeating itself. The failure of the Hijrat movement, the detachment of several prominent Mussalmans from the non-co-operation movement and dissension even among the ranks of Khilafat workers themselves all point in this direction. I am not without hope that the agitation will exhaust itself, but we realise the dangers of the situation and shall not hesitate to act strongly in the event of any disorders or of any such manifestation as may lead us to apprehend an outbreak.

"I turn now to Your Exalted Highness's second suggestion. While realising your natural anxiety that the terms which have been dictated should not be regarded as final, I am afraid, I cannot encourage the hope that any revision is probable. I have been in the closest communication with the Secretary of State during the whole progress of negotiations and it is no secret that our efforts have met with no small measure of success. I am now in a position to know that any further representation would be ineffectual, but I can assure Your Exalted Highness that should the progress of events lead me to suppose that further intervention is possible, I shall continue to press upon His Majesty's Government. as I have done in the past, the Mohammadan point of view regarding the Turkish settlement.

"Very sincerely yours,
"(Sd.) Chelmsford.

"Lieut. General His Exalted Highness Nawab Mir Osman Ali Khan Bahadur, G.C.S.I., G.B.E., Nizam of Hyderabad."

Draft copy of a letter to the Viceroy and Governor-General of India issued on the 8th July, 1920 :—

"I am glad to receive your letter of the 22nd of June and to learn from Your Excellency that my policy with reference to the Khilafat agitation had proved beneficial throughout British India. My decision to act in the way I have was influenced by considerations of guarding true Islamic interests no less than of rendering such service to the British Government as is expected from a Friend and Ally. The more I reflect on the situation that has arisen over this agitation the more convinced I am that if it did not subside it would bring in its train untold miseries to the Muhammadans themselves. This is obvious enough to all sober minded men, but the agitators in their mad desire to create disaffection against British rule stick at nothing. The virulence of the Urdu Press has broken all bounds and I feel sure Your Excellency's attention has been invited to the scurrilous attacks that are incessantly directed against you and me. One has only to see the issues of papers like the *Zamindar*, *Siasat*, and *Zamana* to have some idea of the seeds of sedition

that are being sown broadcast. Such papers are widening the sphere of their circulation and are creating in my Dominions an atmosphere which is exceedingly unhealthy. The attacks on me and my Sadr-i-Azam are unbridled. It is for Your Excellency to say what measure of protection it is possible to give to an Ally and his officers against public vituperation which has become the order of the day. The Urdu Press in British India is out for inflaming the mind of my people against me and my Government. I do not know what is possible for Your Excellency's Government to do in this connexion, but it seems to me if the present crusade is allowed to be maintained, my task in giving the right lead to Indian Muhammadans will be rendered more and more difficult in the future. I, therefore, wish to draw Your Excellency's attention to this particular aspect of the agitation which is becoming unduly pronounced. In doing so, I do not overlook Your Excellency's wise observation that repression is not advisable where an agitation is likely to exhaust itself, but the attitude of the extremist Urdu Press seems to call for serious consideration."

"Viceregal Lodge,
"Simla,
"19th July 1920.

"My dear Nizam Sahib,

"I have received Your Exalted Highness's letter of the 8th July and fully share your indignation at the scurrilous attacks made upon yourself and your Sadr-i Azam in respect of the measures which you have taken to curb the violence of extremist agitation within your Dominions. I am calling the attention of all local Governments and Administrations to these attacks and asking that, if there be any repetition of them, the provision of the Indian Press Act may be enforced against offenders. I trust that this action may have a salutary effect in preventing further attacks.

" Very sincerely yours,

" (Sd.) Chelmsford. "

In Hyderabad, the agitation was sponsored and invigorated by the following Muslim gentlemen :— Barrister Asghar, Askari Hasan, Khaliuzzaman and Mohammad Murtaza and Humayun Mirza. Under the unifying influence of Mahatmaji even the patriotic Hindu citizens of the State had assimilated the spirit of these activities. They were Pandit Keshav Rao, Vaman Naik and Raghavendrarao Sharma. The embers of the discontent towards the British were kept smouldering even in 1921, 1922 and 1923 and other leaders from both the Muslim and Hindu communities made the cause of this struggle their own.

Youm-e-Khilafat, (Khilafat Day) was observed in the month of March and April 1920 at places like Hyderabad, Gulbarga, Aurangabad, Raichur, Karimnagar, Jangaon and Medak. Resolutions were passed unanimously and sent to the Nizam with a request to forward them to the Viceroy.

At the meeting at Hyderabad on the 16th of March 1920, Barrister Asghar presided. Thousands of Musalmans and Hindus participated. Pandit Digambardass Choudhari and Moulavi Fasiuddin addressed a meeting in a mosque on 19th March 1920 at Aurangabad and resolutions urging the redressal of the injustice done to Islam were pressed. At Karimnagar, a meeting took place at the Idgah at which Syed Shah Habibulla of Hyderabad presided. Among the mixed audience even the first Taluqdar Syed Mohiuddin Ali Khan and the Joint Magistrate Rai Ratanchand were present. Vakils Mohammad Hussain and Narasinga Rao were the chief promoters. Several resolutions were passed. One of the resolutions which voiced the full support of the Hindus to this agitation was proposed by Narasinga Rao and seconded by Venkat Rama Rao who had persuaded the Hindu merchants to close their shops.

The police report states that permission was not obtained for the meeting.

The meeting at Mahboobnagar was held at Idgah under the presidency of Moulavi Jaun Mohammad, vakil, at which Hafiz Wajuddin. Pesh Imam, Wahid Ali, school master, Shabbir Ali, vakil and Bashiruddin and Abdur Rahim, girdawars, spoke.

The Raichur citizens organised a meeting on the 28th of March, at the Jumma Musjid. Hidayat Mohiuddin Khan, a vakil from Hyderabad, was proposed to the chair by P. Krishna Rao. Taranath Rao of Premashram who supported the movement very enthusiastically appealed to all to boycott British goods till t e Khilafat wrong was redressed. Mohammad Mahboob Hussain, Government teacher and Yogindra Rao addressed the meeting.

In the month of April 1920, Shaukat Ali, honorifically called Khuddam-i-Kaba, was carrying on an all-India tour and was about to pass Gulbarga and Raichur. The enthusiastic citizens of both these cities had a foreknowledge of his arrival. At Gulbarga, Shaukat Ali was expected on the 18th of April and a large crowd of three thousand people consisting of Musalmans, Hindus, vakils and Government officials attended the Railway station to pay respect to him. Even the Collector of Gulbarga, Sardar Hyder Ali Khan, was conspicuous among the Government officials. The whole station area was deafened with the cries of 'Shaukat Ali ki jai' and 'Gandhi Mahatma ki jai.' Temporary arrangements were made for creating a lofty seat for Shaukat Ali from which he addressed the meeting. The reports show that the Collector was an acquaintance of Shaukat Ali previously. Shaukat Ali delivered a very fiery speech and made a trenchant attack on the British administration. He appealed to the masses for donating large contributions to the Khilafat Fund. Subscriptions for the purpose were collected by Mustafa Ali Beg, a clerk of the Jail, Haji Hyder, contractor, Waterworks and a few clerks from the Subedar's office on the 14th April and a purse of about Rs. 800 was presented to the distinguished leader. Shaukat Ali inculcated in the minds of the hearers that Islam was in danger and it was the duty of all Musalmans to gird up their loins and be prepared to sacrifice their all for the sake of securing their holy places

under Moslem control. He also emphatically persuaded the Musalmans in the Government services and particularly those in the police and military to give up their jobs and non-co-operate with the British Government. Shaukat Ali and his party were respected and garlanded at the railway station of Shahabad near Wadi at 1-30 p.m. Shaukat Ali was presented with a purse of Rs. 1,700 in all. The organisers had collected funds from the villagers and the workmen in the cement factory who honoured the guest intreovation and offered fruits and flowers.

At Raichur, Abdul Jalil had collected money previously for offering 'Phoolpan' to Shaukat Ali and he and Taranath had this news proclaimed in Raichur by beat of drum that Shaukat Ali will pass by that day's mail for Madras and therefore all Hindus and Muhammadans should come to the railway station. The number of men present at the railway station included all vakils and other respectable men. They were estimated at 2,000. On arrival of the mail train Shaukat Ali was garlanded and people shouted 'Allaho-Akbar' and 'Shaukat Ali ki jai' from all sides. Shaukat Ali then delivered a short speech the purport of which was that as the Government did not approve of their demands, Mahatma Gandhi and Tilak were going to England for the purpose and that "if the Goernment did not meet our demands this time we shall no longer be their subjects nor they our Sovereign. We shall leave our connection with the Government." He then directed Hindus and Muhammadans to work harmoniously and told them to collect and send subscriptions.

Taranath Rao saw Shaukat Ali especially and at the departure of the train Rs. 250, the subscription collected, was made over to the latter.

On the 23rd, April 1920, a mammoth meeting was held on the Viveka Vardhini grounds to celebrate the *Youm-i-imtihan* (a day of trial). Ten to twelve thousand Moslems and Hindus had assembled. Barrister Mohammad Asghar proposed the name of Moulavi Syed Jamat Ali Shah of Sialkot (Punjab) to the chair. The chairman said that Hyderabad should be quite proud of their King, the Nizam, just as the Afghans feel proud of their Amir. "The whole life of the

Moslems," added the chairman, 'depended upon Khilafat and anything that would bring about disintegration in it, was sure to make people uneasy and distressed. Once when I was in Mecca, the Sultan had sent a sword and a Firman to the Sheriff who held a darbar, wearing the sword round his neck and read the Firman with great respect. But now the Sheriff has thrown away all allegiance to the Khalifa", he said.

Hidayat Mohiddin Sahib, vakil, said that as a matter of fact Shaikh-ul-Imam was like the religious pen of the Khilafat through whom religious mandates upon which the religious sentiments of the Musalmans were based were issued. He had been arrested because he voiced his disobedience to the British. To arrest a man without a weapon does not bring in any credit to the man in power. The speaker further said that the Archbishop of Canterbury would deserve a place the in Andamans for driving away the Turks from Europe. The Turks are blamedfor bad Government and it is said that they cannot establish peace among men of different nationalities as if the Britishers are successful in dealing with the troubles on the Indian frontier. Dr. Mohammad Hussain Efandi had written a speech describing the glory and significance of Constantinople and it was read by one of his relatives. Raghavendra Rao, vakil, addressed the audience quite pointedly that the Hindu-Muslim unity displayed in such meetings is not a temporary thing. He added just as people living in a locality immediately rush to extinguish a fire that consumes the houses in the locality, irrespective of the fact whether they belong to Moslems or Hindus, in the same way, it is the bounden duty of every Hindu to offer the strongest support to the cause of their Moslem brethren.

At this meeting, Akbar Ali, the editor of *Sahifa* commenced his speech with the praise of the British Government, perhaps with a tactful diplomacy to condemn it at the end but the audience prayed to the Chairman to cut short the speech. One of the resolutions was proposed by Moulvi Hidayat Mohiuddin and seconded by Jamil Ahmad Saheb. It ran as follows :—

"We express a feeling of great pain and sorrow on the temporary occupation of Constantinople and we deem it our first duty to inform that the Moslem prestige cannot

tolerate that the holy place where the tomb of Hazarat Ayub Ansari, one of the most venerable companions of the Prophet, exists should be in the hands of non-Moslems and we also request H.E.H. the Nizam to take proper steps, being the helper of the religion, to restore the holy place to Islam."

As the Chairman had suddenly to leave the chair for some important business, Pandit Keshav Rao, vakil, was requested to occupy the chair. A subscription of ten to twelve thousand rupees was raised on the spot. Contributions were also made in the form of Shervanis, coats, walking sticks, watches, etc. Dr. Mohammad Hussain gave his motor car and half of his property. A poem suitable for the occasion and eloquently describing the Moslem sentiments was recited in a very impressive manner. Many of those present in the audience actually began to weep. Sri Vaman Naik made a short speech impressing the extreme necessity of Hindu-Muslim unity for the attainment of their common objective. Shri Vaman Naik, Murtaja Shah, Raghavendra Rao and other volunteers put cotton bags round their necks and moved in the audience and collected funds.

CHAPTER V

NATIONALISM IN TELANGANA AND THE ANDHRA MAHASABHA

The Telangana region of the State was culturally rich and economically better off compared to the Karnatak and Marathwada areas. It had also a hoary traditional, cultural background. There were a number of Zamindars, Samsthans, Deshmukhs and Deshpandes who owned large tracts of lands but the majority consisted of farmers and peasants who were honest, hard-working folk. With the spread of education and the newspapers, political consciousness was generated amongst them.

In 1921, an association called the Andhra Jana Sangham was formed with Tekmal Ranga Rao as its Secretary.

(1) The association was to be called "Nizam Rashtra Andhra Jana Sangham."

(2) The aims and the objects of the association were to work for the progress of the Andhras.

(3) The abovementioned objective was to be achieved by forming new associations, helping the existing ones and by convening public meetings and other allied activities.

(4) Every Andhra of the State whose age was not less than eighteen and who could read and write could become a member of this association.

When the membership rose to one hundred, a regular managing committee of 15 members with Raja Rajagopala Reddy, Barrister, as President and Shri Madapati Hanumantha Rao as the Secretary was elected. As an allied wing of this body a research society called Andhra Parishodhak Mandali was also established.

With the establishment of these institutions, other sister associations also began to spring up all over Telangana and therefore a necessity of getting them federated with a central body was keenly felt and the Andhra Jana Kendra Sangham was formed. The first meeting of the central body was held at Hanumakonda on the

1st of April 1924 and it was largely attended by representatives from Hyderabad, Secunderabad, Warangal, Khammam and Huzurabad. This Committee was authorised to frame a constitution which was adopted on the 27th of April 1924 at Hyderabad. The aims and objects of the Committee were further expanded, and are given below:—

1. To establish libraries and reading rooms.
2. To help and encourage students.
3. To accord respect to scholars.
4. To collect manuscripts and to conduct research.
5. To spread knowledge through hand-bills, booklets, and public speeches.
6. To propagate Telugu.
7. To encourage fine arts and physical culture.
8. To help the helpless.

During the course of about twelve years, the Andhra Kendra Jana Sangham had to face several impediments ignorantly placed in its course by Government. When an attempt was made in Suryapet to start a library, the Collector of Nalgonda, while on tour to the place, enquired of the organisers as to whether Government permission was obtained for such a venture and upon receiving a negative reply, ordered forthwith that the library should be closed. On an approach to higher authorities, the Home Secretary was pleased to state that Government permission was entirely unnecessary for opening a library. Notwithstanding such an order, a great dignitary like the police patel in a village in Warangal district had the audacity to question the establishment of a library in that unit and order, that as it had been started without Government's sanction, it should be removed. The District Magistrate also endorsed the orders of the police patel. Even against such obstacles, the library movement sponsored by Madapati Hanumantha Rao progressed satisfactorily and about ahundred centres received knowledge from newly established libraries. To create a spirit of discipline and understanding in the organisers of such libraries, a library conference was convened on 22nd February 1925 at Madhira. Delegates from almost all centres had assembled and the freedom with which

they discussed all problems relating to the libraries made the Government apprehensive of the general trend of the movement and permission was denied in 1926 to hold a second library conference at Suryapet. Incessant endeavours on the part of the organisers fructified after two years and the conference was held under the chairmanship of Vaman Naik.

The Andhra Jana Kendra Sangham organised the rich merchants in the Telangana region. These merchants had always to cater to the requirements of the Government officials on tour either by selling commodities at concession rates or giving them freely. They sought the help of the Sangham to represent their grievances in an organised manner. Such a demonstration was first made in Suryapet by the merchants in December 1922. Merchants had to bear the consequences of such a protest in the earlier stages but with the help of the Andhra Jana Kendra Sangham, they could assert their freedom. A booklet entitled *Freedom of Merchants* was published in Telugu and circulated to all the merchants.

The Sangham endeavoured to put a stop to another harmful practice called the 'Begar.' According to this, Government officers, patels, patwaris, Deshmukhs and Deshpandes exercised a right to employ the skill and labour of craftsmen for their own benefit without any payment to the workmen. But the Nizam had issued Firmans against such evil practice of enlisting forced labour and yet the victims did not receive any relief from those orders. The Andhra Jana Kendra Sangham published a booklet in Telugu and conveyed the knowledge of the Firman to all the sufferers. Attempts of the Sangham to establish schools in villages were also confronted with similar difficulties. During one year, nearly four thousand schools opened by the Sangham in such a manner were to be closed. So, the organisers of the Sangham had to concentrate their attention on properly conducting the schools that existed already. Even with such a strain, the workers of the Sangham continued their efforts to create awakening in the Telangana region. Twelve Telugu booklets written in easy simple style intelligible to an ordinary villager priced at one anna each were placed within the reach of all. The Andhra Jana Kendra Sangham never enjoyed the goodwill of the Government which repeatedly denied permission for holding purely educational and library meetings and

conferences. In the initial stages, the Sangham did not have any political bias but the repressive policy of the Government generated a spirit of resistance among them.

Andhra Conferences

The year 1930 brought in a great upsurge throughout India. As a consequence of this the first Andhra Conference took place in the first week of March 1930 at Jogipet under the presidentship of Suravaram Pratapa Reddy, BA., BL, popular editor of the *Golkonda Patrika*. Madapati Hanumantha Rao, though the well deserved the presidentship. was a selfless individual and vested another person with this honour.

Several resolutions which gave expression to the genuine inconveniences and reasonable aspirations of the people were passed at this conference. It seems many persons like Vaman Naik, Madapati Hanumantha Rao, Shridhar Naik and Swami Yoganand had participated in the conference and made speeches which supported the several resolutions adopted by the conference.

Resolutions relating to the conditions of farmers who were not rendered adequate assistance by the Agricultural Department of the State, either in the form of Takkavi loans as in Marthwada or by giving them instructions to better the conditions of the crops, were passed. A resolution very strongly expressed the emergent need of several villages for a proper supply of drinking water. Some of the resolutions like exemption of customs duty on the export of hand-spun yarn and hand-spun cloth, support to Ayurvedic Doctors as in the case of Unani Hakims, introduction of election element in municipalities instilled wider and deeper political awakening in the minds of the subjects. Appeal was made to the people in general that they should try to make use of the old Panchayats for minimising litigation. A resolution to encourage women's education and the elimination of the purdah system for ladies bears eloquent testimony to the desire for social reforms along with political ones. The conference was keenly conscious of the necessity of rewriting the history of Telangana and the people in general were requested to give every possible help to researchers when they approached them. The following gentlemen seem to have shown great patriotic fervour in the conference:

(1) Vetharaju Jadaganti Rama Rao.

(2) Vutukuru Laxminarayana Rao.

(3) Narasa Reddy.
(4) Venkatarama Rao.
(5) Adiraju Veerabhadra Rao.
(6) D. Venkataramanacharyulu.
(7) Chidire Lakshmana Sarma.
(8) Guru Prasad.
(9) Venkateswara Gupta.
(10) M. Narayana Rao.
(11) Danikota Nirdala Sastry and
(12) Venkata Bhujanga Rao.

The second session was held at Devarkonda under the presidentship of Burugula Ramakrishna Rao in 1931. The conference had committed itself not to introduce politics in its deliberations, yet a sagacious president like Ramakrishna Rao could not exclude politics from his presidential address and this aspect of the presidential speech did not escape the notice of the Government who insisted on claiming a security of Rs. 2,000 which would be forfeited in case of reference to politics. This repressive attitude of the Government was resented by the organisers of the conference who did not hold the third session till 1934 when P. Venkataranga Rao was elected to preside at Madhira in the Warangal District. But a written undertaking had to be given that the conference would exclude all politics. The Sanatana Dharmists amongst the members did not like that even social problems should be discussed by the conference. The District Talukdar championed the cause of the Sanatanists and social problems were not discussed at the conference.

As in the previous session many persons from Hyderabad had congregated to participate in the deliberations. Pandit Keshav Rao and Srinivas Rao Sharma, had along with others gone to attend the conference. They even moved resolutions in which they were interested. This conference reiterated all the resolutions that were not taken notice of by the Government though they were humbly submitted to their notice a year before in the last session of the conference. The atmosphere that pervaded the assembly was very healthy and progressive. Elimination of Udru as the medium of instruction for Hindu girls was very strongly recommended. People were also anxious to see that Government

encouraged technological and agricultural education among the masses. Strong appeals were made for wearing hand-spun and hand-woven khaddar and use of home-made goods. It was an admitted fact that the cultural level in the Sarf-i-Khas, Paigahs, Samasthans, and the Makhtas was generally low. The conference urged upon the Government the necessity to create the same facilities and standards as were prevalent in the Diwani Khalsa area. In the recent revision of revenue rates the Settlement Department had enhanced the taxes which hit hard the farmers. An appeal was made to the Government that they should reconsider the whole matter and relieve the burden of taxes from the shoulders of the agriculturists. The resolution was adopted unanimously that the library movement as it was prevalent in a State like Baroda should be introduced in the whole State so that the miserable percentage of literacy would be enhanced. The conference took notice of the backward conditions of the Adivasis and the Harijans and requested the well-to-do people to make contributions for starting a fund to bring about an upliftment in their conditions. The forced labour called Begar system extracted from the villagers against the orders of the Government was to be stopped and such officers as were accustomed to do so should be punished properly.

The Devadasi system that obtained in certain temples for periodical celebrations encouraged prostitution and therefore the Andhra Mahasabha expressed its deep concern regarding the matter and appealed to the people that such women should be married and rehabilitated as members of well-settled families. A resolution of the previous session was reiterated according to which people were requested to collect manuscripts and other materials in the form of pieces of art for rewriting the history of the country. The postal rates were recently enhanced. The Andhra Maha abha requested the Government to bring down the prices of the postcards, etc., to the previous level so that the people should be able to enjoy the benefits of the postal system.

The Andhra Mahasabha organised its session in 1934 at Khammamet under the presidentship of P. Venkata Ranga Rao. There were several resolutions passed expressing gratitude to the Government for carrying out beneficial reforms as remissions of taxes to cultivators

in areas where they were hard hit. Some of the interesting resolutions which revealed the aspirations of the people related to the suggestion to introduce Telugu as the language in the Munsif court and Registration offices, as in British India. The rights of the Balootedars were ordered to be protected by the Government but in practice a great neglect was shown. The conditions were much better in Sarf-i-Khas and so the Sabha made strong recommendation that these rules should be implemented even in Telangana Khalsa parts. A resolution was unanimously adopted recommending the utilisation of the religious cess collected by the merchants and traders towards the cause of education. The management of certain temples was entrusted to public committees. This move of the Government was appreciated by the people with a request that such a practice should be invariably introduced in all the temples. The weavers of th Khalsa area were exempted from paying any tax but this practice was inoperative in the Jagir areas. Government was requested to remove this discrimination in the Jagirs. M. Koteswara Rao was appointed to prepar a constitution for the Andhra Mahasabha early and get it sanctioned in the next session. A special ommitment had to be given by this Mahasabha t at resolutions insinuating criticism of the administration or bearing on politics should not be adopted. And yet it can be seen that several of these resolutions had touched upon politics.

The next session of the Andhra Mahasabha took place at Sirsilla in the Karimnagar district under the presidency of the veteran Andhra leader, Madapati Hanumantha Rao, in 1935. The Silver Jubilee of His Ex lted Highness the Nizam was impending and the Mahasabha unanimously adopted a resounding resolution praying for his long life and prosperity and expressing loyalty to the Ruler. A one-year plan was worked out for introducing libraries, disseminating education both for adults and children and methods of ensuring health and freedom from disease to the peopleand it was adopted in this conference. Essential resolutions like prohibitio and eradication of illiteracy were also adopted. Two taluks, Alampur and Kodangal, with a preponderance of Telugu, annexed to districts which were Kannada and Marathi, were to be associated with the Telugu-speaking district of Mahaboobnagar. This resolution had anticipated the

proposal of the States Reorganisation Committee. A resolution urging upon the Government the necessity of including Telugu-knowing officers in appointments to high key posts was also adopted. An interesting resolution relating to railway communications was passed. A request was made to start more trains running through Telangana area. Further, it was requested that there should be vigorous arrangements for maintaining cleanliness in the third class compartments, equipping them with many more outlets for exit and entrance as they were in the previous carriages. The perseverance displayed by the people and the leaders in Telangana to continue the practice of organising Mahasabhas annually deserved commendation.

The fifth session of the Andhra Mahasabha took place at Shadnagar under the presidentship of K. Venkata Ranga Reddy in 1936. Due to commitment to the Government, the resolutions passed in this conference did not have any political significance and were entirely free from the so-called virus of politics. The same old resolutions were reiterated with emphasis and the attention of the Government was invited towards their implementation very pointedly. One of the resolutions entreated the Government to conduct an economic survey of Telangana and enlist the services of public representatives for the purpose. The proposal to increase cattle wealth of the region also deserves special mention.

The sixth session of the Andhra Mahasabha took place at Nizamabad under the presidency of M. Narasing Rao in 1937. The most outstanding feature of this session was assertion of the attainment of Responsible Government and the expression of dissatisfaction with the impending reforms. One resolution requested the Government to devise ways and means for lightening the existing burden of agricultural indebtedness and one suggested that the tax the farmers had to pay for receiving irrigation water from the Nizam Sagar, should be calculated separately in proportion to the water received by the farms, the complaint being that though there was no adequate supply of water the cess that they had to pay was as heavy as ever. There was also a strong proposal for enhancing the number of post offices in the Telengana area.

The year 1938 has got a special significance in the political struggle for the attainment of democracy in the history of the Hyderabad State. The State Congress before

its birth was condemned by the Government as a communal body to be started under foreign influence of the Indian National Congress. The State Congress, therefore, had determined to actively protest against the Government order and start satyagraha. With such a declaration by the nationalist workers of the State Congress, other parties like the Arya Samaj and the Civil Liberties Union also became alert and under three different banners the people began to express their resentment against the repressive policy of the Government by starting satyagraha. Jails were being filled. Many of the enthusiastic workers of the Andhra Conference had participated in the satyagraha. Prominent among them may be mentioned; Ravi Narayana Reddy, M. Ramachandra Rao and N. K. Rao. It was but natural that the constitutional activities of the Andhra Conference should receive a setback when an outlet in the field of satyagraha was opened for their buoyant activities. When Ravi Narayana Reddy was released, perhaps he came into close contact with the Communist leaders of the British Andhra Pradesh. Differences began to appear and re-appear between nationalist leaders like M. Ramachandra Rao and Ravi Narayana Reddy. It is known to the students of history that the Communists looked upon the second world war as the peoples' war and struck a note different from the Congressities. These differences, though very mild at the beginning, created a split between the two groups. There was already a third group of liberal Nationalists, elderly persons who always liked to follow a "go-slow" policy. Some imprudent workers from all the groups were endeavouring to create a compromise among all the three groups. They succeeded in electing M. Ramachandra Rao President for the Seventh session held at Malkapur. Deliberations were focussed on the discussion of the merits and demerits of the Reforms announced by the Government and they were found to be quite unsatisfactory in toto. Even after such a compromise, the differences between them kept on corroding the unity. And the misunderstandings between well-settled elderly and educated workers and enthusiastic youngsters who had to struggle for their livelihood became serious. Ravi Narayana Reddy was elected President for the 8th session held at Chilkapur in 1941. The tussle between the two factions grew apace and began to appear more basic and fundamental. Narayana Reddy secured Ramakoteswara Rao of Warangal as President for the 9th

session held at Malkapur, district Warangal. Though the highest authority of the Andhra Conference was vested in the president, Narayana Reddy controlled all the activities and the Congress-minded nationalists had to be convinced to their amazement that they could not influence anything. The non-Communist group was persuaded towards the Quit India policy of the Indian National Congress, while the Communists were openly helping the war effort. The Hyderabad Government, hawk-eyed in watching its own interests, patronised the Communist workers and enlisted their services for war effort. At the tenth session held in 1943, the presidential election showed great bitterness. The young party set up B. Yalla Reddy for the presidentship while the Nationalist group had pitted against him the name of Venkata Ranga Reddy, a liberal Andhra leader. The Nationalist group succeeded in electing Venkata Ranga Reddy and defeating his opponent. But this did not mean smooth sailing in any form. The activities of the younger group were definitely antagonistic to the interests of the Zamindars and therefore the differences continued. The non-Communists became anti-Communists in the long run. This anti-Communist group consisted of Congress-minded youths, the bulk of whom were lawyers and middle-class gentry, naturally led by landlords and Jagirdars. The eleventh and the twelfth annual conferences were held at Bhuvanagiri and Khammam under the presidency of Narayana Reddy alone. Ideological differences compelled non-Communist sections to hold a separate conference at Madikonda in 1945. After the conclusion of the Second World War, the attitude of the Government of Hyderabad underwent a slight transformation. The Government did not give permission to the Communists to hold their session in 1946 when Yella Reddy who was in prison the was elected to presidentship. In 1946, the nationalist members of the Andhra Conference held their session at Kandi under the presidency of Jamalapuram Keshav Rao.

The history of all these activities of the Andhras in the Telugu districts of Hyderabad State clearly reveals the fact that the Government administration did not contribute to the fullest prosperity and progress of the people. The dissatisfied elements which had become politically conscious, lay latent to receive some igniting force and grow into a sort of conflagration on the proper occasion.

CHAPTER VI

THE FIRST HYDERABAD POLITICAL CONFERENC AT KAKINADA IN 1923

The All-India National Congress session and the Khilafat Conference together with numerous conferences were held at Kakinada during the Christmas week of the year 1923. A few officers of the C.I.D. from Hyderabad had proceeded to Kakinada to assist the Madras C.I.D. at their request. The main deliberations of the Indian National Congress did not relate to Hyderabad in any way. And yet, this session had a deep impact on Hyderabad. Owing to the breach in the east coast line of the Bengal-Nagpur Railway, most of the up-country and Bengal political leaders passed through Hyderabad on their way to Kakinada. Many of these patriotic leaders were warmly welcomed by the public at the Railway stations in the Hyderabad State. At some of the Railway stations, the Ali Brothers, Sarojini Naidu, C. R. Dass, and Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel made their speeches at the request of the people. Their speeches also were as harmless as possible for the hyperconscious political brains in Hyderabad. This year, as an extraordinary circumstance, several people from the State had gone to Kakinada; their number computed to be about 500 as visitors and about twenty-five as delegates. The most important matter relating to Hyderabad was that Vaman Naik, Raghavendrarao Sharma and Madapati Hanumantha Rao were busy in inducing people of Hyderabad to hold a political conference at Kakinada, the primary reason being that such a permission to hold the conference in the State had been denied to them.

Vaman Naik and his associates had erected a great pandal outside the Secunderabad Railway station, and grand welcome with decent arrangement of boarding and lodging was offered to enable the leaders to have relaxation.

Vaman Naik and his colleagues had planned to hold a political conference in the pandal erected for the volunteers conference at Kakinada under the presidentship of Sarojini Naidu. But this proposal was strongly opposed by Rai Bishesharnath and Abdul Kareem, pleader from Gulbarga, on the ground that no such a conference should

be held outside the Hyderabad Dominions without the knowledge and consent of the bulk of the Hyderabadi tion. But secret meetings were arranged and the opposi- population was brushed aside and a political conference did take place with Madhav Rao Aney of Yevatmal(Berar) in the chair, Sarojini Naidu having expressed apology for her inability to preside, she being very busy with the Subjects Committee of the Indian National Congress. Signatories of this political conference were Bisheshar-nath and Madapati Hanumantha Rao. The resolutions passed at the conference were as follows :—

Resolution No. 1.—That this public meeting of the subjects of His Exalted Highness now present at Kakinada most respectfully places on record its continued and devoted loyalty and fidelity to His Exalted Highness.

This proposal was put forward by Raghavendra Rao Sharma who explained that the meeting was held only for the purpose of reminding H.E.H. the Nizam of what he had already graciously promised. Messrs. Bisheshar-nath and P. V. Joshi supported the above resolution which was unanimously passed.

Resolution No. 2.—That this meeting most respectfully invites the attention of H.E.H. to the Firman graciously issued in Farwardi 1329 Fasli (1920) announcing the expansion of the Legislative Council and elected element therein and other liberal and far-reaching reforms and prays that orders be speedily issued to give effect to these reforms and new councils be formed by the next birthday of His Exalted Highness thus setting an example to other Indian States.

The above resolution No. 2 was put forward by Vaman Naik who said that in the year 1329 Fasli, Rai Balmukund Sahib was ordered to collect material for the formation of the Legislative Council on a large scale. He collected the required material and submitted his report long ago but no result had come out as yet, and therefore the meeting takes the liberty of reminding H.E.H. of what he was graciously pleased to promise of his own accord.

At this stage of the meeting, Abdul Kaeem, a pleader of Gulbarga, who was the only Muhammadan present among the audience, got up and again opposed the proceedings. The President called for order but the said gentleman persisted in giving vent to his thoughts

of disapproval of the meeting and proceeded to say that it was not right on the part of the organisers of the meeting who themselves belonged to Hyderabad to convene a political meeting of the subjects of the State outside the Hyderabad Dominions which was objectionable and a procedure like that was likely to incur the displeasure of their Ruler. He further continued that supposing H.E.H. did not grant what the meeting was asking for, what then were they prepared to do? Were they not creating such circumstances which may lead to the springing up of feelings regarding the local Government which are not prevalent in British India? (Some of the audience said that such was not their intention). Abdul Kareem then weighed the wording of the resolution under discussion and said that words used in the proposal led more or less to compulsion and seemed to hint at making it incumbent upon H.E.H. to act up to what he had only graciously announced. The few people present there were taking the announcement for a promise and seemed to exact its compliance. Abdul Kareem strongly opposed the proceedings in a short winding speech.

This was followed by a short address by Kashinath Rao Vaidya, pleader of Hyderabad, advocating some changes in the wording of the resolution and he suggested the following changes :—

The word 'promise' in the proposal should be substituted by the word 'announce' and the words 'Responsible Government' be totally withdrawn from the proposal. The original proposal read as follows :—

"That this meeting most respectfully invites the attention of His Exalted Highness to the Firman graciously issued in Farwardi 1329 Fasli (1920) promising Responsible Government and expansion....." etc.

After making the above changes suggested above by Kashinath Rao, the resolution was passed by the house.

N.B.—The words 'Responsible Government' were withdrawn because some of the audience questioned the sense and the extent of the application of these words.

"*Resolution No.* 3.—That in the interest of the benign Government and for the protection of His Exalted Highness's loyal subjects this meeting respectfully prays that the existing restriction on political meetings and press be removed as they are injurious to the formation of healthy

public opinion which is a potent weapon for controlling some of the practices recently condemned by His Exalted Highness the Nizam and which are eminently necessary for the effective participation of the subjects in the new reforms so graciously promised.

The above resolution No. 8 was put forward by Digambar Das, pleader of Aurangabad, who said that a great number of newspapers had been proscribed in His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Dominions and as everyone was eager to know what was going on in the world at large, this meeting requested His Exalted Highness to kindly remove those restrictions. As regards the holding of political meetings within the Hyderabad Dominions, he said that unless such restrictions were removed there was no possibility of a free public opinion which was the most important element for the good administration of the country and the working of such reforms as mentioned in the proposal No. 2. He further suggested that in view of the improvement of the Government the orders regarding the newspapers and the political meetings should be done away with, as these orders aimed at the suppression of public opinion. The speaker further continued that the Firman prohibiting political meetings in the State was issued in view of the then existing political circumstances which had changed now and therefore the restrictions placed under that Firman were unnecessary now. In no country where there was good Government should such a Firman exist and it was essential that full freedom be given to the press and the newspapers which can be of service to the State in such affairs as the Berar case which is going on at present. The public can freely discuss the Berar question in the newspapers and thus they can also express their approval of the King's desire and give their support. If such freedom was granted the people of Berar would themselves commence agitation to become a part and parcel of the Nizam's Dominions, because Berar was working vigorously for this sort of freedom. In concluding his speech, Digambar Das appealed to the audience to support the proposal with full enthusiasm and referring to the opposition made by Abdul Kareem he said that they had to convene that meeting at Kakinada because it was not possible to obtain permission to do the same inside the State. He further said that loyalty was but an ordinary thing and there are things much higher than loyalty which they cherished in their hearts for

their King and these were love and affection. The Kings of Hyderabad were always loved by their people who were ready to give even their lives and properties also for their present Ruler. To doubt their loyalty would be blasphemy on the part of anyone. They were really proud of their being the subjects of such a just Ruler.

The above proposal was then supported by one Swamy Rao of Bellary who said that he was very glad to see that the Hyderabadees were holding a meeting at Kakinada but the few that were assembled there would not be able to accomplish anything solid. What was being discussed was politics and public welfare and these could not successfully be worked out by a few men. Every man should take part and interest in such affairs and therefore everyone of Hyderabad should be allowed to express his opinion freely and to be acquainted with all that was passing outside his own State. The speaker further addressed :— "Your present Ruler has tried to educate you all sincerely but he has not been successful in this. He cannot possibly be aware of this unless the public are allowed to express their grievances freely. This is no fault of your King and it is the fault of the bureaucracy of Hyderabad. Why is education better in the city of Hyderabad than in the districts ? This is because the advanced people of the city expressed their thoughts freely whereas the masses of the districts are afraid to say anything against the bureaucracy and it is, therefore, necessary that they should be allowed and encouraged to express their feelings and opinions."

Then coming to bureaucracy the speaker said :—"The bureaucracy is fully aware of the fact that if the public were to be fully educated and enlightened they will have to suffer as it is they who can prey upon the ignorance of the masses. So, they take every step to stand between you and your Ruler. Your Ruler is really your greatest well-wisher. Your duty, therefore, is to work among and along with your people. You must make them understand that the King should be approached freely to express their grievances to him. Every district, every taluk and every village should do this. If the King comes to know the real state of affairs, he will, surely, attend to your welfare and comforts. Your Ruler cannot do it single-handed and it is necessary that you should join hands with him and help him in this case."

Abdul Kareem, Pleader of Gulbarga, got up again and opposed this proposal also saying that he did not agree with this and quoted the examples of a paper that had unscrupulously criticised the Government, and said that if freedom of speech and press were granted in Hyderabad, the Government and Ruler of Hyderabad would be placed in a similar predicament and the mischievous people would deliberately blunder in the use of these weapons. After this the proposal No. 3 was put to vote and passed by a majority.

Baba Saheb Paranjape of Berar then got up to suggest a new proposal that was not in the draft. He proposed that the Nizam's Government should enlist the favour of the people of Berar by giving responsible and representative Government to the people and said that if this was done the people of Berar would themselves try to come under the rule of His Exalted Highness the Nizam, as they were also trying their best for this form of Government which was being held away from them by the British Government. If H. E. H. the Nizam could give them what they wanted they would most willingly be his loyal subjects. This was a better and surer way to get Berar than spending lakhs and lakhs of rupees through Sir Ali Imam and his expensive undertaking. It was nothing but sheer waste of public money to try to get Berar back in the way that is being followed now. If the Nizam's Government continues as it is, a Berari would not be much enchanted at the idea of going under the Nizam's rule. On the other hand, if the Nizam's Dominions got the suggested form of Government they can be quite sure that the Beraris will also speedily begin agitation to go under the Nizam. This is the only way to get the Beraris back and this way alone can be depended upon to gain the support of the people of Berar and their willingness to come under the rule of the Nizam.

The President in his remarks said that although he was a native of Berar he was indirectly a subject of H.E.H. the Nizam. He was very glad that he was fortunate to be present at a conference of the Hyderabadees and felt honoured by being elected the President for the occasion and had every sympathy with them. The meeting dissolved after unanimously carrying the last resolution to authorise the President of the meeting to submit the above resolutions to His Exalted Highness the Nizam which was done by telegram.

CHAPTER VII

THE SECOND HYDERABAD POLITICAL CONFERENCE AT BOMBAY IN 1926

The second political conference of the Hyderabad State was held at Bombay in the last week of November, 1926. Datto Appaji Tuljapurkar was the Chairman of the Reception Committee and Y. M. Kale, the great scholar of Berar, presided over the deliberations.

Y. M. Kale said he was a Berari and was assailed by the "dread of being retransferred to H.E.H. the Nizam's Dominions." He continued :—

"Those of us who visited these territories, as I did and studied the situation, could not but deplore the lot of the Hyderabad subjects and especially that of the Hindus. It was with one voice therefore that the Hindus of Berar refused to go under H.E.H. the Nizam's rule but I may better restrict myself to the present subject."

He described the culture of Hyderabad State and stated, "It was built on a solid Hindu bed-rock. Herein are situated the Ellora Caves and the Ajanta Paintings combining the ancient Hindu and Buddhist cultures." He explained the composition of the population and remarked :—

"The dominating languages are thus Telugu and Marathi; Urdu being the language of only 1/10 of the population and mostly restricted to big cities. It is common knowledge that both Telugu and Marathi are cultured languages having plenty of literary merit and will stand compa ison with any of the spoken languages of India."

He took a survey of the administration of the Hyderabad State during the last hundred years and eulogized the saintly character of Mir Mahboob Ali Khan, the 6th Asaf Jah. As regards Mir Osman Ali Khan, Kale said :—

"With the present Nizam, H.E.H. Mir Osman Ali Khan, came a change. He is a man of remarkable energy

and intelligence, though all the energy is misguided. Educated in the modern style and devoting his personal attention to the minutest details of administration he has improved the finances of the State and imported some competent and educated men into the administration. With them, however, came, though these could not continue in office very long, the spirit which seems to have accentuated the ruler's new and young zeal for Muslim religion and culture and we find a systematic and well-planned effacement of all tha is Hindu."

The Berari president explained the money grabbing policy thus:

"Without even the semblance of a judicial trial he has deprived several of his Noblemen and Jagirdars of their properties and reduced them to a state of penury. Such instances have already been exposed in newspapers and many more must be in existence. The Hindus and Muslims have suffered alike, perhaps, the Muslim nobility being larger in number, has suffered more."

About the *Nazarana* system he said: "The *Nazar* system has already become a scandal. Large amounts are screwed out under this outwardly innocent name. The old system of *Nazarana* consisted of small presents made on rare and auspicious occasions and was never made an object of pecuniary gain. It is the practice in big circles, only to touch the presents whatever they are, in token of acceptance and return them sometimes with a counter gift of a larger money value. Here we find a systematic campaign, arranged by subordinate officers, of recovering large amounts under this name as if it were a tax and people are taken in numbers to the ruler's camp and regular fees recovered. All the money goes, not to the State coffers, but to the private chest of the ruler and does not come back to the people in any form. At one time, collections called '*Chanda*' were made in order to buy off Berar, as it was given out. These forcible and unlawful collections raised such an uproar even amongst the mute millions of the Dominions that these collections were ordered by a Firman to be returned to the donors. This must have been probably brought about by pressure from outside. How much of this amount really went back into the hands of the Riayat, nobody can say for certain. But even after this Firman

the *Nazarana* system goes on as before. Some eye-witnesses at the recent tour of Aurangabad and Jalna have told that the *Nazars* for having a look at the ruler were rated from Rs. 100 in the beginning to Re. 1 in the end and all the while the Government officers were busy in bringing people to have a darshan of the Huzur."

The Nizam ruled through his Firmans and public meetings were banned in the State.

He added, "Freedom of press within the dominions is also unknown. Inside the dominions no free speech is allowed and if external help is offered it is stigmatised as outside interference and as such disallowed. Thus there is a systematic and well-planned tyranny that is practised. The people are always terrified, and demoralised and are afraid of speaking even privately."

A scheme for introducing reforms was announced. A committee was appointed and outlines were drawn, but:

"There seems to be no intention on the part of the Nizam to make any further advance in the matter; perhaps it was intended as a lure to the Beraris who were promised full provincial autonomy and as an earnest of the same and to show the good faith of the proposal some such announcement was deemed necessary. The difficulty, however, is that there is no lawful way of enforcing the fulfilment of this promise and it is not likely that the Nizam will yield to any pressure from within or from without."

The President closed his address with the following remarks:

"One word remains to be said and that is about the attitude of our Muslim brothers in the British Provinces. The Hindus and Muslims have long been working hard to bring about unity and to develop a common national feeling. Though this is marred by occasional outbursts of selfish and communal jealousies, the sober elements of both communities know full well that only a wider outlook will ultimately benefit both. The Muslims should not try to exploit the religious bigotry of a particular ruler but should try to help their Hindu brethren in the States and outside, if they can do so. The present Muslim attitude towards the misrule and oppression in

Hyderabad is in direct contrast with that visible at the time of the agitation against the Indore Maharaja and his misrule. Most of the Muslim leaders have failed to show any sympathy for the suffering humanity in Hyderabad. Whenever attempts are made to expose the misrule in Hyderabad some short-sighted people have even gone to the length of charging the Hindus of engineering an agitation against the Nizam, because he is a Muslim. Nothing can be farther from truth. We have as much reverence for a Muslim ruler as we have for the Hindu Rajas, but when religious intolerance is taken to its farthest limit, it is the common interest of both Hindus and Muslims alike to try sincerely to remedy the evil. The utterances at the "Nizam Conference" at Lahore and its recent echo from Allahabad together with the writings of some Muslim papers are no wonders in the present communal atmosphere and we might look to the day when our Muslim brothers treat Hindu interests with as much concern as their own and *vice versa*. There are honourable exceptions to this and nobody should take this as a general indictment of Muslim leaders. We request both Hindus and Muslims alike to help the subjects of Hyderabad in their present struggle."

CHAPTER VIII

THE THIRD HYDERABAD POLITICAL CONFERENCE AT POONA IN 1928

The third Hyderabad Political Conference held at Poona in the first week of May, 1928 was a very bold adventure which deeply and enormously impressed the thoughtful people all over India. L. B. Bhopatkar was the Chairman of the Reception Committee and N. C. Kelkar was the President. Netajee Subhash Chandra Bose had honoured the session not only by his presence but even by making a short but brilliant speech on the occasion. Raghavendra Rao Sharma was the moving spirit and the live-wire behind all the functions.

The first session was held at Kakinada in 1923 under the presidency of Madhav Rao Aney, the second in Bombay with Y. M. Kale as President, both of whom were Beraris. The Conference commenced on the 5th May, 1928. Bhopatkar while welcoming the delegates said in parts :— "This is the 3rd session of the Hyderabad Political Conference and should really have been held in some part of the Hyderabad State but owing to many insurmountable difficulties it is being held in Poona. This is sufficient to show the difference between British India and the Native States. The subjects in British India can give vent to their grievances and difficulties but the rulers of the States who are our own flesh and blood prohibit the exercise of such a right by their subjects. It has, therefore, become all the more urgent to hold conferences like the Hyderabad Political Conference. The whole of India is full of States whose population is not a negligible factor. British India and the States are divided only by artificial partitions, for any number of examples where the people of both the parts are closely related to one another may be found. It is, indeed, a matter for wonder that these people should be separated by such artificial boundaries. In British India, men have the right to speak and assemble but beyond these artificial limits, a man becomes dumb, blind, has not the right to assemble nor even to consider (over his) grievances. In British India, we are agitating for a democratic government and if this is not done in States also, the Swaraj in British

with the Hyderabad State and my province also knows something about it. The goal of the Congress is to establish a democratic Government. In British India we have the white bureaucracy or autocracy but in the Native States the people have to fight with the brown bureaucracy or autocracy. The character of both is much the same and therefore our cause too is the same. We are all striving for the establishment of a democratic Government. British India realised that it was not possible to enjoy human rights unless a declaration of rights was made. All Indians have felt by now, that without a declaration of rights any constitution is not worth the paper on which its constitution is written. Such a declaration is, therefore, very necessary to secure freedom of speech, press and person. Till now the Congress has not done much for States subjects beyond sympathising with their aspirations. Our hands are already full owing to our fight with the white bureaucracy and hence the Congress has not been able to do much. The time is coming when people all over India will take an increasing interest in the mal-administration of States. It is very necessary to hold such conferences where people of British India and States can assemble together and deliberate upon such matters. The Indian States must come in for one and the same administration and this is not possible until a democratic administration is established, for the division of the States from British India is only an artificial one. This problem is not so acute in Bengal where there are only one or two first class States. It is necessary, however, even for Bengalis to take a more interesting and larger part in this agitation. I assure you that the Congress has full sympathy with the cause of the people of Native States. We can imagine their dangers, difficulties and grievances. In future, the Congress will do something tangible for them. There is no reason why Congress committees should not be formed in States in future, whether the rulers welcome these committees or not. The subjects have a right to possess Congress committees and thus become integral parts of one whole organisation. I, therefore, thank you all and hope that we will be enabled to do something more tangible and take more interest in our brothers of the States."

Raghavendra Rao Sharma read several messages of sympathy and goodwill; prominent among them were

those of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, K. T. Mathew of the All-India Native States Subjects' Conference, Satyamoorty from Madras and Vaman Naik from Hyderabad.

N. C. Kelkar made an extempore speech as President. His address was free, frank and fearless. Said he: "I thank you all for the honour you have done me in electing me the President. I am not a subject of the Hyderabad State and if anybody questions my right to be the President, he would be only on the right. I see a large number of persons from the Hyderabad and other States and it cannot be said that this is only a congregation of Poona people. They wanted me to preside and I accepted their proposal. A pertinent question arises here as to why this conference is being held in Poona and not in the Hyderabad State. It is really painful and disgraceful that in a vast State having a population of 1½ crores and an area of thousands of square miles there should be no place for the State Conference and it should wander about like orphans and come outside the State limits to hold their sessions. This is shameful but there are 3 partners in this disgrace. The first partner is the Government of Hyderabad which has added to its disgrace by not considering as to what the people are going to ask. For, after all, at the most they would ask for good Government (Swarajya) and if even this is denied then the Government should certainly bend down its head. It has no brains nor are there any good advisers. Further, there is none strong enough to put some sense in the head of the Nizam who when he realises that in the enormous State like that of Hyderabad there is no place for the people to hold their conference he will surely have to bend down his head in disgrace. The second partner is the British Government which is said to be the Suzerain power. They have the least hesitation to interfere in the administration of States when it suits their interest. I am sure that today there is such a heap of correspondence in the Residency about the mal-administration in the State that four asses would not be able to bear its burden, not to mention as to how many asses prepared it (laughter). But the result of all this is nothing. However, when required, details of any case shall come out all right from the heap of correspondence. They will only show it to the Ruler to frighten him for their own self-interest. They have never asked the Ruler as to why he did not permit his subjects to have their conference when they are roaming

about like orphans in jungles. They never told the ruler "See, our own subjects scold us. If you want to have power, you must hear all this. We have authority and you too, have some. We are the Imperial Government and ten times greater than you are. We permit our people to hold their conferences and why then do you deny this elementary right to your people?" The British Government can ask the Nizam's Government all this but it is their aim to conserve these States like the backyards of our houses. They would enter these reserved States at will and hunt what they like and take anything by force. What is disgraceful to be done here in British India will be done by them in the States. They will not do anything by themselves. In the Montagu Chelmsford Reform scheme they touched upon this subject and did not omit. But even there, they have unknowingly given out their intentions. Instead of comparing the reforms to spring-time, the cool breezes and similar beautiful things they have likened it to a fire in a house and they tell the princes that when a house is on fire the neighbouring house is also in danger. We, however, say "Let both the sides burn. We will have new houses." Thus the British Government could get things done by force but they don't do it. The third partner in this disgrace is the class of the State subjects themselves. Have people in any part of the world come by their rights without pain and difficulty? In British India people were hanged, sent to jail and harassed. Although things are done here under the holy name of law, yet people die all the same. The British Indian people got their rights in this manner. The States' people must remember this. If they agitate, a thousand or 500 persons may be sent to jail in big States but nothing will be done in smaller States. In British India we have the Andamans. Did not Savarkar go to the Andamans and return? Did he do it for himself? Why don't you people start agitation inside the State? If you agitate and write in our papers they are at once proscribed and we are thus put to some loss. You must suffer and prepare yourselves even for Satyagraha. Outside agitation is not the proper path. Do not assume a stern attitude at once. You must start in the same manner as we did at the commencement. I tell you as a friend that you must not go about your work as we are doing now. You must take up the resolution of loyalty first. Please your Ruler as much as you can but at the same time

do not lose sight of your goal. Enter Government service and do not take any extreme measures. Break the law but do not say anything against the Ruler individually or any of his people. But put forth the public demands. Here also we do not attack any person individually but we deal with them as Governors, Commissioners and Collectors. Further, do not promote ill-feelings between different communities. Do not stop when you are speaking out your grievances but speak carefully. In this way, you will get the sympathy of all and establish yourself firmly in your States. Give up this nomadic attitude and establish yourself firmly in your States. People are sure to be with you. These three are the partners and when all the three feel the shame, we will have State Conferences within the States themselves.

"When we enter this agitation, one is likely to object that the agitation is being carried on because Hyderabad is a Muslim State. I was president of the Hindu Mahasabha and now am the president of the Hyderabad Conference. But let me assure you that I would have been the president of this Conference even before this if only I wanted it. I was not waiting for the Hindu Sabha before becoming the president of this Conference. It is merely a coincidence. Everyone knows that I have been working for the State propaganda for the last 8 years. If this objection is to be raised how can one explain away the work that I have done during the last seven years. We are not agitating only against Muslim States but also against a larger number of Hindu States. For the pleasure of persecuting 37 Muslim States are we going to harm 526 Hindu States? We do not say what all the Hindu States do is pardonable. Our first attack was on a Hindu State and Muslim States came in only later on. If anyone can guarantee that the Muslims of Hyderabad who form 1/10th of the population there are not troubled, we are prepared to keep quiet. But even this is not the actual state of affairs. Again, there are States where the Brahmin and non-Brahmin question is raked up. There is, therefore, no Hindu-Muslim sentiment in the agitation against Hyderabad. It is the biggest State in India and cannot be neglected. When there is the moon and you look at the sky it is not possible to see only the sun without seeing the moon. How can you neglect such a big State which has a population of 125 lakhs equal to that of 15 or 20 of our districts. The State is as big as one of

our provinces and hence, there is no reason why it should be overlooked. Mr. Sharma is the one untiring individual who is carrying on this fight. On the day he left Hyderabad, he swore that he would not stop this agitation until he returned to Hyderabad as he had left it. Anyhow, why should he stop it even after his return ? He swore that he would not go to jail alone and said ' The Nizam is on one side and I am on the other. Let me see what the Nizam will do.' Had he ventured into the State alone, he would have been shut up in some unseen corner. But the example of Hyderabad is like that of the birds that were caught in a net and as individual attempts were of no avail they decided to fly united and thus go away with the net that had caught them. I would, therefore, not advise his going into the State alone. All the credit of this agitation is due to him. A certain gentleman assured Mr. Raghavendra Rao Sharma that he would see that he is quite safe if he enters the State and that nobody touches him. Let us wait and see. I will not say much about Hyderabad now, for you will hear much of it in the afternoon from those who have a direct knowledge of things there. This agitation has commenced as a result of the agitation in British India. We are not going to be mindful of the artificial borders when we do not feel them. There is no reason why we should recognise these partitions. The men in States and in British India are not after all different. And if our agitation brings about reform in the State we will put the Britishers to shame. We are waiting to find examples of Swarajya amongst these States. All that the State people want is Swarajya and we will put the Englishmen to shame even when there is the constitution of England. It is only such nominal monarchy. Besides this, the States' subjects should have representative institutions. There are two classes of men in this agitation. One class wants to drown the States altogether. We must have some idea of propriety. I am of the opinion that States must remain for they are memories of our great ancestors. Why should we lose the emblems of these glorious memories? Some say they were "Pindaris." But what of Englishmen and how did they get their empire ? When the Archaeological Department is digging out old graves why should these States go? Holkar was a shepherd and became a sardar in one generation. It is only a proof of the saying that every soldier carries the emblem of the Field Marshal in

his knapsack. He is a relic of our bravery. Why lose this relic ? The third reason why I am in favour of the States is the danger of Communists who say we don't want capitalists. If anybody asks us to give our motor car or takes away what our forefathers earned we question him " Who are you to do all this ? You were born of a 'Fakir' and you have become a Raja. Is this small luck ?" To keep these States in existence is not a small affair. Italy got its independence only through a State which was the first to advance. If tomorrow we get a good Nizam, will it be a small matter ? We will put him forward even as Peidmont led Italy. The physical resources of these States are ours. Who can say what is there in the womb of time? Liberty had once come out of the womb of time in this very Poona. The treasure and the resources of the States will be at our disposal when our States improve and we can have a model to put the British Government to shame. We will tell them, 'Here we have 16 annas (full) Swarajya and not the 8 annas Swarajya with the steel frame of the Civil Service.' But the worst is also coming. We must tell the Princes, 'If you want to live do so properly. Otherwise, we do not mind even if you die.' The rulers of the States are really unfortunate when they lose the opportunity of getting the blessings of the people of such vast States. Hyderabad has got full Diwani powers and criminal powers. You have thus powers over the life, honour and property of the people. No appeal against the Hyderabad Government is heard by the British authorities except in stray cases. When you want to wield such benign powers you must also shoulder equally big responsibilities. Your subjects must have councils and representative institutions. But they are content with little and they would be happy even if you use your present authority properly. What the Raja writes is the law. If a ruler is fond of a planchet what the devil says would be law. In States, the deeds of the Princes have preference over law. Law comes out of your Princes like the nails of your hands or the hair on your body, like the smoke from the fire and so on. But still your subjects are prepared to be happy under such conditions. Even under these circumstances, the Princes have set aside the aspirations of their subjects and have started an agitation of their own by engaging a lawyer for 20 lakhs of rupees with a view to see that no interference

shall be made in their high-handed rule. This is akin to a conference of thieves who passed a res lution strongly disapproving the method of lighting the railway carriages in tunnels or like a conference of tigers that passed a resolution condemning the system of tying animals in safe cattle-shed at night. There is no limit to the amount of their zulum. These 20 lakhs of rupees are being spent from the State revenues and not out of th ir private purse and all this for carrying on agitation against their s bjects. There was a system in Europe according to which a man condemned to be shot for treason was made to dig his own grave first and then made to stand on the brink of the grave and shot so that he dropped dead into the grave dug with his own hands. The attempts of the Princes are of a similar nature and the people should, therefore, give a little attention to these activities. But they are not even prepared to subscribe for a paper that is run here in their cause. Is this money also to be paid by the British Indians to show the States subjects their faults as it is our duty to speak for them. Until you stand on your own legs how can you hope to be successful and how far can others help you? If you cannot even stand on your legs the only course for you is to keep quiet and please your Ruler as you can. I have thus spoken on the main principles of this agitation and the actual facts about Hyderabad could be heard this afternoon from actual sufferers. We do not mean the Princes ill but on the other hand bear them goodwill. We feel for any reasons that they must continue to live. They can have all their powers but give only Surajya first and Swarajya later on. We are prepared to admit our faults when our Rajas will discuss the matter with us. Some Rulers say that they are very small but all the same they want to wield the powers of the Nizam. We have got our declaration after hundreds of difficulties, but we have taught even our Emperor the Sanskrit word "Swarajya." Can we not teach the same to our own Princes who have Sanskrit mouths. If they accept a fixed private income, we are prepared to make every provision for their comfort, dignity and superiority. Has not after all even the republic a President? I have spoken on general principles and have left minor details for the afternoon."

About 16 resolutions were passed. The resolution number one was moved by Y. M. Kale, President for the

previous session at Bombay. He said, that the resolutions passed at the Bombay session along with other relevant material were forwarded to the Nizam's Government and also the British Government. The latter had the courtesy to acknowledge the receipt while the former did not acknowledge it even. In such cases it was the duty of the paramount power to enquire into the complaints and use pressure until the people were in a position to look after themselves. It was really disgraceful that the British Government did not give an interview to the Hyderabad Subjects' Deputation. If they could not grant such simple requests, they were not fit to settle the disputes. It was their duty to hold impartial enq iries by allowing both the subjects and the Rulers to avail them selves of the material that was with them.

Chapter IX

THE FOURTH HYDERABAD POLITICAL CONFERENCE AT AKOLA IN 1931

The fourth Political Conference of the subjects of the Hyderabad State was held at Akola in August 1931 under the presidentship of Ramachandra Naik, the chairman of the reception committee being Sirajul Hasan Tirmizee. The address of Justice Ramachandra Naik approved td be quite realistic.

Regarding the venue of the Conference the President said :—

"It is most unfortunate that we had to leave our jurisdiction and come here for this noble and good cause. One consolation is that we have not come to absolute strangers nor had we to go beyond the legal limits of our State. You all know that Akola at one time was part and parcel of Hyderabad and for all we know it may have been some unknown force, the result of our old associations, that made us decide on this place, and seek help from the people of Akola which they have so readily given."

Describing the conditions in the Hyderabad State he remarked :—

"Liberty of speech and association are elementary rights of the people. In Hyderabad nothing has caused more dissatisfaction than the so-called Police Gashti (Circular) under which no public meeting can be held unless a ten day's previous notice is given to the Police Commissioner in Hyderabad and the Collectors in the districts and their permission is obtained. No doubt in some States such orders have been issued, but in Hyderabad we feel it most because Hyderabadis maintain that they are exceptionally law-abiding people. When there was trouble all over India and other Native States, Hyderabad was particularly peaceful and law-abiding. When there was freedom of speech the people of Hyderabad said or did nothing which necessitated such a Gasthi. In fact the Hyderabad people have re. eatedly challenged

the Government to show anywhere more law-abiding and loyal people."

He traced the history of the State and commended the speciality of the composite culture of the State. Coming to the present, he said the following about education :

"Though the Government is spending as much as Rs. 78½ lakhs, the percentage of the educated people is on'y 3½. A good lot of the money is being spent in trying an experiment by imparting education in a vernacular language (Urdu) though the mother-tongue of the majority of the subjects is not Urdu. The heads of the expenditure are not proportionate. Most of the money is spent in the capital city and for the payment of high salaries and in renting buildings, and in translating books, etc. Even these high salaried officers are imported from outside. In fact, those who know anything of Hyderabad know that the Education Department is the least in touch with the people, whereas it ought to have the greatest sympathy with and should consist mostly of the people of the State."

Giving statistics, he said :—"Primary schools do not exist in villages of 2,000 to 3,000 population; 115 villages of 1,000 to 2,000 population; 2,988 villages of 500 to 1,000 population. No account is taken of the villages below 500."

About women's education, he remarked :—

"There are no high schools for girls whose mother-tongue is not Urdu and these constitute about 85 per cent of the population. Even in the capital itself though there are three Government high schools for girls, not even one of them makes provision for the t aching of Telugu, Marathi and Kanarese, the principal vernaculars of the State to the would-be mothers. As a result of all this, in spite of the enormous increase in the expenses of the Education Department, the number of literates has not increased. There ought to be provided a sufficient number of primary schools and a law passed for the compulsory and free education of boys and girls of school going age. Even for adults, schools must be started on the lines adopted by Turkey

and other countries of Europe, thus giving every youth a chance to educate himself and to enable him to make the best use of his abilities."

Dealing with public health, Naik said:—

"The health of the people is sadly neglected. The number of people dying of consumption is daily increasing. Plague and influenza pay almost yearly visits, the death rate is on the increase, there is scarcity of hospitals and dispensaries, there is no adequate provision of maternity homes. No doubt, there is a Director of Physical Culture with the required staff but they do not appear to have spread their activities much outside the capital city."

Regarding the administration of the State, he remarked:—

"We know that the modern tendency is to have a system of Government where the greater number of mind, knowing the most about the State and having the fullest opportunity of knowing the same have control over it. Our Ruler recognised this as long as 12 years ago when he issued a Farman in which he stated that he no longer finds it advisable to have a mere personal rule in his State and therefore formed an Executive Council to help him in this work. And what is more, he put his ideas into practice and we find he now rarely interferes with the decision of the Council. But the object of the Ruler will not be gained unless the Council contains some representatives of the people and is made subject to the control of the Legislature."

Justice Naik's speech was comprehensive and it dealt with Legislative Council, Federation, Agriculture, Industries, Municipalities, Military and Police, Finance, Banking and Business, Local Self Government, Religious toleration, the Press, Excise and Customs, Justice and Jagirdars.

About the Judicial Department, he remarked:—
"In our Judicial Department sufficient attention is not paid to the knowledge of the vernaculars. Officers must know sufficient vernaculars to be able to take down the depositions of the witnesses in the local vernaculars. In

our State, we find, cases take a long time to be decided. There are instances where the cases have been dragging on for scores of years, though I must say sincere attempts are being made nowadays to expedite the work. I think some drastic measures have to be adopt d to tackle this question. I would like to bring one fact to the notice of the Government and that is the present arrangement of the Judicial Committee, the highest judicial tribunal of the State. Appeals from the High Court go to the Judicial Committee but the Judges of the Court are also the Judges of the Judicial Committee and it often happens that the judgement of the three senior-most and experienced judges of the High Court is upset by the three most junior judges of the same Court only sitting in a different place. We must have permanent judges fully qualified and experienced for the Judicial Committee. Again the office of the Legal Adviser and that of the President of the Judicial Committee, the highest tribunal in the State, are combined in one and the same person. This is an anomaly which should not be allowed to continue any longer. The same person cannot advise and be a judge at the same time."

He concluded his speech in the following strain :—

"Last, but not least, to our Ruler, whose extraordinary ability and capacity for hard work and whose simple habits are recognised by everyone and are the pride of his people, whose reign has been made glorious by the construction of various public buildings and huge reservoirs and who has given liberal grants for many other objects of public utility and who has put a stop to various injurious customs in the State, my respectful and humble appeal is that he may graciously be pleased to order that immediate steps be taken for the inauguration of the Legislative Council on modern lines and thus lay the foundations of a representative form of government which will further contribute to the happiness of his beloved subjects and make his reign still more glorious and such as will gratefully be remembered and honoured by posterity."

Chapter X

GROWTH OF JOURNALISM AND THE NATIONAL SPIRIT IN HYDERABAD

The first Telugu journal was started in 1912 by Srinivas Sharma from Mahboobnagar district. For the purpose of printing the journal, he also started a printing press called "Sarojini Vilas". It was a great achievement that in spite of the widespread illiteracy, the paper had nearly 500 subscribers. While it dealt mostly with social, economic and agricultural problems, underlying them there was a current of nationalist thought.

Srinivas Sharma was a great Sanskrit scholar and an eminent Ayurvedic doctor. He, therefore, brought to bear his learning on all articles that appeared in the paper. It is said that because of the paper and the press, he sustained a great loss which he tried to make good by starting an amateur dramatic club called "Veeraloka Nataka Mandali." In spite of all these efforts, the paper could not flourish and it had to be closed down within a period of two years.

In 1917, Swami Venkat Rao of the Divine Life Society there started a monthly journal called *Andhra Math* from Secunderabad which was printed at the Jagadishwara Printing Press, Gowliguda, Hyderabad. While the journal was mostly devoted to the propaganda of the ideals of the Divine Life Society, it contained a feature which was semi-political and made comments on the policies of the Government in various matters. The journal could not survive beyond eight months.

In 1920, Vediraju Seetaramchander Rao and his brother Raghava Ranga Rao started a Telugu weekly called *Telugu Patrika* from Enugurthi village in the Warangal district. These brothers were eminent scholars of Sanskrit and Telugu. This weekly also had 500 subscribers. It could not survive beyond five years. In these five years, it rendered valuable service in cultural and social fields.

In 1920, a political worker Shahnavis Narasimha Rao started a weekly called *Neelagiri* from the Nalgonda

district. He was not like Srinivas Sharma or the Vedíraju brothers, a great scholar, but he seems to have had enough political knowledge and more than enough command over Telugu and Urdu languages. From a purely political point of view, *Neelagiri* was the first paper that raised its voice of protest against the autocratic rule of the then Government and demanded more freedom of speech and of association. The Government did not take any action against the paper but there are reasons to believe that the editor himself was subjected to harassment for his political opinions. With great effort, Narasimha Rao conducted the paper for five years. In 1920, another paper was started called the *Andhrabhyudayam* which was published for three years and closed down. The details of this journal are not known. From a village in the Atraf Balda District, a monthly journal called a *Desh-bandhu* was started which came out for three years and then closed down

In December 1923, a monthly journal was started from Warangal. Mudigonda Veeresalinga Sastri was the editor of this journal which was called *Saiva Pracharini* It was founded by the eminent exponent of the Siva cult Sri Kadimaila Rajalingaradhya. Though it was essentially a magazine of Shaiva religion, it opposed the restrictions imposed by the Government on freedom of religious practices. It continued as a monthly journal for four years and then was converted into a fortnightly.

The eminent scholar Shri Buchiah Linga Shastri started a monthly magazine called *Saivamani* from Secunderabad which was printed in its own press called " Panchakshari Press. " Details of its contents are not known.

In 1925, Sri Bhaskar started a bi-weekly from Secunderabad called *Nedu.* It was a bi-lingual published in English and Telugu. It brought to bear a pronounced nationalist outlook on the politics of Hyderabad. It continued for a couple of years and then ceased publication.

In the same year, the eminent leader Bhagya Reddy started a fortnightly calledthe *Bhagyanagar Patrika* which in the first instance, continued for two years when Bhagya Reddy had to go to Mysore for reasons of health and the paper ceased publication. After a couple of years, when Bhagya Reddy returned from Mysore,

he revived the paper under a different name. He called it the *Adi Hindu Patrika* which he brought out as a weekly. His health was so bad that he could not bear the strain of journalism and the paper had to be closed down after six months. It is needless to state that both the papers edited by Bhagya Reddy were clearly political inasmuch as he himself took a prominent part in the political activities of the State along with the eminent leaders like Vaman Naik and Keshav Rao.

1925 marks the beginning of a new era in the political life of Telangana, inasmuch as, it was in that year that the Andhra Mahasabha came into existence and also in the same year the *Golkonda Patrika* was started by Suravaram Pratapa Reddy as a bi-weekly. The birth of the *Golkonda Patrika* also saw the death of the *Telugu Patrika* and *Neelagiri*. The services of the *Golkonda Patrika* are too well known to require further recounting. Suffice to say that Suravaram Pratapa Reddy was one of the pioneers of the political movement in the State who braved all storms for the cause which he had willingly espoused. In 1927, P. N. Sharma (who is now a Sessions Judge) started a monthly called *Sujata*. This journal continued for three years. It was a joint enterprise of P. N. Sharma, Suravaram Pratapa Reddy and Madapati Hanumantha Rao. In 1930, *Sujata* was closed down and when accounts were finalised, it was found that they had incurred a loss of Rs. 200 each.

In 1934, Dattatreya Sharma started a monthly from Secunderabad called the *Deccan Kesari* which was bi-lingual, that is, it came out in Telugu and English. In 1936, another monthly was started from Secunderabad which was called *1936*. It closed down after its first publication. Shrimati Rachamalla Satyavati Devi started another monthly from Secunderabad called the *Telugu Talli*, which came out for a year and then closed down. In the same year, the great scholar Veerabhadra Sharma started another monthly from Secunderabad called the *Vibhuti* which was conducted for three years, when it was closed down as the editor went away to Kashi. In 1937, Chivukula Appaiah Sastry who was a Sanatanist, started a weekly called the *Divyavani Patrika*. It was essentially anti-progressive in socio-economic matters and fairly progressive in political matters. Devulapalli Ramanuja Rao started a monthly called the *Shobha* from Warangal

district which played quite a prominent role, but for reasons of finances, it had to be closed down within one year.

The only Telugu paper with a clear political outlook and which supported the Congress was the *Golkonda Patrika*. From 1938 to 1945, we do not find any new Telugu paper, political or otherwise, being published. In 1945, after a great deal of difficulty, permission was granted to bring a Telugu monthly called *Tarnai* which was mostly literary in its content. Chilla Subba Rao was responsible for its production. In this period, the Government was a little favourable to the communists and permission was granted to the communists to start a Telugu Weekly called The *Andhra Kesari*.

The *Deccan Kesari* was a monthly journal in Telugu brought out from Secunderabad which continued its publication for four years. The name of the editor and the details of the contents of the journal are not known.

Qazi Abdul Gaffar, the eminent man of letters and the editor of the *Payam* started a Telugu daily called *Sandeshamu* in 1945 which had hardly a life of six months.

1945 also saw the birth of two Telugu Dailies namely the *Telangana* and the *Meezan*. the *Telangana* was financed by Rajagopal Mudaliar and *Meezan* by Calcuttawala. The *Telangana* was edited by a very talented journalist B. R. Chari and *Meezan* by a well-known man of letters, Adavi Bapi Raju. The *Telangana* tried to support the nationalist movement but had to close down within a couple of years. The *Meezan* was essentially a daily of feudal outlook and supported the activities of the Government. Shri Adavi Bapi Raju had to quit-*Meezan* when the financier asked him to attack the Congress in indecent language. The *Meezan* continued its publication till the Police Action in 1948.

Hyderabad Herald

Syed Asadulla, the younger brother of Dr. Syed Abdul Latif of the Osmania University, had started a paper the *New Era* at Hyderabad but it was suppressed by order of the Executive Council. Later, he started a weekly paper called the *Hyderabad Herald*. at Madras Its first issue was published on the 10th of August 1931.

An article titled "Enormous Wastage of Money" stated that 21 lakhs of rupees were spent in connection with the Second Round Table Conference, so also 50 lakhs of rupees on Palair Wyra projects out of which Wyra was mere waste due to leakage. The tar roads of the City laid at the expense of Rs. 80,000 per mile were in need of repairs the very next year.

There were 35 European Officers who drew eight and half lakhs of rupees annually. They were paid in British Indian Currency. These arrangements were against the recommendation of the Salaries Commission. There was one Mr. Benton, Deputy Director, C.I.D., who was paid more allowances than his basic pay. Mr. Pickthall, the Director, Information Bureau, drew the attention of Mr. Trench, the Police Member. The question was discussed in the Council and in the meanwhile the paper was disallowed to come into the State and then the matter was dropped.

THE *Nizam Vijay* AND THE *Golkonda Patrika.*

In the meeting of the External Relations Committee held on the 24th July 1932, it was resolved that the Political Department should obtain the views of the Information Bureau and the Police Department regarding the anti-Government policy of these papers and also ascertain what help if any they were receiving from the Government. In a letter dated 25th August, 1932 Prof. Quadar Hussain, Khan the Director of the Information Bureau, expressed his opinion about these two papers.

The Director admitted initially that criticism in the Press in relation to all public acts of Government and all proceedings of Courts of Justice so long as it was fee from malignity, corrupt or malicious motives, might not be discouraged. But when criticism was offered with the intention to bring into hatred or contempt the Ruler and his Government or to excite disaffection towards them or to promote feelings of ill-will it must be considered seditious.

Then he had judged the merits of these papers after going through their cuttings of seven months. The *Nizam Vijay* he considered, on the whole to, be sane and moderate which drew attention to defects and abuses in the administration in a helpful and suggestive wav. at

the same time giving generous recognition and support to Government measures. Regarding the *Golkonda Patrika* Quader Hussain Khan stated that it was, on occasions, malignant and vituperative, tried to excite ill-will between Hindus and Muslims. Government did not give any subsidy to these papers in any form. *Nizam Vijay* got Rs. 45 and the *Golkonda Patrika* Rs. 52 for copies supplied to offices.

The *Nizam Vijay* was founded in December 1920 under the joint patronage of Vaman Naik and Keshav Rao. Laxman Rao was its editor and proprietor. Laxman Rao Phatak was member of the Hindu Political Association, the Hindu Mahasabha and the Social Service League. He was a friend of Raghavendra Rao Sharma. The editorials were based on news items supplied from districts and coloured by imagination. The paper was suspended in August 1929 but the editor secured permission for two other papers *Lokash ikshan* and the *Nagarik*. The Director of Public Instruction found fault with the *Nagarik* and it was stopped.

The *Nizam Vijay* was revived in January 1930 and again it published objectionable news.

The *Golkonda Patrika* was edited by Balakrishna Reddy and published by Jayaram Krishna Reddy. But the paper was practically in the hands of persons like Madapati Hanumantha Rao and S. Pratapa Reddy, the former editor of this paper, M. Narsinga Rao, B. Ramakrishna Rao, etc. These politicians, were well-known. The *Patrika* was an organ of the Central Andhra Association with pro-Congress policy financed and supported by the Hyderabad Reddy community. It had successfully achieved its object in spreading the Andhra Movement in the Telangana districts. It generally dealt with matters related to Sanghams and Begar. The *Patrika* was equally enthusiastic regarding educational advancement. It also condemned the activities of the Urdu papers.

The *Rahbar-i-Deccan* AND *the Nizam Vijay.*

Pickthall was askd to submit his opinion regarding the *Nizam Vijaye* and the *Rahba-i-Deccan* with a statement of the help given to them.

Some articles from the *Nizam Vijay* were picked from the November and December numbers of 1931. They showed that the religious policy of the Hyderabad Government was harmful to the Hindus. It gave wide publicity to the Satyagraha of the students of Pattan when they were disallowed to carry Ganapati procession.

The *Nizam Vijay* praised the Nizam when he was going to construct Shadikhana out of Municipality funds but suggested that there should be two such places, one for the Hindus and the other for Muslims. The editor L. B. Phatak had published three pamphlets, the representation of Hindus in State services, their religious disabilities, and educational conditions. The aid given to it was only Rs. 35 per year.

The *Rahbar-i-Deccan* freely criticised the Government administration in an impudent tone. It did not spare any department. The separation of the detective branch from the City Police was disliked by the paper. *Rahbari's* criticism of Government had the undercurrent which insinuated that severe attitude should be developed towards Hindu activities including Hindu papers.

Dr. Abdul Haq was ruthlessly attacked and Sir Akbar did not like it. Upon suggestion from him, Mehdi Yar Jung reprimanded the paper. The help given to it was Rs. 17,756 annually.

There were several Urdu newspapers in Hyderabad. One of the oldest was the *Musheer-i-Deccan* owned by a Maharashtrian gentleman Baji Rao whose son Vasudeo Rao Aurangabadkar conducted it for a long time after his father's death. This paper always pursued a mild policy and did not come under fire. The other Urdu paper edited and conducted very ably, was the *Rayyat* with which M. Narasing Rao was identified from the beginning. The policy of the *Rayyat* was very cautious. It did not hesitate to criticise the Government. This paper unfurled its standard of revolt when the Nizam's State Railway was purchased prematurely. It also criticised cases of unfair dealings in the P.W.D. and some misdeeds of officers. But the Government was watching its activities very meticulously. It was stopped for its severe criticism regarding the Railway affair for two & a half years but was again permitted to continue with a warning, in accordance with Firman dated 20th April 1933.

The question of granting permission was opposed by all the members but Sir Kishen Pershad supported it very strongly and therefore it could be permitted. Shoebulla Khan who was killed on account of his spirited national policy in his *Imroz* had worked with M. Narsing Rao in *Rayyat* for some time.

Payya edited by Kazi Abdul Gaffar was a very good Muslim paper. It was far-sighted and balanced in its views. It commanded respect in the minds of people in all strata except the virulent members of the Anjuman Ittehad.

The *Subeh Deccan* was favoured by royal patronage inasmuch as the poems of the monarch were published in it. It criticised the actions of certain Jagirdars and officers and its criticism proved effective. The editor of this paper was reprimanded for its articles on "Atkar 'o' Azkar" in 1935.

The *Nizam Gazette*, as its name indicates, was a semi-Government paper. It maintained a very high standard and was generally above communalism. Even during the days when nothing but fanaticism was voiced through papers, the *Nizam Gazette* did not allow its policy to be contaminated by any communal virus.

The *Rahbar-i-Deccan* edited by Ahmad Mohiuddin and Abdullah Khan was a strong paper and its cuttings were forwarded by His Exalted Highness the Nizam for the consideration of the Executive Council. There were many other Urdu papers like *Waqt Meezan Paisa Akbar Sahifa* which supported the policy of the Ittehad ul-Muslimeen. There was a News Agency called the Deccan News which had a particular fascination for communal and exaggerated news. But the Modern News Agency did yeoman service in furnishing authentic items and was very much favoured even by a first class paper like *the Hindu*.

The English papers like *the Hyderabad Bulletin the Deccan Chronicle* and *the Daily News* had an appeal to the enlightened section of the educated community and therefore they were uniformly balanced in their views. These papers always resorted to a middle course between timidity and aggressiveness. The policy of the

Nizam's Government was such that the local papers were allowed to criticise the affairs relating to the Government of India in a very frank manner. But anything that lashed a Hyderabad official or the Head of a Department was interpreted as either communal or political.

The story of the *Marathwada*, a weekly published from Aurangabad by Anand Rao Waghmare, was very unique. The paper was always virulent and aggressive in criticising the policies of the Hyderabad Government. Later it shifted its headquarters to Sholapur in the Bombay State where the Congress Ministry was in p we . Thursday was the day in the week on which this paper was published. Its articles were always unpalatable to the Gover ι-ment. Friday was a weekly holiday in the State and the paper would achieve its object of injecting unpleasant ideas into the minds of the readers when the Government would take a decision either on Saturday or Sunday to ban the entry of the paper into the State. But the editor was clever enough to secure permission of the Bombay Government immediately for publishing another paper to issue on Thursday and get it circulated in Hyderabad under a different name. This trick continued and about some dozen names were changed by the paper, when the Political Department and the Press Commissioner of the Hyderabad Government became fully aware of and issued a list of papers in all languages which alone were allowed to enter the State. Such an inclusive list could not become comprehensive and exhaustive to welcome all innocent and good papers and hence the Information Bureau had to add the names of several good papers which stood banned for no fault of theirs.

A small booked titled *Publicity Campiagn againstthe People in the Hyderabad State* as bulletin No. 8 of the *Hyderabad People's Condition* being was brought in 1938. It series very forcefully described the publicity campaign unleashed against national leaders and their activities for securing democracy.

CHAPTER XI

ACTIVITIES OF THE ARYA SAMAJ IN HYDERABAD

The Arya Samaj is really a religious and social movement, but it took a political colour in Hyderabad. Its significance in British India never assumed that magnitude as it did in Hyderabad. The political problem in Hyderabad related mainly to the justification of the minority rule over the majority. The minority of the ruler's community aspired to grow in strength through religious means. Proselytizing the members of the majority community was one of the easy means to add to their own members. This is quite justifiable as long as the means are fair and merely persuasive. The majority community had large groups who were exploited for menial social service but generally neglected, ignored and ill-treated. Conversion from among these people was not cared for by the majority people. They were never conscious of the double loss that they were sustaining due to this gross callousness they displayed towards their own co-religionists ; their numerical strength was being reduced and the strength of the minority was increasing. Numerical strength of social groups plays a tremendous significance in representative governments. It is at this point that the religious movements passed imperceptibly into political spheres.

Whether the Hindu religion is a proselytizing religion or not, is a disputable question. There are contradictory authorities in the religious texts called the Smritis. Some of the religious texts recommended the reconversion of a fresh apostate and not the proselytization of a person belonging to other religious professions. But the Arya Samaj as established by Swami Dayanand Saraswati in 1875 strongly emphasised these aspects of religious proselytization. He preached equality of all human beings and their title to equal opportunities of education and refinement. According to him, the Vedic religion was the best and anybody could be converted into the following of the Vedic fold. This naturally meant a perfect sanction for the reconversion of the apostates.

The teachings of Arya Samaj had penetrated long ago into Hyderabad even before the dawn of the twentieth

century. Pandit Keshava Rao Koratkar, a great patriot and a lawyer who was raised to the Bench of the Hyderabad High Court was elected the President of the Arya Samaj in Hyderabad and continued to be so at the helm of Arya affairs till 1932. Pandit Keshav Rao was a great person with several lustrous facets to his career. He endeavoured to establish branches of the Samaj throughout the State and helped the spread of education through libraries and schools. *Satyartha Prakash*, the Bible of the Arya Samaj, was authoritatively rendered into Telugu in 1921. There was the Mopla agitation in the Malabar that year and the Samaj collected large funds for the aid of the distressed in Malabar. In 1924, the Arya Samaj collected five thousand rupees in the State and donated this to the Educational institutions in Kangdi, Hardwar. The annual functions of the Samaj were bright patches in the cultural life of Hyderabad. A band of enthusiastic workers began to grow and they watched and protected the interests of the majority.

There was a strange religious activity started by a Muslim by name Siddiq Dindar in 1929. He declared himself as the avatar of Channa Basweshwar held in high regard by the Lingayats. Siddiq Dindar said that Islam was the modern form of the preachings of Channa Basweshwar. He delivered speeches belittling the avatars of Rama and Krishna and irritated the feeling of the Hindus. Sri Mangaladev, a preacher of the Arya Samaj, was invited to counteract the harangues of Siddiq Dindar. Another learned scholar, Pandit Ramachandra Dehlavi, who had read the original *Quran* and its commentaries also came to Hyderabad. This propaganda on both the sides began to embitter the mutual feelings. Pandit Keshav Rao introduced a bill relating to the widows in the Legislative Council in 1930 but a few conservatives among the Hindus expressed a dislike and resentment towards this bill, the Muslims supporting this orthodox agitation of the Hindus. But later Pandit Vinayak Rao Vidyalankar, the worthy son of the great leader, pressed this through the Legislature and got it passed into a law. The legal position of the Hindu widows was strengthened.

The Arya Samaj improved its organisation in 1930 under the guidance of Mahatma Narayanaswamy. The Pratinidhi Sabha was established as central body in Hyderabad and the district branches were placed under

its control. Pandit Keshav Rao was elected President of the Pratinidhi Sabha and Sri Chandu Lal. Secretary while Pandit Vinayak Rao was chosen to act as Treasurer.

It was at this time that the Samaj attracted two great enthusiasts Bansilal and Shamlal of Halikhed. These brothers galvanized the district Gulbarga, Bidar and Udgir and created a great awakening. They established Samaj branches, schools and libraries. They devoted their all to instil a spirit of fearlessness and courage in the minds of the Hindus. They had to endure all sorts of hardships. The death of Pandit Keshav Rao on 21st May, 1932 at Poona was a terrible blow to the Arya Samaj in Hyderabad. The Arya Samaj began to incur the displeasure of the Nizam's Government. Restrictions were being clamped in various forms on the Arya Samaj. Pandit Vinayak Rao Vidyalankar was elected to substitute his father as President. Arya Samaj preachers like Sri Chandra Bhan and Pandit Ramachandra Dehlavi were prevented from entering the State. The Sarwadeshik Sabha of Delhi submitted a memorandum to the Nizam's Government in 1934. The Hyderabad Government disowned all the accusations detailed in the memorandum and said that the Arya Samaj was entirely free for conducting all its religious and social activities. Narayanaswamy, Swami Swatantrananda and Acharya Ramadev came in deputation to observe the conditions in the State. They were allowed to move freely and address meetings. But the moment they left the State, all the restrictions were revived with greater vigour.

In 1935, the first Taluqdar of Bidar ruthlessly dealt with the Arya Samaj at Nilanga. The Havan-Kund and the Samaj Mandir were desecrated and destroyed. The Samaj registered its protest against this severe action of the Taluqdar. Nawab Zulqader Jung, the Police Secretary of the State, ordered the Taluqdar to reconstruct the Mandir and the Havan-Kund, spending, money from his own pocket.

But the attitude of the Police towards the Samaj was very stiffened. The Samaj could not celebrate any functions or meetings relating to the death dates and birth dates of great personalities, religious ceremonies, fairs, Nagar kirtans, literary activities, conduct schools,

Havan-Kunds or unfirl 'Om' flags. After an intensified endeavour the Samaj was permitted to start the Urdu weekly *Vedic Adarsh* in 1934. But its fearless and rank tone displeased the Government and its publication was stopped by Government Order in 1935.

In 1936 at Humnabad-Manik Nagar, the Arya Samaj workers had commenced their preaching work. A few Musalmans picked up a quarrel with a 'Nagar Kirtan' party and there was a great scuffle and clash. The police appeared on the scene to encourage the Musalmans to chastise the Aryans. The two famous brothers Bansi-lal and Sham Lal and Pandit Narendra Saksena were arrested. At Umerga, a worker by name Ramachandra was found to have a copy of the *Satyartha Prakash*, the Bible of the Arya Samaj. It was seized by the Police as a seditious book. A great agitation had to be made when the *Satyartha Prakash* was returned to Ramachandra.

The Circular No. 53 which forbade all meetings of every character was issued in 1937. But the Arya Samaj protested against it by making celebrations without any prior sanction. In this year, an Arya Samajist, Veda Prakash, by name was persuaded to accept Islam, but on his stubborn rejection to do so, he was murdered at Gunjoti.

In 1938, the Government of the Nizam promulgated an order that permission should be sought before a Havan Kund was put anywhere. This order was defied by the Arya Samajists at Hyderabad.

At Gulbarga in 1938 a great communal riot burst out when a few drops of coloured water soiled the dress of a Musalman during the Holi celebrations.

At Hyderabad the notorious communal riot of Dhulpet took place, starting on the 16th April, 1938. This created acute unrest throughout the city ; 21 active persons were arrested. When the Arya Samaj workers endeavoured to enlist the service of Mr. K. F. Nariman, an advocate of Bombay, Government put restriction on his entry into the State. Sri Bhulabhai Desai conducted the case for a few days but later Sri Brija Behari Tanakkuli, the famous advocate of Delhi was invited, But with all this, all the accused were sentenced, prominent among

these were Sohanlal, Umarao Sinha and Devi Sinha. On 22nd June, 1938, a great missionary of Arya Samaj Dharma Prakash was murdered by a few fanatics who could not endure the propaganda work he was doing.

A serious riot took place at Udgir during the Dasara Celebrations in 1938, in which Sri Shamlal was arrested with 20 colleagues. Shamlal died in Bidar Jail on the 17th December, 1938 and it is reported that some foul play was the cause of his death.

In all such cases, the practice of the Police was to arrest only such persons from among the Hindus and Aryans who showed some spirit of resistance and talent irrespective of the fact whether there was any direct or implied relation between the incident and the person concerned. When these complaints were forwarded to the Sarvadeshik Arya Pratinidhi Sabha, it wrote several times inviting the attention of the Government. It was concluded by the Sarvadeshik Arya Pratinidhi Sabha that a strong fight should be given to the Hyderabad Government without which matters could not improve. On the 24th October, 1938, the first batch of the Arya Samajists offered Satyagraha under the leadership of Sri Devilal; all the participants in this batch were sentenced to three years' rigorous imprisonment.

The Sarvadeshik Arya Pratinidhi Sabha put Mahatma Narayanaswami in charge of the Satyagraha in Hyderabad. But he desired that an All-Arya Samaj Conference should be held to discuss this problem and its sanction should be secured before such a fight was launched. The Conference was held at Sholapur under the presidency of Sri Aney. The grievances of the Arya Samaj were properly ventilated and its demands were reiterated. A Hyderabad Day was observed all over India. The Hyderabad Government could not foresee the intensity and volume of the Arya Samaj Satyagraha. The whole of India responded to the call of the Conference. Mahatma Narayanaswami entered Hyderabad on 31st of January, 1939. But the police arrested him and drove him to Sholapur. But he again offered Satyagraha with a batch of 20 followers on the 4th February, 1939 at Gulbarga. He with his followers were arrested and sentenced to one year's rigorous imprisonment. The second dictator was Sri Kumar Chandrakaran Sarda, who with his batch offered

Satyagraha on 5th March, 1939 and later Sri Khushal Chand who assumed the name Anand Swamy. He went with a batch of 154. The fourth dictator was Raja Guru Dhirendra Shastri with a large following. The Nizam's Government was contemplating to bring about some understanding. But the leaders of the Anjuman-e-Ittehad prevented the Government from doing so and the Government had to retrace some of its steps. Dhirendra Shastri and his 530 followers were sentenced to two years'. rigourous imprisonment. The fifth dictator was Vedavrata and the sixth was Mahashaya Krishna, B.A. The seventh was Duryanendra. In addition to these leaders of the Satyagraha movement who were all well known all-India figures, there were other dictators and volunteers from Hyderabad itself. The names of the dictators are Sesha Rao, Dattatreya Prasad, Digambar Rao Shivangeerka, Shanker Rao Patil, Andhori Nivritti Reddy (Ahmadpur) Digambar Rao Latkar, Ganpat Rao Kathle (Kalam). Thus in all 12,000 Satyagrahis were arrested of which 5,000 were Hyderabadis. Pandit Vinayak Rao Vidyalankar was nominated as the eighth dictator. He was going to offer Satyagraha with 1,000 Hyderabadi Satyagrahis on the 21st of July, 1939. But the Nizam's Government announced certain administrative reforms and hence the Satyagraha was suspended.

The Satyagrahi prisoners were ill-treated in the jails. It is very painful to learn that the Satyagrahi volunteers should have been manhandled and thrashed by the Muslims in the presence of the Police, when the Police were carrying them to the jails. When the Satyagrahis were beaten and injured, medical aid was denied to them. Food and drink were not given for hours and thus affliction caused to them. There was a Satyagrahi Sri Ramachandra Rao by name. He used to sing the *Vandemataram* song on occasions of prayer. He was warned to give it up. But the fearless young man would not budge an inch from his determination. He was taken to the yard and flogged. At every lash, he would shout *Vandemataram*. Sri Ramachandra Rao received so many lashes that he began to bleed but he never gave up shouting *Vandemataram*. The merciless lashing rendered him unconscious and consequently his *Vandemataram* could not be uttered. The human agency responsible for the flogging considered that it succeeded in compelling the prisoner to obey orders. The gentleman is popularly

known as Vandemataram Ramachandra Rao. He has been elected to the Assembly recently. 23 Aryan Satyagrahis died in the jail. This method of ill-treating the prisoners had its unfailing consequences. Public opinion even in England was moved. Questions relating to these incidents were put in the House of Commons.

Even after the announcement of the Reforms, the Pratinidhi Sabha had its doubts regarding the interpretations of some of the clauses. Therefore, the Working Committee of the Sarvadeshik Arya Prathinidhi Sabha met on 24th and 25th of July, 1939 at Nagpur, deliberated over the Reforms and sought clarifications relating to certain clauses. But the Nizam's Government did not care to offer any clarification. The Sarvadeshik Arya Pratinidhi Sabha insisted on clarification. Then the Government instructed the Aryan authorities to send a deputy with whom they would discuss and clarify. Sri Lala Deshabandhu Gupta was deputed to wait upon the authorities of the Nizam's Government. This discussion had a salutary effect. Almost all the demands of the Arya Samaj were conceded. When on the 7th of August the declaration was made that the Aryan Satyagraha has been suspended there were 3,500 Satyagrahis in prisons. Many still were ready to offer their services. The Camps of the Satyagrahis were set up on all the four sides of the Nizam's State, *i.e.*, at Vijayawada, Sholapur, Barsi, Ahmadnagar, Manmad, Pusad and Chanda.

In spite of the apprehensions of all the leaders of the Arya Samaj, the Satyagrahis remained disciplined and exercised great moderation. Even in the face of situations created to cause irritation they held their patience. Notwithstanding the suspension of the Satyagraha movement a very lamentable incident occurred at Nizamabad. Sri Radhakrishna, an Arya Samaj worker, was stabbed by an Arab in front of the Police Station on the 20th of August, 1939. The Arya Samajists in the State, however, did not show any excitement.

Even after the Reforms and the agreement to withdraw the Satyagraha Movement, the fact is the condition of the Arya Samajists did not improve. After 1940, the Arya Samaj started constructive activities. In commemoration of late Pandit Keshav Rao an educational institution called the Keshav Memorial was started on

the 20th of July, 1940 and the foundation stone for the present magnificent building was laid on the 20th of September in the same year by Shri Ghanashyam Singh Gupta. The organizers decided to have Hindi as the medium of instruction in the high school, but they could not achieve their objective till 1948.

Pandit Vinayak Rao Vidyalankar was re-elected President of the Arya Pratinidhi Sabha at Hyderabad and Pandit Narendraji, the Secretary in 1941. The Aryans had to suffer untold misery and distress. At Damargidda in the Gulbarga district, restrictions were imposed on the flying of the 'Om' flag. At Umari, in district Nanded, three Arya Samaj missionaries Gangaram, Ganapat Rao and Dattatreya Rao were done to death by the Pathans who could not brook their selfless activities. On the 4th of June, 1941, the Arya Samaj Mandir at Aland was closed. Fourteen Arya Samajists were arrested and convicted in the court at Mardi in Gulbarga District. The Pathashalas at Ahmadpur and Chakur were ordered to be discontinued. The Samajists at Sakol were warned not to set up a Havan-Kund without prior sanction, otherwise legal proceedings would be started against them. No chance of harassing and inculpating the Arya Samajists was allowe dto slip and without causing some edgree of harm to the Arya Samajists.

The organisation of the Anjuman-e-Ittehad was in the good books of the Government and the members of that body always acted aggressively against the Arya Samajists. These persons never received any punishment at the hands of the Government. But the Samajists also were so much inspired that they began to work for their cause with redoubled dynamism.

The condition of the Arya Samajists between 1942 to 1948 was like out-laws. Their religious fervour never damped. The distresses, the difficulties and damages they were exposed to were limitless. They had always to depend on their own personal endeavours for defence. Propaganda against the Arya Samajists was given wide publicity in Urdu papers, while the Aryans were not permitted to have their own papers. If information was published in papers from Britsh India, they were not allowed to enter into the State.

A conference was held at Udgir in 1942 under the presidentship of Pandit Vinayak Rao Vidyalankar. Sri Narendrajee was the Secretary. The conference came off on 12th and 13th of February and 26 resolutions were adopted. It was impressed upon the Government that the agreements reached and terms laid down in the Reforms were being violated at every step. If the Government did not try to retrace these steps, the Arya Samaj shall have to gird up its loins to meet the situation and then the Arya Samaj would not be held responsible for any of these consequences. But the Government did not take any heedas was its wont. At Aurad Shahjahani, in the Bidar District, the Muslims attacked the shops and houses of the Hindus and Aryans and burnt them when doors were closed. One person who showed some resistance was killed. Mahatma Gandhi ordered a sum of one thousand five hundred rupees to be sent to the aid of the sufferers. Even the Samaj collected Rs. 2,000 for the same cause. Deshabandhu and other Aryan workers of the place were arrested and sentenced to long terms of imprisonment. Permission was not granted for the annual celebrations at Chincholi and Gunjoti.

On 3rd March, 1942, when the Aryan procession was peacefully passing at Humnabad, Sri Shivachandra and his four colleagues were shot dead by the Musalmans. At Nagar Kurnool and Hingoli, a deadly assault was made on Hindus by the Muslims and the culprits were discovered by the Police only among the Aryans who were later sentenced. The same miserable tragedies were enacted at Jogipeth and Tarakheda. On the 10th of December 1942 the shops of the Hindus were looted at Gulbarga to ensure that they were paralysed financially so that they may not patronize the Samaj activities. No steps were taken by the Government to punish the real wrong-doers or to root out such tendencies.

In 1943, the Arya Samaj could celebrate the Aryan Conference at Nizamabad. Sri Ganapat Kashinath Shastry was elected to preside. The same resolutions as in the previous conference were reiterated. But one very significant resolution related to the establishment of one hundred Pathashalas and volunteer corps 25,000 strong. Sri Dattatreya Prasad's speech at the conference was found by the Police to be quite objectionable and action was launched against him in the court. Pandit

Narendraji was also found guilty of some speech delivered by him at Gulb rga. Narendrajee was sentenced to one month's rigorous imprisonment. Unmindful of all these calamities, the Samaj established a Swadhyaya Mandal (study circle) at Ghatkeshwar for training preachers and celebrated 26 annual functions at the branches in the districts and held Vedic Sapthahas at 29 places throughout the State.

The Third Annual Conference of the Samaj was celebrated at Narayanpeth. Rai Sarat Chandjee presided over the deliberations. The new features of this conference were the celebrations of Mahila Sammelan, Arya Kumar Sammelan, the Updeshak and Mantri Sammelan. This year the Sindh Muslim League had resolved to put a ban on the *Satyartha Prakash*. An all-India agitation protested against this. Hyderabad State Arya Samaj fully supported the protest movement.

A communal clash took place at Nizamabad on the occasion of the Dasarah. The Arya Sabha demanded that an investigation should be made to find out the culprits but the Government did not give up its passive attitude. In 1944, the strength of Aryan missionaries rose to 300, the Pathashalas and the number of pupils receiving education also showed a commendable increase and, therefore, a new edition of the *Satyartha Prakash* was brought out.

In 1945, a training centre called Upadeshak Vidyalaya was started at Nalgonda. The trainees received coaching for carrying on the preaching work. Sri Bhadradev and Pandit Narendraji moved from place to place and collected a fund of Rs. 7,000 with which the Vidyalaya made a beginning.

The Fourth Aryan Conference took place at Gulbarga on 22nd, 23rd and 24th of April, 1945 under the presidentship of Raja Narayan Lal Pitti. The Police authorities were anxious to inflict something or other on the conference. In the very presence of the Police authorities Pandit Vinayak Rao, Shri Ganapat Shastri, Pandit Narendraji and a worker Sri Hira Lal Pandey were severely beaten. Pandit Narendraji suffered from a fracture in the leg. Acute displeasure spread all over the State and the Police were compelled to degrade one Sub-

Inspector of Police and four constables. Due to the illness of Narendraji, Sri Krishna Dutt worked as Secretary. Efforts were made to get the ban on entry into the State put on Arya Samaj leaders like Shivachandra, Chandra Bhan, Kshitish Chandra Vedalankar lifted but the year 1946 had to dawn for such consummation.

The Fifth Aryan Conference was celebrated at Warangal in 1946. Pandit Vinayak Rao presided. Pandit Narendraji was released and the ban put on his movement and speech was lifted.

Sri Mirza Ismail assumed the Prime Ministership of Hyderabad and a breeze of generous freshness was experienced. Permission was granted to start a weekly *Aryabhan*. Many Arya Samajists languishing in jail for communal riots were released. A Minister of such liberal views could not get on at Hyderabad. Circumstances so conspired that he had to offer resignation and leave Hyderabad.

After the 15th of August, 1947, when India attained Independence, Hyderabad was trying to assert its independence. The Arya Samaj knew fully well that this was an impossible affair. The Hyderabad State Congress was trying to prepare itself for opposing the Nizam's demand for independence. On 30th July, 1947, Pandit Narendraji, Shri Dattatreya Prasad and Gangaram were arrested and sent to jail.

On the 3rd September, 1947, at Parkal, a flag hoisting day was being celebrated. One thousand five hundred persons participated in the procession. The Police resorted to firing and as a result one hundred and fifty persons were killed with bullets and two hundred and fifty were arrested.

The Sixth Annual Conference of the Arya Samaj took place at Jalna, under the presidentship of Govindlal Pitti. This conference passed a resolution that the Nizam should integrate his Dominions with the Indian Union and immediately give Responsible Government.

During the period from 15th August 1947 to 17th September, 1948, thousands of Hindus had left their houses and crossed into the Indian territory due to the

Razakar menace. Arya Samaj had set up camps for such refugees in places like Sholapur, Pandharpur, Barsi, Bijapur, Umarkhed, Buldhana, Amaravati and Vijayawada and every possible help was given to them. Mohonlal Krishna Dutta, Bansilal Vyas, Rajpal Shamsundar, D.R. Dass, Digambhar Rao Latkar, Gopalrao Kalyani, Prashanta Kumar and Karmavir were some of the self-sacrificing workers who served the people. Sesharao Waghmare and Govind Naik of Nilanga and Ramachandra Rao Laturkar gave a fight on the borders of Osmanabad. The Arya Samaj of Hyderabad produced great revolutionists like Shri Narayana Pawar, and his associates Gandaiah and Jagdish. Narayan Rao had thrown a hand grenade on the motor car of the Nizam. They were sentenced to twenty years rigorous imprisonment. Vinaya Kumar, Satyanarayana Sinha and Madanmohan had rendered wonderful secret service in supplying secret information to Pandit Vinayak Rao.

Pandit Vinayak Rao Vidyalankar was the President of the Lawyers' Protest Committee. He collected authentic information about the Razakar atrocities and sent a report to New Delhi and therefore he was arrested.

Vandemataram Ramachandra Rao, his brother Veerabhadra Rao and Narasimha Rao jeopardised their lives for securing information relating to the activities of the Nizam, the trips of Sydney Cotton, supply of warlike material and conveyed it to Sri K. M. Munshi. Mahatma Anandaswamy managed to send two thousand rupees per month for the struggle in Hyderabad State till the 17th of September, 1948.

Thus has the Arya Samaj in Hyderabad State made its own contribution for the attainment of independence.

CHAPTER XII

GANDHIJI'S VISIT TO HYDERABAD IN 1934

It was rumoured that Gandhiji would visit Hyderabad to stimulate Harijan uplift work. But Gandhiji's personality was so complex that his vivifying contact meant a shock to autocratic and bureaucratic forces. The anti-democratic repressive methods of administrators would become exposed to the critical observation of citizens loving civil liberty.

In Hyderabad, the enlightened members of the Executive Council became astir to discuss how Gandhiji should be allowed to visit, but be controlled and circumscribed by certain conditions. The Political Member, Mehdi Yar Jung and the Police Member, Sir Trench, were chiefly concerned but they differed with each other. The third influential member was the Finance Member, Sir Akbar Hydari and if he also gave his independent opinion, the chances of having unanimous opinion on this important national issue would have been totally lost. It is of profound interest, at this distance of time, to see what attitudes these politicians had towards the influence that Gandhiji left wherever and whenever he moved.

On the 6th of February, 1934, Mehdi Yar Jung who was anxious to bring about agreement between himself and Sir Trench wrote to Sir Trench as follows :—

" The more I think over the matter the more I am convinced that it would be a very good gesture and an act of courtesy if we let Gandhi give his lecture on the uplift of the depressed classes and also permit a procession. It would show our interest in our own depressed classes and I cannot imagine that we have anything to fear from such a lecture. The procession would " let off steam," as it were.

"But once Gandhi is here, I see great danger of serious public discontent arising if processions and public speeches were to be suppressed in such exciting circumstances when the enthusiasm of the public was at its height. Agitation based upon actual incidents happening at such

a time would be all the more formidable and difficult to allay as it would be based upon the people's actual experience and inspired by very deep feelings.

"If we cannot treat Gandhiji with the courtesy due to him or give him the amount of reasonable liberty that should be accorded to a man or a mission which, ostensibly at least, accords with our own aims, then it is far better that he should not be allowed to come at all. In a word I do not like half measures.

"I would like the Kotwal to see this letter and also my dissenting Note in Urdu on the Council Resolution. His views would be interesting and valuable."

The Urdu Note written for the information of H.E. the President and other members translated into English ran as follows :—

" Personally I am not disinclined to allow Gandhiji to pay a visit to Hyderabad but I prefer rather to disallow Gandhiji to visit Hyderabad to his being allowed to visit with certain restrictions on his free movement.

"If Gandhiji visits Hyderabad, the people will be touched by his personal presence, their hearts will heave and they will be eager to take him in procession. To prevent the citizens from the fulfilment of their devout intention of taking him in procession and disallow him to make a public speech is to furnish the people with a concrete example that they do not enjoy the privileges of free citizens. Our opponents will have the opportunity of exploiting the situation for agitation. We need not apprehend any danger from the procession of Gandhiji or his public speeches. Our real concern should be that the minds of the people should be disabused of the idea that they do not enjoy the fundamental rights of free citizens. The restrictions that we are contemplating to impose on Gandhiji's free movements and speeches will alienate and estrange public sympathies from the Nizam's Government. Political agitators will provoke discontent against Government in the minds of the people and impress upon their mind that this is a challenge to their human rights. These are the only grounds and none else on which I voice my dissentient vote in allowing Gandhiji to visit Hyderabad. Totally rejecting permission to Gandhiji to

visit Hyderabad will not have such grave consequences as his being permitted to visit with restrictions on his freedom. Close observation of public psychology should reveal the fact that their mentality is affected more by what they see and tangibly feel rather than that which is more imaginary and unsubstantial. I hope my reasons for difference of opinion will become clear to the Council."

Mehdi Yar Jung expressed his attitude to Sir Akbar Hydari in a private note so that Sir Akbar Hydari might not entertain any misconception regarding his personal opinions.

Yet, Sir Trench placed the following resolution before the Council for discussion :—

" I am much impressed by what the Nawab Saheb writes and in modification of the proposals made by me yesterday in Council, now suggest that the following conditions be attached to the grant to Mr. Gandhi of permission to come here.

(*a*) Only one public meeting should be allowed. This should not take place at Viveka Vardhini Theatre but at Lingampalli Garden. At this public meeting Mr. Gandhi may be allowed to deliver a speech provided he keeps off politics and restricts himself to the Harijan movement. Permission may also be given for a public address to be presented to him but the address must be wholly unconnected with politics and must be submitted for approval at least one week before the meeting, to Government. Lingampalli Garden is a most suitable place for a meeting as it was Mr. Gandhi's intention to go there to open a Harijan Seva Samithi which he may be permitted to do.

(*b*) Mr. Gandhi cannot be allowed to open a Khaddar shop in Pathargatti Bazaar or anywhere else.

(*c*) No procession can be allowed. The Kotwal has been instructed to submit his proposal to me in due course regarding the precautions he will take to stop a procession.

The Kotwal agrees with these modified conditions. You will see that I do not go quite so far as the Hon'ble Political Member would go if Mr. Gandhi is to be allowed to come to Hyderabad. With your permission, I suggest that the case be placed before Council at the next meeting for reconsideration. There is no great hurry about it as Mr. Gandhi has postponed the date of his visit till the 9th of March, 1934."

Sir Akbar wrote to Mehdi Yar Jung as given here :— "Many thanks for letting me see these papers. I am very glad to see that you have been able to effect a change in the Hon'ble the Revenue Member's attitude. I take it now that you will support this modified proposal and that our resolution will be a unanimous one."

Mahatma Gandhi visited Hyderabad and Secunderabad in the month of March, 1934 and inculcated the necessity of endearing the Harijans. He was presented with a big purse. A locality called the Upper Basti in Kachiguda was re-designated as Harijan Basti but there were reports to show that the Police objected to this pro-Gandhian gesture for Harijan work.

The organizers of the Marwadi Vidyalaya had set up a Hindi Vachanalaya and they had implored Gandhiji to grace it with his visit. The crowded programme of Gandhiji did not permit even a short time for this function. Gandhiji, upon this, wrote an apologetic letter dated 27th March, 1934 from Patna. It reads as follows :—

"I am very sorry that I could not spare any time to see the Marwadi Hindi Vachanalaya during my stay in Hyderabad. I appreciate such endeavour on your part. I wish that the people in Hyderabad should derive as much benefit from this as possible."

CHAPTER XIII

VANDEMATARAM

October, 1938 must be immortalised in the memory of the Hyderabadis, as the month in which the smouldering embers of agitation in the minds of the people burst out, in a flame and the intensity of Mahatma Gandhiji's personality was felt keenly by the Nizam's Government. Associations like the Civil Liberties. Union the Arya Samaj andthe State Congress began to offer peaceful resistance to the laws of the Government considered as oppressive. The atmosphere throughout the State, in the Governmental sphere and even in social and communal strata became vibrant and sensitive. It was hardly a month since a mild explosion hat t ken place in the Osmania University Campus. Even a small straw can break the back of a camel. The Hindu students in the Osmania University Hostels were prohibited to say Vandemataram in prayer rooms, separately provided for such purpose in their hostels. They did not obey the order of the authorities, who expelled them from the hostels and rusticated them from the College.

The facts of the case briefly detailed are as follows :— The Osmania University College had then three magnificent hostels called A, B and Temporary, each with two Prayer Halls one for the Muslim students and the other for the Hindu students. The activities and silent or loud prayers, offered by each group in their Prayer Halls were in no way the concern of each other. But it is said that a few Muslim students suspected and smelt something intolerable brewing in the Hindu Prayer Halls, in the month of September before the Dasara in 1938. It was detected that Vandemataram was being sung by the Hindu students in the Prayer Hall. The Warden of of the B Hostel was alerted who instructed the Prarthana Mandir to keep the Prayer Hall closed. Students did not mind the closure for the time and offered their prayers including Vandemataram in the corridor. Vandemataram reached wider publicity and even the unwary Muslim students came to know what the genesis of the trouble was. The action was thought to be an error of judgment on both the sides and as usual the Prayer Hall was kept

On 30th November, 1938, the news of the expulsion and rustication of the boarders spread like wildfire and the Hindu day scholars started a sympathetic strike and, picketing of Hindu students commenced at bus stops. It is reported in a pamphlet that the Professor of Chemistry who was a Proctor came across a group of students picketing the buses, lost balance of his mind and abused and threatened the Hindu students. Some Hindu students lay before his car. He ordered the driver to pass the car over the bodies of the rebels. But the servant revealed greater humanity than the master.

The Hindu students had several grievances against the University authorities and which were disquieting their minds. The uniform of the college student, pyjamas and blue sherwani, was not liked by the majority of the Hindu students. A batch of three hundred Hindu students had submitted an application to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor expressing their feelings. But it fell on deaf ears. The uniform was made obligatory on the occasion of dinners. A deputation of 40 students, it is reported waited upon the Pro-Vice-Chancellor and said " We are willing to put a white shirt and dhoti." The Pro-Vice-Chancellor is reported to have said " You must adopt this culture or quit the hostels."

The Hindu students did not like that there should be *Akhlakiat* for them, in which they had to read books, written by non-Hindus while the books for the Muslim students were written by Muslim authors. The Hindu students had painfully noted that there were post-graduate classes for Arabic, Persian and Urdu while there were none for Sanskrit, Telugu, Marathi and Kannada.

They had evinced great tolerance till the prohibitory order regarding Vandemataram and other hardships in its wake. A pamphlet on this incident issued by Kumarraj Ganpatrao, B.Sc., states as follows.— "The above facts make it quite obvious how the Hindu students of the Osmania University had to face hardships and restrictions, so much so that the authorities do not even hesitate to disrespect the religion and culture of the Hindus, whom it seems they deem to be their inferiors. For instance last year during the festival of *Milad-un-Nabi* which was celebrated in the Muslim dining hall, Maulvi Mazarul

Hassan Gilani, a Professor of the Diniyat Department, said in the course of his lecture, " I am pained to see the inertness amongst the Muslims, when there still exist 22 crorers of 'gober-parast' (dung-worshippers) in the country." It must be noted that the Hindu students were also present in this function. Quite a similar incident occurred last year on the occasion of Maulana Mohamad Ali Jinnah's visit to the University. While delivering a speech on behalf of the Students' Union he addressed the students as " My Muslim students " when it was a mixed gathering of Muslims and Hindus. It was wrong on the part of the authorities to allow communal leaders to address in such an educational institution as the University."

The Hindu students could realise the discrimination in the attitude of the authorities when the participants of the strike were Hindus and Muslims and when the participants were only Hindus. The students had struck during the days of the Pro-Vice-Chancellorship of Dr. Mackenzie but the assistance of the Police was not requisitioned but for this strike there were police with lathis posted all over the University campus. Friends compelled the boarders of the Hostels and persuaded them to stay in city in the Jain Mandir in the Sultan Bazaar. Continuous strike of the Hindu students commenced. There were mass meetings. Schools and Colleges in the districts also struck and the education of the Hindu students all over the State was interrupted. The pamphlet says:— " A students' deputation waited on the authorities, but the University authorities were adamant and they merely announced that the students should submit apologies and join the classes as usual before the 6th Bahman 48 F. (10th December, 1938) failing which their names would be struck off the rolls of the University. The University authorities were under the false impression that the students may return to the classes by this kind of threat. But the strikers were determined to win their rights and they were not to be coerced into submission by threats.

When the students disappointed the authorities by not returning to the classes on the 6th Bahman 48 F., (10th December, 1938) the University authorities on their own responsibility overlooked for another day also. As a result of this the names of 350 students from the Osmania

University College were struck off on the 12th December, 1939. On the same day, 70 students from the City College, 310 students from the Gulbarga College (including High School students) and 120 students from Mahboobnagar High School were removed from the respective institutions. Continuous strike was being observed in Aurangabad, Nanded, Bidar and Parbhani ditsricts and it was spreading to the mofussils."

Many unofficial negotiations and deputations were arranged and yet both the parties were adamant and were not prepared to budge an inch. A Firman was issued by H.E.H. the Nizam which in general terms deprecated disobedience, indiscipline and lawlessness and stated that a sense of realities should dawn, otherwise sterner steps would be taken.

The following conversation reliably learnt to have taken place between the gentlemen concerned is also very eloquent.

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor explained to Professor Virabhadrudu in a pretty long speech what was happening at Aurangabad, as also Addikmet and then asked him to dissuade the Hindu students of the Osmania University from singing the Vandemataram song. In reply, the Professor said.—

"I am sorry, I cannot do it. But may I put one or two questions in this connection ?

Pro-Vice-Chancellor: Yes.

Prof.: May I know how long this has been going on ?

P.V.C.: For about one year.

Prof.: May I know whether this song is being sung in the Hindu Prayer room or in the common Prayer Hall?

P.V.C.: In the Hindu prayer room only.

Prof.: Did you talk to the students about it with a view to know their point of view ?

P.V.C.: Yes, but it was of no use.

Prof.: I regret I can do nothing, since thousands of people in the country look upon the song as sacred."

Mr. Qazi Mohammed Hussain was the Pro-Vice-Chancellor at the time. When the Professor said he could not undertake the mission, the Pro-Vice-Chancellor said, " Professor Virabhadrudu, keep the whole thing confidential " and the reply was, " So far as I am concerned, it will be so." There were three other members of the staff present at the conversation.

The members of the Committee of Action of the Vandemataram strikers had an interview with Sir Akbar Hydari, the Chancellor of the University and President of the Executive Council. It is reported that Sir Akbar Hydari said that he had great regard for Bankim Chandra Chatterjee whom he never considered to be anti-Muslim. He further said there was nothing in the song that could irritate the feelings of the Muslims. The song might be sung in social functions but it should not be sung in the University Campus. It was further added that Nagpur University might give the students admissions but not services. The Information Bureau published the following communique—" In connection with the present strike of certain Osmania University students over the singing of the Vandemataram song in the Hostels of the University as a part of the Hindu worship and the representation they have made to the authorities on the subject, H.E.H.'s Government in the Education Department wish to make it clear that they are unable to accept any claim that a song which is of comparatively recent origin and has become a subject of controversy is an integral part of Hindu worship; if once this principle were to be admitted there is no saying where it would end as this would open the door to all kinds of extraneous controversial matters being imported into religious worship, whether by Muslims or by Hindus in the hostels of the University.

There may or may not be any objection to the actual words of the song although in other parts of India objection has been taken to it and it is believed out of deference to Muslim sentiments even the Indian National Congress has considerably curtailed it.

Government have therefore decided that they are not prepared to allow this song to be sung in any Government institutions."

When all channels of peaceful approach were exhausted, the Hindu students proceeded to Nagpur and the Vice-Chancellor of the Nagpur University, Justice Kedar, welcomed them, relaxing all restriction of rules of admission. The exodus was very large. The poor parents and guardians of the students had to bear the onus and suffer unpremeditated monetary losses.

The Hindu students of the University had an interview with Nawab Ali Yavar Jung, the Constitutional Affair Secretary, on Dec. 13, 1938 to discuss their grievances which were forwarded by him to the Executive Council. They were as follows: 1. Ban to be lifted.. 2. No victimisation and amenities to be restored. 3. Willingness to suspend Vandemataram till mutually agreed prayer is evolved. 4. Abolition of both prayer halls. 5. If arrangement of prayer is required new temple and mosque should be built near the hostels. 6. Sympathetic strike on behalf of all Muslim students and 7. Unconditional dismissal of Professor Syed Hussain.

There is a translated cutting from *Andhra Vani* of 19th December, 1938 in the Government records and in it Subha-Chandra Bose's message is given in which the students are inspired to continue the struggle for at least six months. Subhash Chandra Bose wrote.—"Don't yield under any circumstances; the Government will come to terms. At least for six months the strike should continue." This cutting bears signatures of Mehdi Yar jung and Sir Akbar and seems to have been read by them,

On Dec. 26, 1938, Ali Yavar Jung requested Sir Akbar to take up the question to the Inter-University Board. Sir Akbar Hydari hesitatingly remarked on the note as follows :— "If the atmosphere is favourable."

The *Hitavada* of Nagpur of the 18th December, 1938 wrote as follows: "Bankim Chandra Centenary was celebrated. Sri Dwarakanath Mishra was in the chair. Subhash Bose addressed the meeting. He was late in coming from Wardha. He said the condition of India before the arrival of the Britishers was miserable. The book by Bankim Chandra *Anand Math* describes this fallen condition. The people bring about a revolution and it is an accident that the Ruler was a Mohammedan King. Bankim is not a communal writer and Muslim

friends should read his literature. Subhash Bose said 'The Mantra should inspire us to win freedom and also to preserve it permanently.'

The Deccan Chronicle of Dec. 25, 1938 Published an article coptioned "Mahatma Gandhi on Students' rights."

Dr. Jaisoorya Naidu took up the case to the Congress High Command and secured messages of Pandit Nehru and Subhash Chandra Bose. Gandhiji's message was "You have every right to sing this national song in Prayer Hall."

It was stated that Mr. K. S. Vaidya and Pandit Vinayak Rao had been to Madras where they met the Premier C. Rajagopalachari and the Registrar of the Madras University.

The LL.D. degree was conferred upon the Maharaja as Bikaner by the Osmania University. He was asked not to accept it.

The Hindu of Dec. 12, 1938 supported the students giving emphasis on Gandhiji's message.

In the meeting of the Board of Inter-University at Patna in 1939 some resolutions were passed and they were in favour of the Osmania University.

There is a note over the signature of R. M. Crofton, Revenue and Police Member, which is given below :—

It relates to the apology to be given by the Hindu student..

"I understand the students' representatives were willing to sign and after agreeing to sign and issue it delayed two days to consult certain other persons. During these two days they received a secret letter from Savarkar and also letters from Jawaharlal Nehru and from Subhash Chandra Bose, all of them telling the students in no case to give in or to allow any compromise and saying that the Congress would support them in their fight. I really think we ought somehow or other to give publicity to this double-faced communal outlook of the Congress. Savarkar we would not expect anything better from; but Bose and Nehru pretend to be nationalists and

pretend that the Congress is non-communal. It was after receiving these letters from Bose and Nehru that the students decided to leave for Nagpur and not to sign the declaration which had previously been accepted by them. In other words, the students themselves were willing, if left to themselves, to settle this unfortunate dispute; but the Congress leaders for their own personal ends are making dupes of them, reckless of the effect that will have on their future careers, and reckless also of the intense communal bitterness which they are creating by refusing to allow this issue to be settled. Surely, this case properly worked out should be given wide publicity as it more than justifies the position that Government has always taken up that the Hyderabad State Congress is communal and its communal attitude is clearly shown by the advice of its masters like, the present President and the late President of the All-India Congress. It would be good, I think, in India to-day for the double-dealing to be given wide publicity and its boast to act as a national non-communal body exposed and these letters of which copies can surely be obtained from Bose and Nehru will clearly show the dishonesty of their politics."

The news of Mr. Kedar's welcome to Hyderabad students appeared in the *Daily News* of 18th January, 1939. Kedar said "If Muslim students had been harassed on such imaginary grounds in a Hindu State I would haveadmitted them into the University. My support to genuine students' cause is always there."

Sir. Akbar in his letter dated 9th February, 1939 addressed to the Chairman of the Inter-University Board (S. E. Ranganathan, Vice-Chancellor, Madras University) argued that the action of the Nagpur V. C. was against the resolutions passed by the Board.

One Mr. Venkata Rao, Vakil, wrote an appealing letter to Sir Akbar, Chancellor, Osmania University. He argued that it was very difficult to find out a prayer for the Hindu students which could be acceptable to Shaivaites, Vaishnavaites, Lingayats, Shaktaites etc. Hindu religion had numberless sects and sub-sects and hence the choice of Vandemataram.

There is a note over the signature of Sir Akbar Hydari and Mehdi Yar Jung dated 8th December, 1938.

This had been handed over to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor who was to be guided with the spirit of the note in all cases. The note was to be looked upon as the Government's decision in the matter.

"NOTE

With regard to the representation made by the students of the Osmania University, both boarders and day scholars, who are at present on strike, it may be explained that the attitude of His Exalted Highness' Government towards the song known as Vande.nataram is as follows :—

Government are unable to accept any pretension; that any song which is of comparatively recent origin is an integral part of the Hindu religion like the Vedas, the Puranas and the Bhagwat Gita etc., because if once this principle were to be admitted there is no saying where the matter would end, as this would open the door to all kinds of matter, political and other, being imported into religious worship in the hostels of the University. There may not be any objection to the words contained in the song, say, on social occasions not connected with the University. But it may be stated that in other parts of India exception has been taken to its being sung, so much so, that even in some of Congress provinces the song has been considerably curtailed.

Government desire here to make it clear that the objection to the importation of matter of recent origin into religious service would apply to all religions alike the Muslim no less than the Hindu.

The representation made by the students contains some very regrettable misrepresentations, for example, the allegation about the students having been turned out of their hostels at 9 p.m. without their bedding is absolutely false, as is also the other allegation about abusive language having been used.

With the full concurrence of Government a notice was given to the strikers to come back within a week from the date of the notice, failing which their names would be struck off the rolls. If the students do not return to the University by due date, then in view of what has

been stated in the notice, action should be taken accordingly. But if the P. V. C. and his advisers in the exercise of their discretion should desire to extend this period to the end of the Christmas holidays, Government would not object."

There is another letter dated Dec. 24, 1938 written by Mehdi Yar Jung, Education Minister, giving his personal opinion to the Chancellor of the Osmania University, Sir Akbar Hydari (Prime Minister), which reads as follows :— " Kindly see the Press Note issued by the Vice-Chancellor of the Nagpur University which Mr. Qazi Mohammad Hussains and Dr. M. Qureshi will submit to you personally. It relates to the admission of expelled students into the Nagpur University.

At the best, it is a breach of Inter-University etiquette that has been committed by the Vice-Chancellor in admitting those students into his University. But the Press Note implies an insinuation against us which is objectionable. We should have been asked the exact circumstances of their expulsion if there were doubts and whether we had any objection to their admission.

I am strongly of the opinion that we should do nothing to stop these students from entering other Universities as otherwise we may be accused of vindictively pursuing them and trying to ruin their careers even outside Hyderabad. That is far from being our purpose. But what I wish to emphasise is that whereas I have heard that the Andhra, Annamalai and Benaras Hindu Universities have been perfectly correct in their attitude and have refused admission to the students who were expelled from the Osmania University, the Nagpur University has not observed the usual etiquette. This may be a matter to be taken up by the Inter-Universities Board of which you are a Member."

Dr. Ranganadhan, Vice-Chancellor, Madras University wrote on 16th February, 1939 in reply to a letter of Sir Akbar Hydari dated 9th February, 1939, that no students of the Osmania University were admitted into the Engineering Colleges of the Madras University. If any of the Osmanians are admitted into any of the Engineering schools he had no knowledge; that was the jurisdiction of the Education Minister.

There is a letter over the signature of Sri C. Rajagopalachari dated 13th February, 1939. He admitted that scurrilous writing was going on in British India and that it is difficult to keep the field clean. He says he would do his best to keep newspapers under discipline but strikes a note at the end in this strain that much need not be expected from this endeavour.

Sri A. C. Sen Gupta of the Morris College wrote under date 7th March, 1939 to Sir Akbar. His anxiety was that these disturbances at the Osmania University should cease as early as possible for they had created new problems at Nagpur. He desired that before the terms of settlement were elicited from the students it was better to understand and ascertain from the Chancellor of the Osmania University as to what commitments he wanted from the students. If students were approached first they might dictate extravagant terms. Gupta desired that the Government circular should be withdrawn and no students should be victimised. Separate Prayer Halls should be allotted for Hindus and non-Hindus. He wanted to mediate after learning from Sir Akbar.

It seems a resolution was passed at the Inter-University Board that the Nagpur University should not admit expelled Osmanians without entering into communication with the Osmania University. There is a draft of a letter addressed to Sri C. Sen Gupta with the signature of Sir Akbar of 14th March 1939 corrected at many places. The Osmania authorities were unwilling to withdraw the circular but were prepared to offer very good terms and they were offered. Compromise was likely to be arrived at but political leaders threw them back into an attitude of recalcitrance. The letter blames that the Nagpur University welcomed them without any reference to the Osmania University authorities.

CHAPTER XIV

THE HINDU MAHASABHA, THE PRAJAMANDAL AND THE HINDU CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION SATYAGRAHA

According to the declaration made by Y.D. Joshi and Jukkalkar before their arrest on Azur 15 (20th October, 1938)that the orders of Government would be defied every Friday by the Hindu Civil Liberties Union, the Hindus and Arya Samajists began to collect near the Ram Mandir, Gowliguda, early in the morning on Azur 23 (28th October, 1938). By 8 a.m. the crowd swelled to about 4,000. The emergence of the Satyagrahis from Ram Mandir who were to constitute the procession was eagerly awaited. Cries of 'Hindu Dharma Ki Jai', and 'Mahatma Gandhi Ki Jai' were raised in a lus'y spirit. Some Muslims were seen near the locality armed with swords. In view of this and in view of the fact that a large gathering of Arya Samajists and students of various schools, for instance Viveka-Vardhini and Chaderghat High School, might create some trouble, the crowd was persuaded to disperse and at places it had to be pushed back. Someone threw stones from the direction of Ram Mandir which resulted in a slight injury to a Brahmin. This incident had subsequently been reported by some of the press correspondent , for instance, by C.K. Naidu and Moorty, as a mild lathi charge. Some Arya Samajists who on the previous day had made offensive demonstrations in connection with Manick Rao's funeral, were also observed in the crowd trying to incite feelings. By 9-30 or 10 a.m. the whole crowd cleared away and subsequently it was learnt that the procession of the Satyagrahis would march from Ram Mandir at 3 p.m.

Hindus, Arya Samajists and Muslims again began to collect in the afternoon and the gathering swelled to 8,000 by 3 p.m. It was noticed that Muslims were carrying swords. Sikhs were present in the crowd in appreciable numbers and all of them were armed with swords. The attention of Karam Singh, "*Muntazim*" of the Gurudwara, was drawn to this and he succeeded in removing a number of Sikhs from the scene. The gathering would have been much larger if certain points were not picketed and traffic

generally suspended. At about 3-15 p.m. Sri Ramulu and Devadas entered the Ram Mandir from behind the "Hunumanji" carrying Waman Naik's photograph. The assemblage inside the Mandir numbered some 500 and Hindu women were observed on its roofs and walls. The gathering greeted the photograph carried by Sri Ramulu and Devdas with vehement cries of "Waman Naik Ki Jai" which were repeated by the immense crowd waiting outside. The atmosphere seemed to echo and re-echo with cries of "Mahatma Gandhi Ki Jai" and "State Congress Zindabad." Waman Naik's photograph was garlanded by Digambar Rao and Devgiri Lachmayya, who in their turn were garlanded by the youths of the Karma Yogi Seva Dal. Digambar Rao read a printed declaration about offering Satyagraha and every sentence of the declaration was punctuated by the gathering with shouts of "Waman Naik Ki Jai".

At about 3-35 p.m. the Satyagrahis emerged from Ram Mandir and were greeted by the crowd with deafening acclamations. The Satyagrahis and a section of the crowd marched on to the public thoroughfare in a procession.

Some 16 persons who were very troublesome were arrested at once and removed from the scene in a Police lorry. The immense crowd in front of Ram Mandir was held in check and had to be pushed back. In the general confusion, a few persons left their chappals on the road, which were later picked up by some mischievous youths and thrown into the air. Some stones were also observed to fly past. The entire crowd, however, cleared away by 6 p.m. Hundreds of Hindus and Arya Samajists were seen visiting the Sikh Gurudwara obviously with a view to enlisting the sympathies of the Sikhs.

In a Police meeting on Nov. 9, 1938. the following was resolved :—

"As regards Karma Yogi Seva Dal, the Commissioner of Police stated that this Dal has changed its name into the Hindu Civil Liberties Union. Action was being taken against individual leaders, some of whom have been convicted and sent to jail and therefore the Commissioner recommended that at present it was not necessary to declare this as unlawful. The D. D. G., C.I.D., also agreed with this view".

As the regards Maharashtra Conference it, was decided that the Home Secretary should prepare a draft and put it up at the next Police meeting.

The article in the *Rahbar-i-Deccan* dated the 5th Dai about the Aurangabad incident was brought to the notice of the meeting and the District Police representative was asked to make thorough enquiries in the matter and send a report.

It was resolved that a record should be kept by the City District Police of the persons coming from outside and action taken against them.

In the meeting of 11th January, 1939, it was resolved that as regards the storing of lathies by Hindus in certain districts, as for instance, in Parbhani, it was decided, on the suggestion of the Hon'ble Police Member, that the D.G.P. should issue instructions to all District Superintendents of Police that when they find it desirable to stop importing or carrying of lathis they should ask the Magistrate concerned to pass orders under Section 145 Asafia Criminal Procedure Code *i.e.*, where a breach of the peace is regarded as imminent. Such orders would either be to the effect that no lathis should in future be imported or that the carrying of lathis in public was prohibited. The Draft Lathi Order with the Commissioner of Police would be sent by him direct to the Director-General of Police so that he might send it for the information of the District Superintendents of Police.

In a meeting on April 26, 1939. it was resolved that whipping should be avoided and used only as a last resort. It could be suitably used where there was violence with indiscipline, for example, if any jail employees were struck by a prisoner.

Regarding payment of four annas a day to those who fast, it was resolved that the ordinary rule should be followed. On isolation of leaders and distribution of 'Jathas' in different jails, the Committee agreed with the arrangements whereby certain leaders were to be housed in separate buildings and if necessary in rented houses, and Jathas distributed in different jails.

Regarding forcible feeding of hunger strikers, it was decided that forcible feeding should be resorted to when the Director advised it.

The report of the Director-General of Jails mentioned that some Arya Samaj prisoners asked for the Jail Doctor to attend on them when really they were not ill. It was resolved that the Director-General of Police might arrange for increasing the Medical staff so that the jail Medical officer might get sufficient relief.

CHAPTER XV

THE MAHARASHTRA PARISHAD

Though the Maharashtra Parishad was held in the first week of June, 1937 at Parthur in the Parbhani District under the Presidentship of Govinda Rao Nanal, a prominent lawyer of Parbhani, attempts had been made for a meeting by eminent persons like Waman Naik, Govinda Rao Nanal and Kashinath Rao Vaidya since 1935. A provisional local committee too was formed but things did not so progress as to take a practical shape. Later, Anand Krisana Waghamare and Anant Rao Kulkarni who was an active organiser from Hipperga contemplated to start a Maharashtra Sangh and organise the citizens of the Marathwada and set up committees in districts, taluks and important villages. Waman Naik was very keen on the formation of such a Sangh but unfortunately he passed away in 1936.

Immediately after this, the Andhra Conference was held at Shadnagar, in the vicinity of Hyderabad, under the Presidentship of Venkataranga Reddy where many Maharashtrian citizens of Hyderabad had the opportunity of observing the harmonious and vigorous work done by the Telengana workers. Shadnagar was then included in the Jagir of Maharajah Sir Kishan Pershad whose Secretary Gunde Rao was personally present at the Andhra Conference. He was a gentleman of extremely agreeable nature and respected by all the three linguistic groups. He encouraged Maharashtrian citizens to take a cue from the Andhra Conference and hold the first session at Parthur which also lay in the Jagir of Maharajah Sir Kishan Pershad. Gunde Rao promised to secure Government permission for the session of the Parishad. Govind Rao Ghare Patil was elected Chairman of the Reception Committee and Balwanta Rao Galgale, Secretary. Vithal Rao Deshpande and Anand Rao Waghamare exerted themselves at Hyderabad to make preliminary arrangements. At the session proper, leading Maratha citizens of Hyderabad were present to supervise all the activities so that a standard of organised and constitutional procedure could be pursued. Swami Ramanand Theerth was present with colleagues of the Mominabad High School. All the

workers enjoyed delightful exultation, because a good beginning was made. In the whole deliberations of the Conference, there was absolutely nothing which could cause even the slightest irritation to Government.

The Second Session was held at Lathur in 1937, in Osmanabad District. Srinivasa Rao Sharma, B.A., BAR-AT-LAW, the younger brother of Raghavendra Rao Sharma, was the President of the Session. The whole atmosphere was seething with political unrest for a considerable time. Dhulpet riots which were the last link in the chain of riots all over the State then had taken place and the whole case was so handled by the Government that the people were practically convinced that no justice would be meted out to the victims and nothing would be done to eradicate the poison of communalism spreading over the State. Anand Rao Waghamare had just started a weekly paper "*Marathwada*" from Poona which was ceaselessly criticising the Hyderabad Government with incisive articles for its gross communalism and iniquity. The Hyderabad Government was extremely vigilant in exercising control over the buoyant activities of the Parishad. The Collector of the place insisted on submitting all the resolutions for his consideration and sanction without which they could not be moved in the plenary session. The Collector was adamant on not sanctioning two resolutions. The first related to the demand for civil liberties and the second to a public enquiry through a commission in to the recent chain of riots. After much discussion, the District Collector was prepared to accept the resolution regarding civil liberties but the second he would not permit to be discussed. The delegates and the organisers of the Parishad were in no mood to submit themselves to such humiliating terms and the Second Session of the Maharashtra Conference came to an end abruptly. A sub-committee consisting of Kashinath Rao Vaidya, Swami Ramanand Thirth and Digambar Rao Bindu was appointed to decide the future programme. Swamiji's influence in the sphere of the Parishad began to wax and be felt by all.

In the years 1938, 1939 and 1940, all the activities of the Hyderabad State Congress which represented all the three regional interests were pulsating with political ardour. Satyagraha was in full swing and hundreds of volunteers and scores of dictators were arrested and put

in jail. All the active workers and thoughtful leaders were in confinement and, therefore, the Maharashtra Parishad had little to claim as its own activities. The dynamic programme of the State Congress which was above all parochialism infatuated the young workers so much so that they forgot that they owed something to the Maharashtra Parishad.

The Third Session of the Parishad was held at the end of May, 1941 at Umri in the Nanded District under the Presidentship of Kashinath Rao Vaidya. That was the first session at which agriculturists in thousands had gathered to witness the proceedings. The ideal of Responsible Government was discussed and inculcated on the minds of all who participated. The constitutional reforms announced by the Government were rejected as inadequate, unsatisfactory and reactionary. The Conference demanded that a constitution, ultimately the aim of which is Responsible Government, should be framed with the help of popular representatives and immediately enforced.

The activities of the workers of the Parishad became widespread and deeper. Lakshman Rao Waluskar of Aurangabad was the main inspiration and guide of the young workers. It was mainly through his efforts that several adult schools and literary centres were opened in the Districts. Members were enrolled in thousands and other useful activities were taken up. In British India, a great avalanche of political movement had burst in August, 1942. It had its effects even in Hyderabad. The Fourth Session took place at Aurangabad under the Presidentship of Shridhar Vaman Naik, B.A., Bar-at-Law. Anand Rao Waghamare and Govind as Shroff, who were released from jail, actively worked for awakening and enlisting members. All the resolutions passed eloquently indicated that the movement had received a momentum which the Government found very difficult to repress and counteract. Aurangabad is the biggest town in Marathwada. A Government officer who had watched the whole conference at close quarters frankly admitted that the whole function was a replica of the Indian National Congress. Differences of opinion regarding the aims and ideals of the Parishad began to appear as usual among the workers; still sobriety was maintained and a constitution which was agreeable

to all was accepted. Govind Das Shroff was elected Secretary who organised the conferenc very systematically with centres and working committees at District and Taluk Headquarters and other important towns and villages. These were the years of food shortage and levy collection which gave ample scope to corrupt practices and harassment of the farmers. The workers of the Parishad exposed all these grievances to the utter displeasure of the Government.

The fifth Session of the Parishad was convened at Beed. Manickchand Pahade of Aurangabad was elected the Secretary. He was the first dictator of the State Congress Satyagraha of Aurangabad Centre. He was a well-known active leader of the radical views and therefore Government used a different strategy by detaining him and Govind Das Shroff at Aurangabad, forbidding them to cross the boundaries of the District. The Standing Committee meeting was held on the 2nd and 3rd June, 1944 at Aurangabad and it was decided to carry on only organisational work.

The Sixth Session was held at Sailu in 1945 under the Presidency of D.G. Bindu and the Seventh session at Latur in 1946 at which Anand Rao Waghamare was elected to preside. Both these sessions show a high watermark of the growing influence and vigour of the organisation. Various programmes which would catch the imagination of the villagers were organised and deeper awakening among the agriculturists was shown. Even the taluk Conference expressed their dissatisfaction with Government in a spectacular manner. Processions of the Presidents in bullock carts with several pairs of bullocks were some of the special features of these sessions.

The organisational work of the Maharashtra Parishad constitutionally might not have been quite thorough but the enthusiastic spirit that bubbled in the hearts of all the workers had a remarkable significance. There were workers of all shades of political opinion like the Communists, Royists, Socialists, Liberals and Congressites. But, as the common object of all was the same, no party wanted to oust the other and, therefore, a sort of fraternity existed among all.

Shri Kashinath Rao Vaidya who presided over the Third Session of the Maharashtra Parishad in May, 1941 said in the come of his address as follows :—

"Ladies and Gentlemen, I shall now draw your attention to one of the most burning topics of the day, not only in Hyderabad but in the whole of India. It is the question of *Hindu-Muslim unity*. Everybody knows that these two communities have been peacefully living in the State for several centuries and enjoyed the reputation of living together with great cordiality. But since recently the tension between the two communities is growing and we do not know to what pitch it will go. Dhoolpet riots, Bidar incendiarism, mob violence at Nanded and other places have brought disgrace to the good name of the State and words fall too short to condemn them adequately. Criminal cases, regarding communal riots, are still going on in courts and even to-day nobody can say when communal trouble will arise. Cities or towns are not free from it, nor are the villages outside its clutches. In many places, it is found that the pretext that leads to the trouble is extremely minor and one would even laugh at it. It is high time that we should study and find out the true causes of the communal disunity and friction that is raging now in the country. Hitherto, the two great communities of Hindus and Muslims harboured no thoughts of ill-will and they lived peacefully as subjects of one Ruler, both of them being equal in their loyalty and allegiance to him. But now one has begun to suppose that he is the conqueror and looks upon the other as his subject. This new and unhistorical theory was being so assiduously propagated that it is taking root even among ignorant village Muslims. It is considered that the sovereignty is vested in the Muslims of the State and that His Exalted Highness is merely a symbol of their sovereignty. On the one hand, these people cannot tolerate the idea of Responsible Government because they think that the prerogatives of the Ruler will be fettered thereby and ostensibly they fight the idea of Responsible Government tooth and nail on this pretext. But at the same time, they have come out with this curious theory that the sovereignty is vested only in the Muslims of the State. If the Muslims say that the sovereignty is vested in the subjects of the State in general, it would not be objectionable to anyone in view of the advanced ideas of the times. But an attempt to make invidious distinction between the two communities is suicidal to the interests of the State. To say that Hyderabad is a Muslim kingdom, in this sense, is an attempt to alienate the sympathies of the Hindus

from the State. We consider that this State is of both the Muslims and Hindus and to say that His Exalted Highness the Nizam is a Ruler only of the Muslims is contradicting the past history. I want my Muslim friends to understand that His Exalted Highness is the Ruler of a crore and a half people and not only of fifteen lakhs of Muslims. By such allegations they are weakening the strength of the State, as well as that of the Ruler. They also forget that this claim of theirs contradicts the Gracious Firman of His Exalted Highness in which he has said that as a King he has no religion but that of looking to the welfare of the subjects, although as an individual he is a Muslim. I, therefore, most earnestly request my Muslim friends to reconsider the effects of such views. They will be serving the Ruler and State by abstaining from indulging in such unreasonable and harmful talk. They may think that by such talks, they would catch the sentiments of uneducated Muslims, but they must remember that if these people once take into their heads that they are rulers, then no administration would be possible. They will refuse to obey the laws and thus it would lead to chaos."

CHAPTER XVI

THE KARNATAKA PARISHAD

The Kannadigas of the Hyderabad State have been showing great literary activity from the very beginning. Literary activities generally do not invite the attention of Government. But, literature also can never be free from the sentiments of liberty and its demands. Such literary associations flourished in places like Gulbarga, Raichur and also Hyderabad. In 1934, an All-Karnataka Sahitya Parishad was held at Raichur. The organisers of such associations keenly desired that if a central federal body is located in a convenient place like Hyderabad, the gush of enthusiasm displayed in several places would not fritter away but be pooled together for joint purpose. The Nizam Karnataka Central Committee was in the process of offering to co-operate with different associations, but it did not take practical shape. Such a body would have furnished a fruitful field even for the activities of the Government servants, teachers and less adventurous vakils. But it could not be.

In 1937, the Silver Jubilee of His Exalted Highness was to be celebrated in Hyderabad. Several well-to-do and educated Kannadigas had congregated in Hyderabad to participate in the function. This occasion was selected for holding the first session of the Nizam Karnatak Parishad at the well decorated Excelsior Theatre in Hyderabad under the presidentship of P. Kishan Rao, a famous vakil from Raichur. Little could the organisers dream that this newly born association would ultimately have confluence with the State Congress. It meant a plant that had grown in an atmosphere of loyalty to the monarch had culminated in its productivity into something which was entirely antagonistic to the organisational purpose.

1938, as has been seen, was the year of all round political awakening and Satyagraha in the State. Janardana Rao Desai, the General Secretary of the Parishad, represented the Nizam Karnataka Parishad in the first batch of the Satyagraha on the 24th of October, 1938. The sacrifice of Janardana Rao, a well to-do and talented lawyer, created a great adoration for him.

He was chosen as the President for the second session of the Karnataka Parishad at Bidar in 1940. A large number of delegates from Raichur endeavoured their utmost to confine the proceedings of the conference to a non-political field. But, the President voiced the aims and ideals of the Parishad in clearest terms in his address and asserted that nothing but political freedom would be the objective of the Parishad. The resolution debated referred to the Reforms announced by the Government which were condemned unanimously and a demand was made for civil liberties. Janardana Rao Desai made a suggestion in his speech that there should be regional autonomous units federated into a central body. Permission was sought to celebrate the Students' Conference at Bidar but it was negatived by the Government. Bidar has a preponderance of dominating Muslim culture on account of its being the second capital of the Bahmanies after Gulbarga. The Muslims of the place were amazed to see the fearless atmosphere of political aspirations which pervaded the whole session. Only a few months after this celebration took place the greatest tragedy at Bidar occured in which about 80 shops in the market place were gutted and a spirited Kannadiga lawyer Baswantha Rao was assassinated. In the wake of these atrocities at Bidar, similar demonstrations consisting of loot and arson were staged at Aurad Shahjahani and Aland. The workers of the Parishad struggled hard to see that a judicial enquiry would take place into these tragic occurrences but on account of the want of funds and the callousness of the Government, nothing was done to punish the culprits. In September, 1940, Swami Ramanand Teerth, Pranesharcharya and Srinivasa Rao Hawaldar were arrested and detained in jail for 15 months.

The third session of the Nizam Karnataka Parishad was held in March, 1942 at Shorapur in the Gulbarga district under the presidentship of Anna Rao Gynamukhi, a Lingayat vakil of Gulberga. The political halo associated with the Parishad was so embarrassing that the Raja Saheb of the place who had expressed his desire to co-operate with the Conference later refused even to spare his grounds for erecting the pandal. The organisers of the conference threatened direct action, if officials did not prevail upon the local people to allow their grounds for pandals. The conference was truly representative.

Co-operation with the Anti-Air Raid Protection(A.R.P) had become a debatable question. As the Indian National Congress under the guidance of Mahatmaji had expressed its disapproval towards helping war effort, his followers and admirers had to defy instructions of the British Government. Non-co-operation with the A.R.P. indicated the willingness to be mal-treated by the goondas who would rush into various places to extinguish fires. Therefore, some of the sober elements desired to participate in the movement of civic guards and A.R.P. The civic guards were to be equipped with weapons. Difference between the fire-brand enthusiasts prepared to follow the Gandhian cult and the sober elderly group began to appear. The discussion over this resolution ended in a chaos in the Subjects Committee.

The Fourth Session of the Parishad took place at Raichur in May, 1944, the President-elect being Kakkeri Hanumantha Rao, a Legal Practitioner from Gulbarga. The Constitution of the Karnatak Parisnad was not well framed, and though there was a Standing Committee and a Working Committee, the primary membership was very slender. A Sub-Committe was formed to frame the Constitution. In 1946 summer, Kakkeri Hanumantha Rao was re-elected to preside over the Conference. The most urgent problem of the day was whether the conference would be turned into a single political central organisation. The second outstanding issue was the disapproval of the proposed reforms introduced by the Government. Many persons loudly asserted that as the Government would not revise the reforms, as the Government had promised secretly some concessions to the Anjuman Ittehad-ul-Muslimeen and Responsible Government could not be promised, it was better to keep away from the Government.

Ban on the State Congress was lifted on the 3rd July, 1946 and it was decided after careful deliberation to merge the Nizam Karnataka Parishad with the State Congress.

The activities of the Kannadigas were very vigorous and tactful. Ali Yavar Jung has endorsed that these activities are called constructive but they deserve to be called obstructive. On the 2nd October, 1942, the following gentlemen had assembled at Ramachari's house—

1. Ramachari, 2. Janardana Rao, 3. Krishnachary, 4. Srinivasa Rao Madanurkar, 5. Jayachari, 6. Srinivasa Rao Kandi, 7. Jagirdar, 8. Yashvantha Rao, 9. Krishna Rao, 10. Brahmachary, 11. Adavirao, 12. Dr. Deshpande, 13. Ramacharya Joshi, 14. Narendra Dutt, 15. Keshav Rao Shrikhande, 16. Tirmal Rao Gangavati.

The folloing res'utions adopted:--

"Resolved that the District Advisory Committees were useless. We should non-co-operate with them and demand Responsible Government". It was a meeting of the Standing Committe of the Karnataka Conference. They were issuing instructions to all the branches to non-co-operate with Government.

A meeting took place on the 2nd of October, 1942, at the residence of Janardana Rao Desai to establish a Town Committee for the Karnataka Conference to increase membership and to impart adult education.

CHAPTER XVII

THE HISTORY OF THE HYDERABAD STATE CONGRESS

1. *Formation of the State Congress and Governments' ban on it*

Though the Hyderabad State belonged to the Asaf Jahi Dynasty and was ruled by H.E.H. Mir Osman Ali Khan Bahadur, it was a part of India, situated on the Deccan Plateau, land-locked and inhabited by people speaking three languages, Telugu, Marathi and Kanada. These linguistic groups had easy contacts, cultural and social relations and communications with their neighbours residing in either Bombay, Madras, Mysore or Nagpur.

The Hyderabad State Political Conferences were held in several places like Kakinada, Bombay and Poona; a session was held at Akola in Berar in 1931, under the Presidentship of Ramachandra Naik. The choice of the venue was very strategic whatever might have been the intensity of the political aspiration of the participants of the Conference; the sentiments of the r ler and his administrators endeavouring to assert their claims on Berar were delightfully tickled. The significant resolution unanimously adopted at the Conference related to the demand of Responsible Government under the aegis of H.E.H. the Nizam. But the Hyderabad Government did not evince even the slightest interest in this. The Standing Committee of the Hyderabad Political Conference submitted a memorandum of its demands and aspirations on the eve of his Silver Jubilee to the Nizam. It prayed for the expansion of the Legislative Council on democratic lines and expeditious introduction of reforms. Kashinath Rao Vaidya, a newly nominated member of the Legislative Council, requested Government to permit him to introduce a bill for amending the existing Legislative Council Regulations.

During the momentous years of 1931 and 1932, when the Round Table Conferences were being held in England and the era of repression inaugurated by Lord Willingdon was in full swing, a severe struggle continued

under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. Hyderabad could not keep out of the fray. Hundreds of young men and women had offered themselves as volunteers and struggled in the fights put up by the Indian National Congress. Even in Hyderabad, the propaganda of Khaddar, boycotting of foreign goods and prohibition were being vigorously carried on. Fazlul Rahman, the Secretary of the Swadeshi League, had ultimately to relinquish his professorship in the City College, Hyderabad. The District Congress of Hyderabad which was affiliated to the Indian National Congress observed the Motilal Day, notwithstanding the displeasure of the Government. The flag salutation ceremonies had become weekly features. The Navajeevan Sabha also offered homage to Pandit Motilal Nehru at the anniversary, defying Section 144. About this time, Sir Akbar Hydari, President of the Executive Council in Hyderabad, held a special session of the Legislative Council at which he delivered a special gracious message of His Exalted Highness the Nizam and announced the formation of a Special Committee under the chairmanship of Dewan Bahadur Aravamudu Iyengar to study the conditions obtaining in the State and make suitable proposals for the introduction of political reforms in the Legislature and the State. This announcement failed to afford satisfaction to the minds of the politically conscious people of the State who denounced the terms of reference and even the personnel of the Committee. The frustration that was caused to the public was particularly keen because the objectives of the Committee were very vague and did not give any indication of the idea of contemplated Responsible Government. However, the Firman had laid a condition that the reforms of constitution would be inaugurated before the end of the Jubilee year. But as had been seen, this period was extended and it caused great dissatisfaction to the public.

In January, 1938, a Hyderabad People's Convention was held under the presidency of Madapati Hanumantha Rao at which representatives of all the sections had assembled. Here too, a resolution was adopted which endorsed the necessity of introducing early Responsible Government. On account of the dissident note of Kashinath Rao Vaidya, the glamour of the Iyengar Committee had waned. The Chairman of the Convention Committee addressed a letter to Government on 8rd

July, 1938 and invited their attention to the urgent necessity of according Responsible Government to the State and to raise it on a par with other surrounding States. The petition had referred to the case of a small State like Cochin which enjoyed Responsible Government and it was further urged that a premier State like Hyderabad should not lag behind. It was unfortunate that, at the same time the Government had repealed the obnoxious Gashti No. 53 regarding public meetings and had introduced another set of rules which afforded a wider scope to the Police authority for restricting public meetings.

All these tensions between the aspirations of the people and the repressive influence of the Government had come to such a pass that all people began to realise the necessity of a non-communal organisation which could emphatically but constitutionally secure Responsible Government for the State. The Indian National Congress session was held at Haripura in 1933 and was largely attended by about 500 people from the Hyderabad State. Some of the resolutions passed there had inspired self-reliance in the minds of the youthful participants of the Congress and compelled the Hyderabadis to organise some political body even at Hyderabad. Many elderly and thoughtful citizens of Hyderabad felt that if the discontent generated in the minds of the politically conscious youths of the State was not marshalled properly and organised into a political body, it might be misdirected into communal channels. All were anxious to eschew communal rancour and consolidate the patriotic spirit into a well-knit national body. Severl informal meetings were held for the formation and creation of the Hyderabad State Congress. A Provisional Committee was formed in the middle of July, 1938 and within a month about twelve hundred primary members were enrolled not only in the twin cities of Hyderabad and Secunderabad but also in the districts and it was decided to hold a general body meeting by about the 9th September, 1938 for the election of office bearers and adoption of the Constitution.

In the second week of August, 1938, an appeal was issued by the Provisional Committee which ran as follows:-

Translations of this appeal in Telugu, Marathi. Kannada, Hindi and Urdu were distributed to all.

"The Provisional Committee of the Hyderabad State Congress urges the people of the State irrespective of caste or creed or section or class to join the State Congress and strengthen the movement for Responsible Government.

There is evidently a great need for the inauguration of a sound movement based purely on national lines in the State at this juncture when very important constitutional reforms are about to be introduced in the near future by the Government and various social and economic schemes for the reconstruction are under consideration. A recognition of this urgency has led to the inauguration of the organisation called the Hyderabad State Congress, the aims and objects of which are as follows :—

The object of the Hyderabad State Congress is attainment by the people of Responsible Government under the aegis of H.E.H. the Nizam and the Asaf Jahi dynasty. This object is to be achieved by all peaceful and legitimate means and by promoting national unity, fostering public spirit and developing and organising the intellectual, moral, economic and industrial resources of the country.

This Premier State of ours can no longer lag behind others politically in view of the great political progress and constitutional changes happening fast in the adjoining British Indian Provinces and Indian States. Keen interest has been evinced in this matter all over the country in spite of educational backwardness. However, a variety of reasons are obstructing the growth of a harmonious political progress of the State, the most important of them being the present communal tangle.

This communal conflict in the land is too well-known to need any mention. At such critical juncture, the duty of cementing harmony among the communities lies not only on the shoulders of the Government but also on the people themselves, who sincerely believe the unity and mutual co-operation between the communities living in the land is necessary before any social, economic and political progress could be attained. Wide agitation is a sign of the times and the leaders of both the communities in the State owe to themselves and the land the duty of

leading the spirit of agitation into proper channels; it is not enough if they keep themselves aloof from communal dissensions but it is their positive duty to wean them from the wrong path and give the people the correct lead for fostering a spirit of patriotism in the country. Such a spread of patriotic feeling is the only means by which all kinds of communal activities can successfully be combated. There can be no question of suppressing the growing public agitation, for such a step is neither possible nor profitable. The problem is not that, but of diverting the consciousness into right channels and developing a patriotic movement on proper lines.

The aims and objects of the Hyderabad State Congress are such that there can be no room for any difference of opinion about them. It is evident that for the achievement of these objects, we require the active unity and co-operation of all communities in the State. Such a consummation is impossible until an organisation, the ideals of which are loftier than the narrow objects of any communal institution, is established in the land. It is futile to entertain mutual distrust; the Hindus doubting whether Muslims will offer their co-operation to them; and the Muslims entertaining a feeling of reservation that the Hindus will give no consideration to their rights and privileges. Such doubts and distrust should not be entertained at present. Because in any scheme of Responsible Government, the majority has a duty of creating confidence in the minority regarding the preservation of the minority's religious, economic, cultural and linguistic privileges intact, the minority having likewise a duty to effectively co-operate with the majority. This is the only way to remove all differences, if there are any, at present. A wave of inter-communal harmony can thus be made to flood the country sweeping away the communal differences and dissensions from the land. It is, therefore, opportune that a national organisation should be established wherein all the people of the State, irrespective of communities they belong to, can participate equally and build a common institution attracting the respect of both the people and the Government.

We reiterate in conclusion that the ultimate goal of the Hyderabad State Congress is the attainment of Responsible Government built on a strong foundation

of our basic loyalty to the Ruler and the Asaf Jahi Dynasty and the creation of sincere unity and harmony among all the communities to join the Hyderabad State Congress and strengthen the efforts for the attainment of Responsible Government by their conduct and participation, diverting thus the present consciousness in the country from the communal trend to the progressive and national path of patriotism."

The appeal gave a substantial summary of the reasons that led to the formation of the new body and at the same time clearly stated what its policy was going to be and made an appeal to persons of all classes and communities to join the Congress. The policy enunciated in this appeal has been, from time to time, amplified and clarified, but has never been diverted or belied, in any statements published subsequently by the Provisional Committee or issued by any Dictator or Secretary, after the Satyagraha started.

The formation of the Hyderabad State Congress had been prohibited by the Government of H.E.H. the Nizam by means of a notification in a Gazette Extraordinary on September, 8, 1938. The Notification stated *inter alia*:—

"His Exalted Highness's Government has no objection to the establishment of political organisations in the State provided that these are on a strictly non-communal basis and have no affiliations with bodies outside the State.

It is the primary task of those who genuinely desire to sponsor the constitutional advance and liberty of the people, as a whole, to purify their own ranks, become true representatives of a people, inherently at peace amongst themselves and thus create a common national platform. They will then have prepared the surest foundation for Government to give earnest consideration to what in that event could be truly national claims, exclusive to no community, yet non-communal, and entitled to the fullest respect. Otherwise, absence of honest distinction between communalism and politics must inevitably tend to jeopardise the chances of any advance. Despite the sensible objects of the organisation, Government is convinced that the continued

presence in it of persons predominantly communal in outlook and aim will determine its actions. While the statement of Government's policy was made in good time for a reconstruction of this organisation being effected and for its being based on broad national foundations, no steps in these directions have so for been taken and Government is thus confirmed in its conviction that the movement, ostensibly political, is in fact a cloak for subversive, communal activities to which the prestige of the name "Congress" has been deliberately attached for misleading the public.

Government is satisfied from its own enquiries and from its knowledge of some of the leading persons associated with the proposed Hyderabad State Congress that it will be, whatever its outward professions, constituted on communal lines and animated by communal and subversive ends which will retard instead of advancing the pace of constitutional reforms in the State. Government have, therefore, decided to prohibit the formation of any organisation so named or so constituted and the Hyderabad State Congress, if formed, is declared to be an unlawful association under the Public Safety Regulation."

2. *Negotiations between the leaders and the Government to lift the ban on the Congress :*

The Provisional Committee met on the birthday of the H.E.H. the Nizam and sent a telegram of congratulations on his 45th birthday to him. About the same time, they issued a further statement clarifying their aims and objectives, which is as follows :—

(The following item had appeared in the press, before the order embodying the ban was imposed) *editor.*

"STATEMENT OF AIMS

(*5th September*, 1938)

The members of the Hyderabad State Congress will assemble on the 9th September, 1938, to elect their office-bearers and adopt the draft constitution. It is available for inspection by the members at the office of the convener and it is hoped that members who desire

to look into it and propose amendments will do so at least three days before the meeting of the General Body, i.e. 9th September, 1938. In the meanwhile, the provisional committee thinks it advisable, once more, to make a clearer and more detailed enunciation of the aims and objects of the Congress so that there may be no misunderstanding about it in any circle whatsoever. It is clearly understood that the Hyderabad State Congress has no connection, official or unofficial, with the Indian National Congress. It is and shall be entirely confined, both in its objective and in its programme of work, to the limits of the requirements of the people of this State and no outside agency, either political or religious, has anything to do with this indigenous institution."

"LOYALTY

The name 'Congress' has been adopted merely to emphasize the nationalist basis underlying this movement as distinguished from that of communal or provincial movements and also because most of the items of the constructive programme of the Indian National Congress will have also to form part of the constructive programme of the State Congress. The second important point which the Committee desires to stress is that this movement is founded upon sincere loyalty to the Asaf Jahi throne and it will always strive to enhance the prestige and power of the king who is the embodiment of the glory and power of this State. The third and the most important fact is its absolutely non-comunal outlook which is the bed-rock of this movement. The committee desires to make it clear to all members that there will be no room for communal politics or for any policies directed for the benefit of any particular community or to the detriment of any other community. The State Congress agreed with the Hon'ble the President of the Executive Council in his severe condemnation of communalism. It appeals to the youth of the State to come forward and strengthen a truly nationalist movement so that the progressive forces in the State may not drift into undesirable channels of activity. It will be an important part of the programme of the Congress to strive to remove all the causes of communal discord and to promote harmony and good relationship between the communities. The Committee once more emphasizes the fact that the best guarantee for this new

body not lapsing into communalism would be for nationalists of diverse communities to join it in sufficient numbers and control its operations. In conclusion, the Committee hopes that the atmosphere of mutual suspicion and distrust will soon disappear and this national movement will be allowed successfully to replace other movements with narrower ideals."

On the 6th of September, Sir Akbar Hydari sent for a few public leaders representing various shades of opinion and gave a bit of his mind to them. It was reported in the local press that he expressed himself in very scathing terms against narrow communalism and advised those who were understood to have been engaged themselves in communal activities to give them up. One of the leaders thus summoned was M. Ramachari, a prominent member of the Provisional Committee. Very few people know that this State Congress representative was the only one who was treated very cordially and was given an assurance of co-operation in his efforts of building up a national outlook, and non-communal common platform. But the epoch of miracles was not yet over. The ban on the State Congress was already in the press while the interview was under progress.

On the 7th September, the ban on the State committ e was issued, and the very same day Ramachari was called by the Kotwal Saheb and was made to understand that the General Body meeting of the State Congress scheduled to be held on 9th September, 1938 should not be held in his house which, in case the meeting was held, might be liable to confiscation. The Provisional Committee met in the evening of 7th September, 1938 and decided to postpone the meeting of the General Body *sine die.*

The Provisional Committee was to interview Sir Akbar Hydari and while the meeting was going on, Sir Akbar was requested on phone if he could grant an interview. Sir Akbar himself spoke on the phone and regretted his inability to grant an interview because he was leaving for Bombay and was getting ready for his journey. The Provisional Committee, however, issued a statement refuting the charges levelled against it by the Government. In the meantime, M. Narasing Rao who had been in his private and personal capacity, exchanging his views about the communal and political questions of the

State with Nawab Bahadur Yar Jung for some time past, communicated the result of his talk to the Hindu leaders, some of whom were members of the Provisional Committee. After a frank talk on these occasions on all matters ranging from mass conversion to Responsible Government, Narasing Rao and the Nawab Saheb had agreed that they should continue their talks with the consent of the other important leaders of their respective communities. On the 18th of September, Narasing Rao had received a letter from the Nawab Saheb suggesting that he should obtain a mandate from 20 Hindu leaders whom the letter named, so that on the basis of their talks they might be able to arrive at the definite arguments on the issue raised by their preliminary discussions. The list of the leaders as given by the Nawab Saheb included the names of six members of the Provisional Committee. They were as follows :—

(1) G. Ramachari, (2) P. V. Joshi,

(3) B. Ramakrishna Rao, (4) Janardan Rao Desai,

(5) S. V. Naik and (6) Ramakish n Dhoot.

Among the rest of the 14 gentlemen named by the Nawab Saheb, except one or two all of them were ordinary members of the Hyderabad State Congress. The letter of the Nawab Saheb, *inter alia* pleaded that during the progress of these very important and crucial negotiations any hostile propaganda or offers for arrest, etc., should not go on so that there may be a calm atmosphere conducive to the success of the negotiations.

On the 22nd September, M. Narasing Rao in his personal capacity met Nawab Ali Yavar Jung to whom he represented these facts and suggested that he should try to get the ban lifted in order to ensure a calm atmosphere during his talks with Nawab Bahadur Yar Jung. He also undertook to persuade the Provisional Committee to postpone the General Body meeting of the Hyderabad State Congress till after the conclusion of the talks. Nawab Ali Yavar Jung agreed and took M. Narasing Rao on the same noon to Sir Akbar's residence. The interview with Sir Akbar lasted for about half an hour in which Narasing Rao explained to him the whole situation and requested him to lift the ban. Sir Akbar who had been briefly informed of all things beforehand readily

agreed to help Narasing Rao by lifting the ban provided that the following six persons, M. Hanumantha Rao, Kashinath Rao Vaidya, G. Ramachari, Vinayak Rao Koratkar, B. Ramakrishna Rao, and Janardan Rao Desai, would submit a joint application making the request and giving the undertaking to postpone the General Body Meeting of the Hyderabad State Congress. During this interview no further conditions were mentioned for the lifting of the ban.

The matter was discussed by leaders and Narasinga Rao, accompanied by other leaders, interviewed the Secretary for Constitutional Affairs, Nawab Ali Yavar Jung. The interview lasted for three hours during which several topics were freely discussed. B. Ramakrishna Rao, the pokesman duly authorised by the Provisional Committee, tried to convince the Secretary that the Institution was in no way communal and that the hesitation of Muslim leaders to join the organisation could not by any stretch of imagination render it communal. The question of outside affiliation was also discussed and B. Ramakrishna Rao assured him that the State Congress had no affiliations with any outside body, though it would be impossible to restrict the individual members from exchanging views with or taking advice from outside politicians.

The Secretary, Nawab Ali Yavar Jung, however, placed two additional conditions before them—conditions which had not been mentioned till then. They were as follows :—

1. That the name of the Hyderabad State Congress should be altered so as to delete the word "Congress" on account of its political implications. He was sure that the Council would insist on its removal.

2. That the signatories to the application for withdrawal should give, in their application, the details of the points under discussion between Narsing Rao and Nawab Bahadur Yar Jung and state categorically on what points there was agreement and on what points difference was likely and to what extent; so that on perusal of the application, the Government may be convinced that there was at least a 50 per cent chance of success, so that the Government may be persuaded to

lift the ban on the organisation. He emphasised that in their petition they should urge on the Government the keen sense of stigma that had been cast upon the State Congress for being banned as communal and assure them of the success of the unity talks.

It was pointed out that the name could not be changed without referring the matter to the General Body of the State Congress. The Provisional Committee further decided that its members should not individually, unless authorised by the Committee, seek or respond to any interview.

By this time, the local press correspondents flashed the news that the ban would be lifted almost in an hour or two. It was also stated that Seth Jamnalal Bajaj and Shrimati Sarojini Devi had received letters from the authorities that the Government were doing their best to lift the ban.

Nawab Ali Yavar Jung in a further interview assured M. Narasing Rao that the Government would not insist on an alteration of the name of the Hyderabad State Congress but would insist on the guarantee that had been asked for, regarding Unity talks and assurance from the Provisional Committee of the Hyderabad State Congress that the meeting of the General Body would be postponed until the conclusion of the Unity talks. A resolution was passed by the Provisional Committee in response to this, reaffirming the belief of the Hyderabad State Congress in the necessity of communal harmony and expressing the willingness of the Provisional Committee to postpone the meeting of the General Body of the Hyderabad State Congress for a fortnight provided that Government were prepared to lift the ban so as to ensure the success of the Unity talks. A copy of the resolution was sent to M. Narasing Rao for his information.

M. Hanumantha Rao, Kashinath Rao Vaidya, and M. Narasing Rao saw Ali Yavar Jung with a draft of the application for the lifting of the ban on the Hyderabad State Congress, for his approval. The draft contained a *general assurance* that the unity talks had a favourable start and there was every hope of a settlement being reached. It also mentioned the important points at issue which were

being discussed. M. Hanumantha Rao and Kashinath Rao Vaidya expressed their willingness to sign this assurance and undertook to collect the signatures of the Hindu leaders othe than the members of the Provisional Committee. Nawab Ali Yavar Jung replied that the assurance was not acceptable but that a detailed assurance was required and it would be necessary for the following three persons, all of whom members of the Provisional Committee, to be amongst the signatories :— B. Ramakrishna Rao, Ramachari and Janardan Rao Desai.

The position of the Provisional Committee was explained to him and M. Narasing Rao assured him that though the members of the committee would not participate in the discussions of the Unity talks, they would assist a happy settlement. Nawab Ali Yavar Jung was not satisfied with it and insisted on a definite assurance with full details of points at issue being given and indicating the chances of agreement under the signature of the persons he had named. The Government otherwise would not care to consider the lifting of the ban on the State Congress. The negotiations with the Government broke down and the situation assumed serious proportions when on 26th September, the Executive Council decided not to lift the ban from the Hyderabad State Congress. The Government thus banged their doors against all negotiations and consultations.

The Government insisted on knowing full details of the Unity talks. But they had reached a stage of stalemate. The inexplicable oscillation of the attitude of the Government about rescinding the ban was firm. The rigidity and coldness with which the question was treated finally in the Executive Council was intolerable and thus left to the Hyderabad State Congress no other option, but to win its way through suffering and struggle. When all arguments failed to convince the Government, the State Congress very reluctantly, yet resolutely, decided to bring about a change in the situation through the logic of Satyagraha.

On 28th September, 1938, M. Narasing Rao addressed a letter to the Provisional Committee of the Hyderabad State Congress expressing his regrets at the failure of his negotiations with the Government regarding the l fting of the ban from the State Congress and requesting them in

his personal capacity to consider the postponement of the General Body Meeting of the Hyderabad State Congress for a fortnight in order to ensure a calm atmosphere which might really prove conducive to the success of his Unity talks with Nawab Bahadur Yar Jung Bahadur.

On the same day, the Provisional Committee adopted a resolution accepting M. Narasing Rao's suggestion. The resolution made a restatement of the attitude of the Hyderabad State Congress towards communalism. The resolution states that in spite of the Government not lifting the ban, they would not say or do anything which might disturb the calm atmosphere necessary for M. Narasing Rao's talks for a fortnight.

The Provisional Committee issued a manifesto in response to the growing public demand, clarifying its position regarding the problems that formed the core of the Unity talks and the outlines of their future policy. The fortnight of waiting was over and no chances of a resolution were visible. The Unity talks dragged on indefinitely and further suspension of the decision of the Committee became impossible.

3. *Satyagraha by the State Congress*

The Committee considered all possible alternatives and when it found all roads closed, it decided upon the inevitable course of Satyagraha. The Provisional Committee was dissolved and the Council of Action took its place. This Council later formed the State Congress in defiance of the ban and constituted itself as the Working Committee.

About a month elapsed between the decision of the Provisional Committee of the State Congress and the actual date (*i.e.*, 24th October, 1938) when the Satyagraha started. The atmosphere in the State and even in British India was very tense. Opinions were expressed that wiser counsels would prevail and the Nizam's Government might lift the ban and generally permit the State Congress to function. This political body had repeatedly declared through the press and deputations that its aims and objectives were perfectly free from the communal virus. There were other opinions which congratulated the Nizam's Government upon its prudent decision to ban

the State Congress. Their philosophy was that the deadly consequences of a poison were not to be learnt by actually swallowing it. Prevention is always better than cure.

Gandhiji had published editorially, in the *Harijan* of the 17th September, 1938 an article under the caption "The State and Responsibility". Portions from it run as follows: "The Hyderabad communiques have therefore come upon me as a painful surprise. Sir Akbar is a great educationist. He is a philosopher. It was a pleasure to read his recent convocation address to the Dacca University. It is passing strange that he should have lent himself to the reactionary declarations which condemn an organisation before it had begun to function. What can be the meaning of communalism in a State which is overwhelmingly one population according to religion? The doctrine of minority is a good hobby to ride to a point. But it must be at least numerically a fair minority. Even a minority of one can expect perfect justice. But it has no status in the political field."

The machinery of the Hyderabad Government was in full swing. The Police authorities were instructed to prepare a detailed "Who is Who" of all the likely Satyagrahis and trace their antecedents and communal activities. The Debt Conciliation Board working under Sri Bharucha had to deal with the Sahukars and Bankers. It was ordered to study and report on the financial aid given by them to the Congress movement. Aspersions were cast on some of the richest merchants like Raja Pannalal Pitti. They protested to Sir Akbar, but the President of the Executive Council warned them to modify their ways because the Government held solid proof in their custody.

Upon this the Provisional Committee of the Hyderabad State Congress issued the following Manifesto:—

"MANIFESTO BY THE HYDERABAD STATE CONGRESS

On account of the fact that the Hyderabad State Congress was banned by the Government on the eve of the election of the Working Committee and the adoption of a constitution, it has not been possible for the Congress

to issue any manifesto enunciating clearly its aims and objects in any detail. The Provisional Committee, therefore, desires to clarify the aims and objects of the Hyderabad State Congress in detail so that no cause may be left for doubting its objective and programme in any quarter, whatsoever.

Personal rule was the original form of Government in this State. Salar Jung I almost converted it into a constitutional monarchy. This is how the position has been described by His Late Highness in his Quanooncha Mubarak of 1892 which is the first constitution of this State. The Cabinet Council and the Legislative Council were then formed. The former was merely an advisory body but soon became effective and the latter continues to exist in almost the same morbid condition in which it was first established. On getting personal experience of administration, His Exalted Highness the Nizam came to know the defects inherent in personal rule and being satisfied about the necessity for radical changes therein he, in 1919 established the Executive Council because he felt that "the foundation of good Government should be laid more on political tradition and continuity than on the personal qualities of the administrator. In other words, H.E.H. the Nizam advocated the substitution of personal rule by the rule of a continuous and institutional form of good government, which cannot mean anything else than Responsible Government. In the same year, H.E.H. the Nizam issued orders for the immediate reform of the Legislative Council by considerably increasing the elective element therein and by introducing the principle of election by direct franchise with proper protection of the minority rights etc., so as to make the Legislative Council "an effective instrument in the machinery of the Government. Eighteen years elapsed since the issue of the above Firman and in spite of the repeated demands made by the people for implementing the Royal Firman nothing was done in that direction by the Government till September, 1937, when another Committee was appointed to investigate into and suggest the several alternative methods of bringing about an "increasing association of the people with the administration of the State. The Committee finished its labours 1½ months ago and the matter is now before the Government whose announcement is awaited.

The movement for constitutional reforms therefore is not new in this State. It has continued to exist in one form or another for the last two decades as best it could under the rigid restrictions on freedom of speech, association and the press. The demand has now become vocal and insistent with the introduction of provincial autonomy in the neighbouring provinces of British India and in view also of the fact that everywhere in other Indian States the people are actively agitating for and some of them are succeeding in getting Responsible Government. Further more, experience of the last 18 years has shown that the Executive Council which is largely responsible for the administration of the State should also be made responsible to the people through their elected representatives. This demand is perfectly natural, just and genuine and in consonance with the great educational and cultural advance that the people of Hyderabad have made during the last 20 years. The Hyderabad State Citizens' League was started some years ago by prominent Muslims and Hindus of this State but it was not allowed to grow. The pressing demand of public opinion now made it necessary that the Hyderabad State Congress should continue its existence on strictly national and non-communal lines with a clear political objective undeterred by any other object or programme. To call it "communal" is therefore a travesty of facts and truth.

The object of the Hyderabad State Congress is the attainment by the people of Responsible Government under the aegis of H.E.H. the Nizam and the Asaf Jahi dynasty. This object is to be achieved by all peaceful and legitimate means and by promoting national unity and developing and organising the intellectual, moral economical and industrial resources of the Hyderabad State. This is the first clause in the draft constitution of the Congress whose membership is open to all persons over 18 years and those who believe in the object of the Hyder bad State Congress. That this belief in the object of attaining Responsible Government is shared by the educated and thinking public of all communities and castes is more than proved by the fact that the Hyderabad People's Convention submitted a united report to the Government a few months ago making definite proposals for the inauguration of Responsible Government. Six Muslim members of the Convention did not sign the

report because the percentage of seats to be reserved for Muslims in the Legislative council was not agreed upon but there was no difference of opinion whats ever upon theideal of Responsible Government being necessary for the State.

The ideal which has been envisaged by the Hyderabad State Congress is not and cannot be communal inasmuch as it implies with its full safeguards the protection of the cultural and other rights of the minorities. Promotion of national unity being the most important item of its programme the Provisional Committee of the Congress has co-operated most whole-heartedly and will continue to do so in any attempt at arriving at an amicable settlement of the question of minority rights, provided it is consistent with nationalist principles and not opposed to the fundamental principles of democracy.

While it would be premature for the Provisional Committee to draw up any detailed scheme of Responsible Government the following points will serve to make the objective clear:—

(1) Fundamental rights should be conferred upon the people immediately and all rules, regulations and circulars restricting freedom of speech, association and of the press and religious processions etc., should be immediately cancelled.

(2) The Government should recognise Responsible Government as the object of Constitutional Reforms in the State.

(3) An immediate instalment of Responsible Government should be granted on the lines of the proposals in the report of the Hyderabad People's Convention with proper modifications to make Responsible Government more effective and real.

(4) Although the Hyderabad State Congress considers the principles of reservation of seats for any community as another form of communalism it will be prepared to agree, as a purely temporary measure to ensure for not more than 10 years in all, that a certain percentage shall be reserved to the minorities in the Legislature.

(5) With regard to State Services the Congress will not, on principle, advocate any reservation of

percentage on communal lines and would suggest the immediate appointment of a Public Service Commission consisting of officials and non-officials with a view to remove nepotism and for establishing an equitable and just selection for the services.

(6) The Congress would guarantee the cultural, religious and educational rights of any minority in its scheme in any reasonable manner."

"These are the salient features of the policy envisaged by the Hyderabad State Congress and the response given to its call by the youth of the country is indicative of the political consciousness that is fast permeating the minds of the people. Though owing to the obstacles put in its path by the Government, the Congress has not been able to do much in tangible perspective to the popular psychology it has lifted the popular agitation from the ruts of communalism, to a plane of nationalism and sincere patriotism, and has thus achieved a solidarity that was never witnessed before.

"It will thus be clear to any unbiassed mind that the above ideals of the Hyderabad State Congress have been the outcome of a broad national outlook and that by no feat of distortion can they be confused with communalism. The Congress believes that if allowed to work it will strike a death blow to communalism prevalent in the State. To dub such an organisation as communal is not only unjust but a disservice to the State itself.

"The State is passing through critical times and great changes are eagerly expected. People have become restive and are clamouring for recognition of their right to share in the administration of the State. The various repressive measures adopted by the Government within the last few months instead of damping their enthusiasm have strengthened the popular agitation. The Committee, therefore, thinks that it is not wise on the part of the Government to repress a people who are enlightened and know what they are doing. Repression only hardens people and increases discontent.

"In spite of this surcharged atmosphere and the repressive policy of the Government, the people have revealed a considerable amount of restraint at the present juncture.

It would be an error if the present inaction and calm is misinterpreted. The Provisional Committee therefore appeals to the people to strengthen the hands of the Congress by supporting the organisation. They should, however, remember that truth and non-violence are the sheet-anchor of the State Congress and they should act in accordance with this ideal. The State Congress definitely disbelieves in untruth and violence and discountenances communalism.

"To the Government also the Provisional Committee makes a fervent appeal in the interests of the State and the public to rescind the ban on the formation of the State Congress and allow it to carry on its work. It would like to suggest to the Government that the only way of combating communalism is to open the floodgates of real Nationalism and allow it to work its course. The State Congress, they proclaim, is the only organisation that opens these sluices and it would not be in the interests of the State to ignore this fact."

The Committee of Action appointed by the Provisional Committee of the Hyderabad State Congress just before its dissolution, issued the following statement:—

"In view of the situation created by the Government ban on the formation of the Hyderabad State Congress, the Committee of Action reiterates the birthright of the people to organise political associations, and declares hereby that the ban on the formation of the Hyderabad State Congress has been defied by accepting the draft constitution and electing a Working Committee. Keeping the situation created by the Government ban in view, the membership of all the primary members has been suspended, absolving them of any responsibility, whatsoever. The Working Committee consisting of the following members will organise the State Congress, carry on its activities and adopt measure to face the situation created by the Government ban in any manner they consider proper.

President:	1. Govind Rao Nanal.
General Secretary:	2. H. Ramkishan Dhoot.
Members:	3. Ravi Narayana Reddy.
	4. Sreenivas Rao Borikar.
	5. Janardan Rao Desai.

At this juncture when we are forced inevitably to take this course of action, we would like to state that we bear no hatred or malice towards any community or individual. We are second to none in our love for the land and the country. We want to live as self-respecting and free citizens. It is our love, and not hatred or malice, that has induced us to resort to this last method of action, and we hope that we will not be misunderstood or misinterpreted in any quarter whatsoever.

Let it be remembered that the Satyagraha that has been launched should be individual in its character and we appeal to the public in general and Congress-minded persons in particular to avoid public meetings and demonstrations for the present as far as possible, till further instructions. It should be particularly kept in mind that the creed of non-violence and truth is the sheet-anchor of the State Congress and nothing contrary shall be done. Individuals willing to join this Satyagraha movement should do so by declaring themselves as primary members of the Congress, propagating the Congress ideals of Responsible Government and the creed of communal unity and non-violence, enrolling Congress members and also distributing the State Congress literature.

The Committee once again thanks the nationalist press of India for having espoused the cause of the Hyderabad State Congress. It is desirous of making their position clear, with regard to the sympathy that is being shown from outside the State both from press and platform. It has been declared by the State Congress more than once, that this is purely a non-communal political organisation having nationalism as its very basis. So, we would like to state that we welcome only that kind of sympathy that is consistant with our principles.

In conclusion, the Committee appeals to the public in general and the youth of the State in particular to stake everything at the altar of political and civil liberty, which is the birth-right of every citizen and for which the State Congress stands. We further appeal that they should enroll themselves in their thousands as primary members of the State Congress to vindicate its prestige.

24th October 1938. (Sd.) G. NANAL, H.R. DHOOT,
J.R. DESAI, S.S. BORIKAR,
R.N. REDDY.

Swami Ramanand Tirtha offered Satyagraha on the 27th October 1938 after the first batch. The following is his letter to the Commissioner of Police and the office note of Ali Yavar Jung on it.

To

Nawab Rahamat Yar Jung Bahadur,
City Police Commissioner,
H.E.H. the Nizam's Government,
Hyderabad-Deccan

Dear Sweet Self,

I have been nominated by the Working Committee of the Hyderabad State Congress as the first Dictator with all the powers of the Working Committee vested in me.

I intend to begin the work of the State Congress today after 3 p.m. near Putli Bowli Police Station, with my four Organising Secretaries. I request you to please take notice of this and take necessary steps.

in Lord, With best regards.....

(Sd.) Swami Ramanand Tirtha, M.A.,
1st Dictator,
Hyderabad State Congress.

27th October, 1938,
Jambagh, Hyderabad.

Organising Secretaries :

1. Venkatesh Joshi,
2. Raghavender S.,
3. Raja Reddy.,
4. Appa Rao.

To

His Excellency the President,

This is what the epistolary style of a serious organisation has resolved itself into. I am sure the Commissioner of Police is very much flattered.

Akbar Hydari,
(Sd.) 20-10-1938.

(Sd.) Ali Yavar Jung.

Swami Ramananda Tirtha, M.A., the first Dictator of the Hyderabad State Congress Satyagraha gave a statement as follows:—

"The first Working Committee of the Hyderabad State Congress having been arrested for defying the Government ban placed on the foundation of the State Congress, I have been nominated by the Working Committee as the first Dictator and all the powers vested in the first Working Committee have been delegated to me with authority to nominate my successor who will, in his turn, enjoy the same powers.

In view of the changed situation, created by the Government notification in the Jarida of 24th October 1938, declaring the State Congress and the Council of Action unlawful, I, the first Dictator, wish to announce that the normal constitution of the Hyderabad State Congress has been suspended and Dictators with a number of persons as their Organising Secretaries will follow in succession as they are arrested. At present I appoint the following four as Organising Secretaries to assist me in my work of the State Congress:—

(1) Captain Joshi, M.A.,
(2) Raghavendra Rao Shrinivas Rao,
(3) Raja Reddy,
(4) Apparao Shelkar, Vakil.

Ours is a crusade against the Public Safety Regulation recently promulgated by the Government under the provisions of which the Hyderabad State Congress is banned and leaders of public opinion are being prosecuted, convicted and taken to unknown quarters. There are instances of persons being removed without trial in the courts of law. We cry halt to this most repressive regime. The civil liberties of the people stand at zero point and the Government have evinced an iron will to put down all public activity, worth the name in the State.

History repeats itself and the Government must know that the will of the people has asserted itself under all climes. It is not aware that a wave of consciousness has passed through the length and breadth of the country and the spirit of sacrifice and service and courage

has permeated the countless hearts amongst the young and old. The greater the repression the stronger will be the will to resist. Very often, it has been said that the present unrest is only due to the instigation from outside agencies. We condemn this state of self-hypnotisation. The unrest inherent in the present situation is purely indigenous. Only it could not find wide expression due to tyranny and repression of the Government. It is time that Government know things as they exist and adjust their policy rightly. It is not yet too late to mend matters, if only the Government make a wise gesture.

I admire the spirit of restraint and perfect non-violence evinced by the people on the occasion of the formation of the State Congress and exhort them to maintain the same under any provocation. This alone can ensure the success of our movement. I draw their attention to the basic assumption of a Satyagrahi in the words of Mahatmaji himself:—

1. There must be common honesty among the Satyagrahis.

2. They must render hearts disciplined to their commander. There should be no mental reservation.

3. They must be prepared to lose all and must be ready cheerfully to face bullets, bayonets, or slow death by torture.

4. They must not be violent in thought, word, or deed towards their enemy or amongst themselves.

On this occasion, I do wish to make it clear that a true Satyagrahi puts up no defence and he does not require any defence. I would request all our friends especially lawyers—not to embarrass our feelings by volunteering their services in the defence of Satyagrahis.

We refuse to be cowed down by the threats of the Government. It has lost all moral support of the public. It has got to yield to the popular will. The youths of the country are enrolling in hundreds and I am sure they will join the struggle in tens of hundreds and overflow the jails."

Young Men: Remember, "Opposition to tyranny is the worship of God": A clarion call is being issued to you. It is your species that has won the freedom's battle all the world over. No sacrifice is too great at the present juncture. Respond to the country's call and understand clearly that the genesis of the present situation is to be found in the political rather than in any other problem.

Keep the flame burning. Take up the thread left unfinished by us. Ours is a purely national game and play it, we are not to be deterred by any odds. No, not even if the nearest and the dearest cry, look not back; "forward march" is our way."

The Provisional Committee of the Hyderabad State Congress in its manifesto stated as under:

"(*a*) The Cabinet Council which was formed in the Hyderabad State in 1892 and was merely an advisory body, soon became in effective and was converted in 1329 Fasli (1918-1919) into the Executive Council.

(*b*) The Legislative Council was established about the same time. The rule of a continuous and constitutional form of Government cannot mean anything else than Responsible Government.

(*c*) After the lapse of eighteen years since His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Firman to reform the Legislative Council, a Committee was appointed in 1937 to suggest measures to bring about increasing association of the people with the administration of the State.

(*d*) The demand for constitutional reforms has become vocal and insistent with the introduction of Provincial Autonomy in the neighbouring Provinces of British India and also because in the other Indian States people are actively agitating for Responsible Government.

(*e*) The demand which is natural, just and genuine is in consonance with the great educational and cultural advance that the people of Hyderabad have made during the last twenty years.

(*f*) In view of the declared objects of the Hyderabad State Congress, the most important of which is promotion of natural unity, to call it communal is a travesty of facts and truth.

(*g*) The Hyderabad People's Convention submitted a "united" report a few months ago making definite proposals for inauguration of Responsible Government. It is admitted that there were only six Muslim members of the Convention and none of them signed the "united" report.

(*h*) The State Congress can claim to have lifted the popular agitation from the ruts of communalism to a plane of nationalism and sincere patriotism.

(*i*) By no feat of distortion, the ideals of the State Congress can be confused with communalism.

(*j*) People have become restive, and although they are at present restraining themselves, it would be an error if the present inaction and calm are misinterpreted, and

(*k*) An appeal is made to the people to strengthen the hands of the Congress."

"The burden of the song of the Provisional Committee is that the demand for Responsible Government is not only natural, just and genuine, but it is in consonance with "the great educational and cultural advance that the people of Hyderabad have made during the last twenty years". Let us examine how far this claim can be made good. Taking the latest available statistics of 1931 census we find that out of the total population in His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Dominions of about 1,45,00,000 the total of all classes of Hindus is 1,27,48,237, that of Muslims is 15,94,666 and that of Christians is 1,51,382, the number of the remaining small communities of Jews, Parsis and Buddhists being negligible. When we compare the educational advance of these communities, we find that among Hindus, only one in thirty two is literate, while among Muslims, the ratio is one in ten and among Christians one in seven. Thus not only the bulk of the population is illiterate (ratio of average literacy being one in twenty four) but the most illiterate class in the Dominions is that of Hindus.

The Committee lay great stress on their contention that promotion of National Unity is the most important item in the State Congress's programme, that to call the Congress communal is a travesty of facts and truths and that by no feat of distortion, the ideals of the State

Congress can be confused with communalism. Communalism means advocating the interests of only one community as against that of all other communities. The population of all Hindus in the Dominions being eight times the population of Mohammedans and seven times the total of all other communities put together, it can by no stretch of imagination be denied that the Congress advocates the cause of Hinduism. The Provisional Committee admits that when the Hyderabad people's Convention submitted a "united" report making definite proposals for inauguration of Responsible Government a few months ago, only six Muslims joined the People's Convention, and not one of them signed the so-called "United Report". The conclusions are as clear as daylight, *viz.*, that the People's Convention becomes inevitably a purely Hindu affair, that the Provisional Committee is similarly a Hindu affair and that the State Congress is not likely to be of a different type.

It is also submitted by the Provisional Committee that the demand for Constitutional reforms has become vocal and insistent with the introduction of Provincial Autonomy in the neighbouring Provinces of British India and that the people in other Indian States are also agitating for Responsible Government. Government's contention is thus borne out that because Congress Governments are functioning in the majority of the British Indian Provinces that the Hindu intelligentsia of Hyderabad are demanding similar privileges here. Gandhiji expressed himself the other day that there can be no communalism in Hyderabad. When interpreted correctly this would mean that the Hindu population being in overwhelming majority, there would be a "Hindu Raj" in Hyderabad".

The Congress Satyagraha continued sometimes twice or thrice in a week. Localities changed. It was the clock tower of the Sultan Bazaar, the area near the Kachiguda Railway Station, the Abid Shop Police Station or even Pathergatti in the city. The third batch consisted of 1. L. Narasimha Reddy, 2. Hanumantha Rao Laxmana Rao, a Vakil of Basmath, 3. Mohana Reddy from Bhongir. They offered Satyagraha in front of the clock tower, Sultan Bazaar.

The fourth batch consisted of 1. Ramachandrarao Nandapurkar, 2. Kamtikar and 3. Sriramulu.

In the fifth batch, there were 1. Baswantha Rao of Koppal, 2. Pelbaraja RangaRao from Khammam, 3. Kallur Narasimham of Khammamet, 4. V.N. Patki and 5. C.M. Purohit from Alwandi.

The sixth batch consisted of 1. B. Yella Reddy, 2. K.V. Muralidhara Rao of Karimnagar, 3. D. Narasaiah of Karimnagar, 4. Narahari Rao Bhoomkar of Osmanabad and 5. Shankar Rao Khanapurkar of Osmanabad.

The seventh batch had 1. Srinivasa Rao Havaldar, 2. K.S. Shigurkar, 3. H.R. Nath, 4. V.S. Desai, Koppal, 5. Vinayak Appaji Prayag of Osmanabad, 6. Trimbak Balabhavu Naik of Osmanabad, and 7. M.H. Kulkarni of Hyderabad.

In the eighth batch, there were 1. Shankar Rao Srinivasa Rao, 2. Vasant Rao Deshmukh of Osmanabad, 3. Sham Rao Tadlimbekar of Hyderabad, 4. Gunde Rao Almelkar of Parbhani and 5. Bheem Kale.

The ninth batch consisted of N. K. Rao and his associates.

The tenth batch had P. Venkat Rao and Gopal Rao.

The eleventh batch had 1. Digambar Rao Bindu, 2. Sitaram Sharma, 3. Ramachandra Gowda, 4. Ganapathi Sharma and 5. S.K. Balaraj.

The twelfth batch had 1. G. Rama Reddy of Karimnagar, 2. Raja Reddy of Karimnagar, 3. Ratna Reddy of Karimnagar, 4. Konda Reddy of Karimnagar, 5. K. Mukunda Reddy of Atrafbalda and 6. R.V. Ranga Reddy of Bhongir.

The thirteenth batch consisted of 1. Mallar Vasudev Dhotrikar, 2. Anant Rao Jayawant Rao Deshmukh, 3. Ram Singh Purushotham Singh, 4. Digambar Shankar Rao and 5. E.V. Joshi.

The fourteenth batch had 1. Kanakaprasada Gupta from Warangal District, 2. Lakshman Appaji Wanjari, 3. Shaik Chandulal Nabi Saheb, 4. Shaik Mohiuddin Saheb and 5. Narasimha Gupta. These two Musalmans gave a confession later that they were tempted to join Satyagraha on the promise that they would get good posts if they joined Satyagraha.

The sixteanth batch consisted of 1. M. Venkata Reddy of Mahaboobnagar, 2. Malla Rao, 3. Durgaiah, 4. T. Venkaiah, 5. M. Venkaiah and 6. Motilal.

The seventeanth batch had 1. Anant Govind Kulkarni with his four associates.

The last batch was led by Kashinath Rao Vaidya and followed by Gopal Shastry Dev and M. Ramachandra Rao. This batch offered satyagraha at Patthergatti in the city.

The Satyagraha was started on the 24th October, 1938 by the Hyderabad State Congress a d was suspended on the 24th December, 1938 by Kashinath Rao Vaidya, the eighteenth dictator of the Satyagrahis, mainly on the advice of Mahatma Gandhi.

4. *Correspondence between Mahatma Gandhi and Sir Akbar Hydari on the State Congress Satyagraha*

Gandhiji addressed a letter to Sir Akbar Hydari on the 26th December, 1938 in which Gandhiji said that he himself had been instrumental in shaping the decision of the State Congress to suspend the Satyagraha and that he hoped that the Hyderabad Government would return a generous response to their action. Sir Akbar whi e replying to this letter of Gandhiji, referred also to the Vandemataram agitation at the Osmania University. Sir Akbar emphatically complained that Vaidya's statement had created a destructive psycho'ogy because a concealed threat was expressed through his statement. Sir Akbar invited Gandhiji's attention towards some hirelings employed along with the Satyagrahis.

Gandhiji thanked Sir Akbar by a telegram dated 9th January 1939 for certain releases. Gandhiji wrote from Bardoli on the 20th of January, 1939, a very frank letter in reply to Sir Akbar's of the 5th January, 1939. Gandhiji thanked Sir Akbar for the friendly tone of the letter adding nothing else and nothing less was expected of him. Gandhiji wrote that all the Satyagrahis who had courted arrest as members of the State Congress should have been released. Gandhiji had defended Vaidya's statement. Vaidya might not have known the State Congress manifesto otherwise he would not court arrest at all. Gandhiji

considered Vaidya's statement as mild and subdued without any threat. He had exhorted the State Congress members to desist from Civil Disobedience Movement. Gandhiji also clarified those of the Aryan League should not be confused with the State Congress. Gandhiji said that he would consult the Sardar and Bhulabhai to find out what they had at the back of their mind when they sent congratulations to the Aryan Conference at Sholapur.

Gandhiji was particularly grateful that Sir Akbar had dismissed from his mind any duplicacy (*sic*) on his own part regarding advice for breaking unity talks.

Baba (Jaisurya Naidu) had taken Narasing Rao to Gandhiji when Gandhiji had said that as Moulana Abul Kalam Azad was in correspondence with Sir Akbar it was better to await the result and that even Bahadur Yar Jung also did not like to proceed further. Regarding Vandemataram Gandhiji admitted that it was not a religious prayer, but he added that the students had a right to recite it in their rooms or their prayer room. They should get their grievance redressed and till then stop their studies or go elsewhere. The explanations given by the Osmania University were found to be unsatisfactory in the light of other facts desired to be corrected. Gandhiji said the students were not under his guidance.

Regarding drunkards and the like who had sought Satyagraha, Gandhiji said that they must have been unauthorised.

Gandhiji concluded the letter as follows:—

"I repeat the request for the discharge of all the State Congress prisoners and for permission for the State Congress to pursue such activities, political or otherwise as are constitutional."

Sir Akbar wrote two long letters on the 16th February, 1939.

Regarding Vaidya's statement Sir Akbar wrote that he was unable to presume to be able to convert Gandhiji to his interpretation and would not like to waste time over it. Sir Akbar says as nothing had happened against the reasons for which originally the ban on the State Congress

was put, it could not be lifted. Vaidya's statement gave figures of arrested Satyagrahis which revealed the secret that the Satyagrahis of the Civil Liberties and Aryan Defence League were included. It was a thousand pities that the advice preferred to purify the ranks of the Congress was never heeded, added Sir Akbar.

Regarding the drunken Satyagrahis, the information supplied by Gandhiji's informants must be wrong, said Sir Akbar.

There was a tone of disappointment in the last part of the letter. Sir Akbar says that he is the admirer of souls like Ranade and for the last forty years was endeavouring to bring about unity to lead the motherland to true nationalism and yet in the evening of life he was pained to find the success of opposite efforts parading under the guise of nationalism and creating communal hostility in a soil which he had regarded always as most promising for the growth of national ideals.

In another letter of the same date Sir Akbar described the condition of the jails in the State, the work extracted from the prisoners, the facilities of diet and reading and religious worship that were given to them. He said that diet included luxuries like ghee and mutton and other cereals as necessities and food supplied was good and it was tasted by Mr. Hollins, Director General of Jails and others. Newspapers were supplied. There were no libraries in jails as some cells were filled to capacity and all rooms were to be utilized. Taps were provided for water for drinking and washing. Messrs. Janardan Rao and M. Narasing Rao had gone to see their relatives and they could do so. They never complained about delay or denial. This was at Hyderabad. They were allowed to have their baths whenever they liked.

Gandhiji had sent a telegram dated Februa y 21, 1939 regarding condition of Mahatma Narayan wamy. Sir Akbar wrote a letter to Gandhiji on the same day. Narayanswamy's own statement in facsimile was enclosed. He had stated that he had no complaint against the treatment received at the hands of the authorities of the Jail. But the letter of Sir Akbar adds "Incidentally, the practice throws some light on the methods and tactics followed by the Arya Samajists in Hyderabad ".

Gandhiji writing from Sevagram, Wardha, on February 25, 1939 stated, regarding the State Congress, that they must agree to differ. Gandhiji said as the State Congress had accepted his advice Sir Akbar should have released all State pri soners.

The State Congress should be allowed to function normally. Regarding Narayanswamy, Gandhiji was grateful to Sir Akbar. The description of the conditions in Jail were referred to where he pinched Sir Akbar for deeming ghee as a luxury which Gandhiji said it was not. Gandhiji hoped that the proposed reforms would be answering the time spirit and would soon come.

Sir Akbar wrote on March 27, 1939 a letter to Gandhiji. He wanted to represent that reports of ill-treatement of prisoners and Satyagrahis were false. He referred to Narayanaswamy's case and also to Satyagrahis at Aurangabad.

Sir Akbar reported the bomb explosions in Hyderabad and added that the Jathas and communal literature had poured into the State and they were responsible for this. Sir Akbar had made a reference to the Hyd rabad Day, as observed, at which " Nizam Murdabad " was the slogan shouted. He further wrote that even the proportion of mulki and non-mulki Satyagrahis was 1 : 5. Reforms of a comprehensive nature covering all conceivable spheres of associations with the people have necessarily and carefully to be thought out, said Sri Akbar.

Sir Akbar expressed happiness over cessation of Gandhiji's fast at Rajkot due to the intercession of the Viceroy.

There is a reply from Gandhiji dated March 30, 1939. Gandhiji promised not to print anything in papers without reference to Sir Akbar. Gandhiji said he expected great things from Sir Akbar. Gandhiji added that he had determined to embark on a joint mission of peace between the two communities but God had willed otherwise. Gandhiji congratulated Sir Akbar for having opportunities of implementing his ideals while Gandhiji had none. He urged that the reforms in Hyderabad should be introduced soon and that he should be able to hear that the Satyagrahis are released unconditionally

soon. He had prevented the State Congress from resumption of Satyagraha. If Sir Akbar showed sympathy to the State Congress people, they would co-operate with him in heralding a new era.

By another letter dated April 2, 1939 Gandhiji wrote from New Delhi to Sir Akbar that he is conferring with the Arya Samaj. Their demands were simple and could be fulfilled.

The next letter of Gandhiji is from Rajkot, Shri Rashtriya Shala, dated April 10, 1939. This is a very long letter of eight typed quarter sheets. The letter discloses the want of consistent policy that the Hyderabad Government was following in dealing with the Aryan Satyagraha. Mr. Hollins, the Jail Superintendent at Gulbarga, the Subedar and the Taluqdar of Gulbarga had talks with the Arya Satyagrahis in Gulberga Jail, though the medium of Mahatma Narayanswamy, Khushal Chand, the authoritative representatives of the Sarvadeshika Sabha of the Samaj but suddenly a surprising communique was issued by the Hyderabad Government. It stated that the news published in certain sections of the press that H. E.H. the Nizam's Government were negotiating with the International Aryan League with a view to arrive at some settlement or compromise was totally incorrect.

Gandhiji added that when Mr. Hollins and other officials were over-enthusiastic and went beyond their authority their action should be endorsed by the Government for the sake of its good name if nothing else. Gandhiji further stated public confidence in the word of such a great Government as H.E.H. the Nizam's ought not to be shaken. But there is a sound answer to what prima facie appears to be unanswerable. " May I expect an early reply "? concluded Gandhiji.

Sir Akbar wrote to Gandhiji on April 11, 1939 acknowledging Gandhiji's letters of the March 30, 1939 and April 6, 1939. Sir Akbar admitted that as stated by Gandhiji adjutsment with the Arya Samaj should not be difficult but the Samaj was not prepared to drop the spirit of aggression. Their attack on Islam and other religions was unjustifiable and the tradition of mutual tolerance in Hyderabad had been destroyed by the Samaj. At Arrah, in Bihar, the Arya Samajists carried the effigy

of the Nizam in mock funeral and this at a time when endeavours were being made to frame a new constitution the success of which it had now seriously prejudiced. Sir Akbar went on saying that these differences between the Arya Samaj and the State could not be settled and solved by negotiations with the Government of Hyderabad and Arya Samaj leaders in British India and therefore they had to drop the negotiations. Sir Akbar confessed that it was necessary for the Government to announce that these talks were not on behalf of the Government. The tone of the talk added Sir Akbar, was " all or nothing." The Samaj demanded 14 points and Sir Akbar shrewdly referred to No. 14.

Sir Akbar said that the Iyengar Committee Report had been published and new reforms would be heralded and an Advisory Committee for the Ecclesiastical Department would be appointed.

Sir Akbar further wrote that when responsible Congress leaders issued a statement neutralizing the threats in Vaidya's statement, the Hyderabad Government released the State Congress prisoners.

Sir Akbar wrote another letter on the 20th July, 1939, to Gandhiji. It tried to explain away the communique. It was stated that Mr. Hollins was negotiating in personal capacity. He did not know that notes of the leaders in jail were recorded. The Taluqdar and Hollins were prepared to allow Messrs. Gupta and Sudhakar to have talks with the Samajist leaders in Jail. But these matters were not recommended by Hollins to Government for consideration and the Arya Samaj papers gave publicity and that was the reason why the matters developed unexpected results. Again the inauguration of the reforms was promised.

Gandhiji addressed a letter to Sir Akbar on the 15th of May, 1939 from "Anand Bhavan," Rajkot. He acknowledged the earlier letters of Sir Akbar of 11th and 25th ultimo, and stated how he was engaged in affairs at Calcutta and Brindaban. Gandhiji was willing to forget everything that took place between the Hyderabad Government and the Arya Samajists. But he urged the two demands of the Arya Samajists (1) absolute freedom for the practice and preaching of the Vedic religion and culture with due regard to the feelings of the followers of the

other faiths and (2) full freedom for starting new Arya Samajs and building of new Arya Samaj Mandirs, Yagna Shalas, Havan-kunds, and repairing of the old ones without obtaining any permission from the Ecclesiastical or any other Department of the State.

Gandhiji added that if he was right in interpreting the letter of Sir Akbar, Sir Akbar was prepared to admit these claims. Gandhiji said Sir Akbar should not wait for reforms, he could do it and enhance the cause of peace and the Arya Samaj Civil Disobedience would stop at once.

Sir Akbar had written another powerful letter to Gandhiji on 30th May, 1939.

Sir Akbar was surprised how Gandhiji allowed in the minimum demands of the Arya Samaj the second item regarding construction of buildings and Havan-kunds without the Government permission. Sir Akbar thought this would keep friction ever present.

Sir Akbar sent a copy of the weekly report from the District Superintendent of Police, Nanded, adding that he was a Hindu Reddy. The report revealed that the location of the Arya Samaj Mandir was the real cause of a great tension in one place. Sir Akbar quoted the joint statement of the Archbishop of York and other divisions to show that freedom of speech and religions should not endanger public order and peace. Sir Akbar desired that permission, must be sought for the construction of buildings for religious purposes and Government could never forgo that right. Sir Akbar had so much to say regarding the Arya Samaj in denunciatory tone.

Sir Akbar thought that the methods followed by the Arya Samaj were methods of coercion and it was having an unholy alliance with another movement led by Sri Savarkar, which makes no pretence of being religious. The use of Jathas, and its use for propaganda affects law and order; there was nothing of religion in them at all. The true spirit of Satyagraha could be respected, but in its use it was travestied by the spirit of aggression as manifested through paraphernelia of flags, dictators, fronts and war councils and the terminology used for various activities.

Sir Akbar concluded the letter in the following way :—

"Let the Arya Samaj show the true spirit of working together for good and they will find the way, as always open to such bodies for whatever religious mission they may consider themselves called upon to persue."

Gandhiji wrote a letter on the 5th June, 1939 from Birla House, Bombay.

He pleaded with the Samaj to give up Civil Disobedience and requested Sir Akbar to grant their minimum demands. Gandhiji expressed regret that talks with Hollins failed. Gandhiji emphatically asserted that Sir Akber should end the agony immediately and the reforms might come in their usual manner.

After this, Gandhiji addressd a letter to Sir Akbar on 21st March 1940. Gandhiji said he had asked the State Congress to offer unqualified apology. Atleast after this, Gandhiji thought, that justice should have been done in the case of the State Congress. Sir Akbar replied to this letter on 4th April 1940. Sir Akbar states the greatest problem in Hyderabad is communal tension and unless that was removed nothing could be achieved. To bring contending parties together, a common ground for all is the need of the hour. Gandhiji sent a reply to Sir Akbar on 14th April, 1940 which opens with the memorable sentence: "You have been giving me stone when I had asked for bread."

The above letter is quoted below :

"Dear Sir Akbar,

You have been giving me stone when I had asked for bread. I fail to see the slightest connection between a simple performance of a promise and the big question of communal unity. And how can unity be brought about in the face of events like Bidar if the papers are to be believed ? As you know I have put a gag on myself regarding Hyderabad but I feel that I must not do so now, if I am to do my duty to the people of Hyderabad. This treatment of the State Congress and the reported happenings in Bidar have filled me with misgivings.

Yours sincerely,

(Sd.) M. K. GANDHI"

The breaking of a promise was defended under the pretext of communal unity. Gandhiji referred to the Bidar incidents and asked whether communal unity was possible in such atmosphere ?

The treatment given to the State Congress and incidents like Bidar happenings filled Gandhiji's mind with misgivings.

Sir Akbar's reply to this is dated May 2, 1940. Correspondence was heading towards breaking point.

The above letter is given below :—

"My dear Gandhiji,

My disappointment is no less than yours.

The big question of communal unity governs all hese minor proceedings, and, until progress is made with that problem, many other problems must be at a standstill and communal maniiestations will occur.

As to the regrettable Bidar affair (which is reminiscent of incidents last year in Bihar), cases are before the Courts involving many accused. I can only express surprise that statements have been issued prejudicing some of the issues. Our first appeal here to both parties was to localise the occurrence, just as I see the Premier has recently appealed in the Punjab Assembly in reply to questions regarding certain communal incidents there. Only thus can the vicious circle, which we all desire to break, be broken.

Kind regards, Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) A. HYDARI."

Gandhiji again wrote on 9th May 1940 to Sir Akbar, which is given below :—

Sevagram,
Wardha,
9th May 1940.

"Dear Sir Akbar,

Your letter makes strange reading. Communal unity would never come by generalisations or glossing over serious disturbances. I do not know what Bihar incident

you refer to. But if there was a denial of justice in Bihar, it is no precedent worthy to be copied.

Anyhow, should public criticism of a big disturbance prejudice judical proceedings against individuals?

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) M. K. GANDHI."

When Gandhiji cornered Sir Akbar in this way Sir Akbar replied in his letter dated 26th May, 1940 and it is given below :—

"My dear Gandhiji,

Yours of the 9th instant.

Reference to the Bihar incident in my last letter was to an incident in the Muzzafarpur district where certain misguided Hindus had perpetrated violence and arson, if at all on larger scale than in Bidar. The attention of the Congress President was publicly drawn to the incident. It is clear that my letter was not meant to suggest that the precedent was worthy of being copied as no one regrets the Bidar incident more than I myself do. The reference was intended to show how the one escaped your notice and sympathy and how the other has touched your sense of duty to "the people of Hyderabad."

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) A. HYDARI."

Gandhiji's last letter is very strong. It is dated June 7, 1940 which reads: "I have slept all these nights over your kind letter of the 26th ultimo. I see, I have lost caste with you. I thought you would take my word for it that I know nothing of the Muzzafarpur violence by Hindus. I am now trying to find out what it was. For that matter, I knew nothing of Bidar till parties wrote to me and sent papers.

I had hoped that you know me sufficiently to know that whenever occasion had arisen, I have not spared Hindus. So far as Hyderabad is concerned, I have been particularly careful and avoided public reference to Hyderabad when I might have. I thought you had

given me credit too for my reticence. Even as it is, I am guiding the Hyderabad State Congress (now defunct) and restraining them. But I must now plead for myself. Only I feel sorry that you can think so unkindly as to write that last sentence in your letter.

I hope Lady Hydari's improvement has continued".

Sir Akbar in his letter dated 12th June, 1940 to Gandhiji writes: "Many thanks for your letter of the 7th June, 1940. My letter was not at all intended to be unkind and I am sorry you got that impression from it. On the other hand, I myself felt pained that you should think so unkindly of me as in your letter of May 9, 1940. thought you had a better opinion of my administration to think that such things as you suspected from reports regarding the Bidar incident were possible during my time.

I was much touched by your kind enquiries about my wife. You may be interested to know that Jagatguru Shankaracharya has been treating her. I hope you are well. *P.S.*—This letter was written before the bereavement which has since overtaken me. I could not issue it then and I am sure you will understand that those were anxious days for me. I have already acknowledged by wire your kind telegram of condolence and would like again to express my thanks to you for your very kind sympathy in my loss." These references are to the death of Lady Hydari.

In spite of the best efforts of Mahatma Gandhi, the ban on the State Congress was not lifted and the stalemate continued in Hyderabad.

5. *Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel's Visit*, 1938

Sir Akbar immediately after becoming the President of the Executive Council seems to have planned to do something for Hyderabad by way of reforms and other features of enlightened administration. In 1938, the communal tension had become very acute and the political atmosphere even on account of British Indian political upheavals was far from calm. Sir Akbar was being blamed for repressive and anti-democratic measures. He was endeavouring if possible to convince Mahatmaji, Jamnalal Bajaj and Sardar Patel that they were not being

allowed to have a correct picture of the situation and was in correspondence with Jamnalaljee.

It seems Sir Akbar had met Sardar Patel and Acharya Kripalani at Bangalore sometime early in June, 1938 when the question of the visit of the leaders to Hyderabad was broached and they were given to understand that they should accept the hospitality of the Hyderabad Government and stay as guests. So, Sardar Patel wrote to Sir Akbar on 28th June, 1938 from Bombay. The Sardar said that even Mrs. Naidu had asked him to go to Hyderabad and see things for himself. Sir Akbar had been to Bombay but the Sardar was not in Bombay. The date of the visit could have been fixed. Sardar Patel did not like that there should be an invitation from Hyderabad and he should not avail himself of the opportunity. So, he enquired of Sir Akbar whether he would like him to go to Hyderabad as serious communal riots at Hyderabad were being reported in the papers. Sardar Vallabhbhai said that Pattabhi Sitaramayya and Nariman were prohibited from entering the State and therefore he did not desire to embarrass Sir Akbar and his Government. This letter was placed for deliberations in the meeting of the Executive Council on the 4th of July, 1938. The decision of the Council was quite against the visit of Sardar Patel to Hyderabad. So, Sir Akbar replied to the Sardar on 6th July, 1938. He said that he was unwell for the last few days and hence he could not write to the Sardar earlier. Presently he was going to Dacca to deliver the convocation address and on his return he was going to stay at Bombay for sometime when Sir Akbar would see if the visit could be fixed according to mutual convenience. The Sardar immediately thanked Sir Akbar on the 7th July, 1938 and said that he agreed with the proposal and the date could be fixed at the interview.

This visit of the Sardar to Hyderabad did not materialize. But Sir Akbar's endeavours to produce a better impression of his administration on the minds of these leaders of the Congress were incessant. In a letter dated 21st September, 1938 written by Sir Akbar to Jamnalal Bajaj who was on a visit to New Delhi, Sir Akbar writes in the postscript as follows:—

"I have marked this letter as private and confidential but you may show it to Gandhiji and

Sardar Saheb and other friends on the Working Committee".

In a brochure en titled "Said The Sardar" brought out by D.G. Bindu in 1950, the Sardar is reported to have said at Aurangabad as follows:—

"This is the first time in my life that I am visiting the city of Aurangabad. I did not have any opportunity to come to this side before. I came to Hyderabad for the first time only after the police action, when Hyderabad was liberated from the old regime. I remember I met Sir Akbar Hydari at Mysore when I had gone there to settle the dispute between the Government and the State Congress which at that time was waging a hard struggle for Responsible Government against the ruling power. It was a bitter struggle; many Congressmen went to jail. There was firing and use of force on many occasions. Sir Akbar had then come as a State guest to Mysore. I arranged a settlement. I do not know why, probably because I had succeeded in bringing the people and the Government there nearer—Sir Akbar invited me to Hyderabad. I told him that I would come willingly only if I felt that this would serve a useful purpose. I told that when I was going down to Mysore, the moment, I entered Hyderabad limits, people came to meet me at the station. I asked them how they were passing their days. They told me bitterly that they could not wear white caps. I, therefore, asked Sir Akbar whether he really meant it when he asked me to visit the State. If he did, I should then have full freedom to meet the people and to say what I liked. Sir Akbar said that in the State of Hyderabad, everybody had full freedom and full scope. I then agreed to visit Hyderabad if I were free to say what I liked. Sir Akbar said he would write to me but days passed and no invitation came.

I felt that so far the matter had been left as a mere conversation. I, therefore, decided to write to him and asked if the invitation held good. Sir Akbar replied that it did hold good but offered some excuse or other. Ultimately, Sir Akbar died. He went to other regions and took the invitation with him. Now, of course, I do not need any invitation to come to Hyderabad. India is one and indivisible. There is no difference between one unit and other under the Constitution."

6. *Correspondence between Sir Akbar Hydari and Seth Jamnalal Bajaj*

In accordance with the telegram he sent from Wardha, Seth Jamnalal Bajaj came and saw Sir Akbar Hydari at Bombay on 11th November, 1938 at 9-30 p.m. He was accompanied by Mr. Chuniram Motilal, son-in-law of Dalmia, who was negotiating with the Associated Cement through Sir Sultan Ahmed and also through Seth Jamnalal Bajaj to come to some terms with the Associated Cement so as to prevent cut-throat competition.

Sir Akbar made it clear that their political talks must not be construed to mean that they were inviting any outside help in dealing with their situation. They were competent to deal with their own people. What Sir Akbar wanted to say was that any outside interference would merely create violent communal reaction leading probably to bloodshed, for which the responsibility would rest on the people outside. There was no necessity for such outside interference in view of his official pronouncement before the Legislative Council, the appointment of the Reforms Committee, and what had been repeatedly made known to everybody the anxiety of Government to pass orders on the Committee's report within a very short time. The present unity talks that were going on would also be prejudiced by any local excitement leading to conflict between the two communities. If any one desired to come in his personal and private capacity, strictly eschewing all public demonstrations, speeches etc. it would perhaps be different.

With regard to the ban on the State Congress, Sir Akbar made it clear that it had been imposed after due warning, the warning having been given through a Gazette Extra-ordinary which definitely made clear the communal character of the Congress. Seth Jamnalal Bajaj said he was himself opposed to such a name and would have advised against its adoption, had he been consulted. Akbar Hydari said that it was impossible to raise the ban against the State Congress so long as its communal constituents continued. If it started another political organisation with representatives of all the communities and without the name "Congress" or "League" he had made it clear that it would be

allowed as the State was not averse to a political organisation which was not communal and had no affiliation with outside bodies. His advice, therefore, was that if the Indian National Congress was really a national organisation and did not want to help communal ill-feeling, it should keep out of Hyderabad and see what developments took place there in the next few months.

Seth Jamnalal Bajaj said that it was now understood that they parted as personal friends, but each would be at liberty to act as he thought best because Sir Akbar had not agreed to lift the ban nor agreed to his visiting Hyderabad. Sir Akbar said it was entirely a matter for him to decide. He expressed regret that their conversation had not led to Bajaj's realising that there was no question now of raising the ban on the State Congress unless it altered its name and made itself more broad-based. In the meantime, the so-called Committee of Action had itself suspended the primary membership of the proposed organisation and dissolved the Provisional Working Committee. Sir Akbar Hydari laid emphasis on the fact that there was absolutely no ground and no live issue for any agitation or for the breaking of laws at the present moment when, apart from the unity talks and the pledge that Satyagraha would not be resorted to pending their continuance, the State was known to be giving final consideration to a scheme of reforms which might well be a lesson not only to other States but also to the British Indian Provinces inasmuch as they were trying to solve their problem by creating a political structure on a non-communal basis, where Hindus or Muslims would not be represented by special percentages or separate electorates or reservation of seats.

Seth Jamnalal Bajaj also referred to the proportion of Hindus and of Muslims in the Services, and Sir Akbar Hydari said that they were not based upon any deliberate or calculated desire of Government to have people of one community in preference to another. The preponderence of Muslims in the higher services was an accident of history and the outcome of historical causes. Hyderabad was conquered by a Northern race; in their train came Hindus, like Maharajah Kishen Pershad's family which even now held positions of trust and enjoyed

the same superior and dominant status. Neither at that time nor at this was it a question of Muslims or Hindus or of people of one particular religion or another being a problem from the communal point of view and ascribing communal motives was mainly the result of consuming indiscriminately the manufacture of biased history written with an obvious political motive.

What Sir Akbar Hydari said towards the end appeared to have appealed to Seth Jamnalal Bajaj who promised to have a talk with his friends explaining the matter. Bajaj expressed his difficulty that there would be a meeting of the Congress Working Committee where the question of Hyderabad would be brought up. It was with the greatest difficulty, Jamnalal Bajaj had held back the extremists on the previous occasion. Sir Akbar Hydari said that he was sure that Bajaj could use all the above arguments and hold back their hands for a few months to see what H.E.H. the Nizam's Government were doing by way of introducing reforms; in the meantime, it would be advisable to prevent anybody like Seth Jamnalal Bajaj, Jawaharlal or Pattabhi Sitaramayya from coming to Hyderabad and thereby complicating the issues.

Then, Seth Jamnalal Bajaj left Sir Akbar Hydari at about midnight and the former saw the latter again on the morning of the 12th November, 1938 at about 11-45 when Sir Akbar Hydari reiterated all he had said the previous night. Bajaj promised to speak to Jawaharlal on his arrival though he said he could not promise anything. He added it would considerably strengthen his hands if he received a communication from Hydari before the Working Committee met which would be about the 25th November, 1938 and enable him (Bajaj) also to let Hydari know his reactions.

Just before Seth Jamnalal Bajaj's departure, he said o Sir Akbar that Dr. Zakir Hussain of the Jam-e-Millia was a great friend of his and he could give him a blank cheque as he agreed with him (Bajaj) completely. He asked Sir Akbar to have a talk with Dr. Zakir Hussain before he left for Hyderabad and to tell him of their interview.

The telegram, dated 9th November, 1938, from Seth Jamnalal Bajaj, Wardha, to Sir Akbar Hydari, Hyderabad, Deccan, reads as follows:—

"Your personal letters thanks Dalmias phone intending reaching Bombay twelfth please wire your Bombay programme address.

Jamnalal Bajaj"

Telegram, dated the 10th November, 1938 from Sir Akbar Hydari, Hyderabad-Dn. to Seth Jamnalal Bajaj, Wardha:—

"Your wire STOP will be in Bombay from eleventh morning to twelfth afternoon STOP—My address Napean House, Malabar Hill Hydari."

Camp: Bombay,
14th September,
As at Wardha

"Dear Sir Akbar,

When we met at Pondicherry, we had a very frank talk about the state of affairs in Hyderabad State. You told me definitely at that time that you were only out to crush the communal activities of certain associations or persons in the State and had no objection to activities that would conduce to the growth of Responsible Government. You were also good enough to invite me, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and other responsible workers to pay a visit to Hyderabad in order to be convinced how false the reports regarding mal-administration in the State were. I had related the substance of our talk to Mahatmaji, Sardar Patel, Maulana Azad, C. Rajagopalachari and Babu Rajendraprasad and we were planning that some of us at least might take advantage of your kind offer and visit Hyderabad. But the Ordinance that you have felt called upon to issue has disturbed me. But I must also hold my breath and ask you kindly to explain why the Ordinance has been passed. Meanwhile, I suspend my judgment.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) JAMNALAL BAJAJ."

"Sir Akbar Hydari,
President, Executive Council,
H.E.H. the Nizam's Government,
Hyderabad-Dn.

21st September, 1938.

My dear Seth Jamnalal,

I thank you for your letter of the 14th instant which I found waiting for me on my return to Hyderabad. I appreciate your attitude in waiting to hear from me before forming an opinion about our Public Security Regulation.

The long freedom of the Dominions from all attempts to disturb public tranquillity has meant that the development of the criminal law, so far as measures to strengthen the hands of the Executive in the maintenance of law and order are concerned, has lagged behind development in other parts of India. That there were in the Dominions no Act corresponding to the Indian Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1935 is typical and recently Provincial Governments have made use of enactments to deal with various types of agitation. The Madras Government has had, for example, recourse to the provisions of the Criminal Law Amendment Act in Madras for the prevention of hooliganism and picketing. Powers have also been given, by Provincial Legislatures to the police to deal with suspicious characters by externment; the most recent one, for example, is the City of Bombay Police (Amendment) Act of 1939 passed by the Congress Government after the communal disturbances there.

The Public Security Regulation does not attempt to do anything more than bring the Criminal Law of the Dominions into line with that in force in British India, with special reference to local conditions; almost every provision of it is based on some British Indian model. It is not the intention of Government here, just to use the Public Security Regulation for suppressing the legitimate political activities of associations or persons in the State which are not subversive, communal or likely to lead to breaches of the peace. The legislation was brought into force as a Regulation because of its urgent need, specially in the districts where activities of a nature

.....

....in the employment of these enactments by Congress Governments in certain provinces made it necessary for the State to bring its Criminal Law up-to-date. Nevertheless, it has been notified that it will shortly be placed before the Legislative Council and if in the course of deliberations there or in its Select Committee it is found from the views or expressions either of members of the Legislative Council or of persons co-opted from the Public for the Select Committee that any of its provisions require modification there is no reason to suppose that Government will not be willing to consider any reasonable amendments.

I should like to say a few words here about the step we had reluctantly to take against the formation of the proposed State Congress of which you are no doubt aware. The persons who inspired it were, however, not only persons with a communal outlook but also persons distinguished for their communal activities even in the recent past. Some of them, for example, sent telegrams during the riots inviting the British Government to intervene, to appoint a Commission of Inquiry, composed of British officials, to occupy the city with the British Garrison; some others were implicated in attempts to spread disaffection and communal poison in the districts. Some of them were identified with the scurrilous communal literature, considered by the Congress Government in Bombay to be objectionable, which has been pouring into the State. The inspiration of these persons was more than likely to influence the conduct and outlook especially of the district branches if formed and rather than allow a series of communal organisations to be established in the districts with the attraction of the name of the Congress and with an ostensibly political programme, it was felt to be in the best interests of the State to advise a purification of the ranks of this body so that whatever organisation might ultimately be formed should be on broad national basis and be purged of elements which had such antecedents of preaching and practising hatred against their fellow-countrymen. My speech, which was a precursor to the action taken, was a deliberate warning and a deliberate offer and I made it clear that while the State was not averse to constitutional advance and was indeed committed to it and civil liberties were implicit in such an advance, we could not think in terms of "Hindu" or "Muslim" liberty or Muslim

Constitutional advance" or "Hindu Constitutional advance." Even afterwards, in conversations, both official and private, many of the local leaders were advised against the danger of confusing political and religious issues with racial hatred and communalism. In taking action, Government made it abundantly clear that it was not against the formation of purely political organisations on a non-communal basis. I am sending for your private information copies of my speech and of the Government Resolution on the Congress where the portions underlined are, I think, relevant to what I have stated above.

I am sending this through a friend who happens to be going to Delhi in order to avoid any delay and as I do not know your address in Delhi I have asked that the letter may be delivered to Mrs. Naidu who will no doubt have it sent to you.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) A. HYDARI.

P.S.—I have marked this letter as Private and Confidential but you may show it to Gandhiji and Sardar Saheb and other friends on the Working Committee.

(Sd.) A. HYDARI."

"As at Wardha,
Camp; Delhi,
October 1, 1938.

Dear Sir Akbar,

It was good of you to send me so promptly and so full a reply to my letter. You have in the Working Committee many true friends. Gandhiji is never tired of mentioning you as a philosopher. He remembers your attending his prayer meeting in the steamer that brought you and him back to India. Smt. Sarojini Devi is like a member of your family. Sardar remembers your invitation to him and instead of entering into any argument with you, I would like some of us to come to you and study things for ourselves and have the benefit of a mutual conversation. Somehow or other your recent measures have given a shock whose effect has not been diminished by your letter.

I hope you have appreciated the mildness of the reference to these measures in the A.I.C.C. resolution.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) JAMNALAL BAJAJ."

"Wardha,
18th October 1938.

Dear Sir Akbar,

I returned to Wardha on the 16th instant after a rather strenous tour of about a month. I had answered your letter of the 21st September on the 1st October, 1938 and have been expecting a reply to my letter.

I had shown your letter to Mahatmaji, Sardar Patel, Mrs. Naidu, and other members of the Working Committee; and we had all, including Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, felt almost sure that the ban on the formation of the State Congress would be lifted without avoidable delay. This Provisional Committee of the State Congress has issued some statements followed by a manifesto to define their policy and attitude. I, for one, cannot see anything communal about either. Therefore, the delay in lifting the ban on the part of the Government is difficult to understand. As a well-wisher of the State, allow me to point out, in all humility but emphatically, that prudence requires that the ban should be lifted without further delay. The policy of the State Congresses laid down in its manifesto and statements, is such as is likely to commend sympathy in other parts of the country also and I feel that the Government will not be well-advised to refuse the State Congress a fair chance.

I understand that the Provisional Committee of the State Congress contemplate some sort of direct action in the immediate future. This will only complicate matters. I think it should be the concern of every well-wisher of the State to avoid any such complications. If you feel that my services could be of any use in preventing matters from coming to a head I shall try to render such help as I can on receiving intimation from you.

You are yourself well aware of the policy of the Indian National Congress with regard to the States. As I told you at Pondicherry that policy has all along been of

helping to avoid conflict. I am sure that you also do not at all relish the prospect of a conflict which inevitably results in laceration of feelings on both sides.

You made it clear in the course of our talk that the policy of the Government was and would continue to be one of conciliation in the matter of political reform. I shall, therefore, request you to lift the ban as soon as possible. If you deem it necessary, I am prepared to go to Hyderabad and meet the organisers of the State Congress with a view to understand their point of view and explain to them the position of the Indian National Congress. I shall be willing to start even if I receive an intimation telegraphically.

An immediate reply is expected.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) JAMNALAL BAJAJ."

"4th November, 1938.

My dear Seth Jamnalal Bajaj,

Many thanks for your two letters of the 1st and 18th October, 1938. I regret I have been unable to answer them on account of my pre-occupation.

Since I last wrote to you explaining to you the reasons underlying the recent Regulation passed, a Regulation, I assured you, which would have been enacted by any Government placed in a similar situation and the danger of the communal disorders spreading, much of my own hopes in regard to the ultimate prevalence of reason has been shattered by the action of the State Congress in deciding to start Satyagraha in the belief that they are defying an established ban. No such ban existed and, as was made clear in a Communique the previous notification regarding the State Congress was only a warning. I am particularly sorry that they decided to do so as I know that they had every knowledge of the fact that final consideration was being given to an extensive scheme of reforms and there was every intention on the part of Government to implement them; that too was very deliberately stated by me officially before the Legislative Council when declaring that in the view of Government it was committed to constitutional advance and that Civil

Liberties were implicit in such an advance. I also regret that they took this decision despite their offer, made to different parties and even brought to the notice of Government, that no Satyagraha would take place while the Unity talks between the communities were taking place. My ultimate feeling is one of disappointment inasmuch as I see no real or live issue just now between the Government and the people, given that they know that reforms are coming, such as to have induced recourse to unconstitutional measures likely to get out of their own hands and lead to violence where even today, in marked contrast to the restraint and behaviour of the State Police, it has already resulted in abusive language, stone throwing and other unseemly acts.

As a Government, there is nothing for us to do now, in face of the attitude adopted by the State Congress but to take the usual action under the law. There can be no going back on the course adopted so long as this attitude continues. That it has alienated many of your own friends here will be clear to you from a perusal of recent statements issued by some of them which may have come to your notice. You say about the manifestoes and statements of the State Congress that you cannot see anything communal about them; if professions of policy and attitude made in such statements are to be taken at their face value, I hope you will extend the same courtesy to Government statements issued from time to time as well as to statements issued by persons at one time belonging to the Indian National Congress and still its friends.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) A. HYDARI."

"My dear Seth Jamnalal Bajaj,

When, in pursuance of your telegram of the 9th instant, you came and saw me in Bombay on the 12th instant, you pressed me to give a reply to that part of your last letter in which you had expressed the desire to pay a visit to Hyderabad for the purposes there stated.

I have, on different occasions, both in my letters and in our talks, pointed out the essentially communal nature

of the State Congress despite all that it may profess and despite its name which is deliberately designed as a mask to win sympathy. We here are fully aware of the persons who have inspired it throughout and are inspiring today; despite the semblance of having separate movements in the case of each, we fully know that they are at the same time guiding the parallel activities of the Arya Samaj and the Hindu Civil Liberties Union. You also know that the State Congress precipitated the situation, took the law into its own hands and has defied it on several occasions, besides committing other provocative and unseemly acts and engaging hirelings for the purpose. While it made no move to purge its ranks of persons with a distinctly communal record and convert itself into a national instead of a communal organisation, it broke its own word that there would be no Satyagraha during the continuance of the Unity Talks. It was perfectly well aware that Government was at the moment, having just been presented with the report of the Iyengar Committee, giving final consideration to a scheme of reforms embracing legitimate civil liberties and representative institutions for the furtherance of the political ideals of the people and their more effective association with the Government. What was the occasion for it to have picked up this quarrel at this particular juncture with such a body, and the idea of lifting the ban now imposed on it, a ban throughout accompanied by the assurance that the State is not averse to political organisations provided they are non-communal and have no association with outside bodies? I feel you can have no sympathy, unless it is the name which attracts. Yet, if I understood you rightly, you yourself told me that you had from the outset thought that the use of that name was inappropriate for the State organisation and that your advice would have been that the name should be changed.

We believe—a belief to which I gave expression when I met you that, apart from the Mulki sentiment and pride which is hurt by any suggestion of mediation or interference in the internal affairs of the State by persons or bodies owning no allegiance to the State there is a still more fundamental objection, namely, that it is inconsistent with the basic idea of the sovereignty of the State that such persons or bodies should come between the Ruler and his subjects. It is as inconceivable for us to think of our interceding or allowing our people to intercede

in such a manner, for example, between the strikers and the Government which recently fired on them in Bombay, as to permit similar intercession by others in our affairs. Differences between us and our poeple can be better resolved and must continue to be settled as hitherto between ourselves. Interference of this nature would be alien to the traditions of the State and be resented by our people. Not having lived in the State and therefore, relying on insufficient information supplied by interested persons, you may be convinced that you are helping what you deem and what may found to be a national cause, but you will in reality be assisting and associating yourself with communal agitators and communal aspirations and ambitions of an unworthy type. As such any visit of yours, even though it can in any case be only in your private and personal capacity, will have the effect of encouraging communalism and associating you and the organisation which you represent with communal activities; it is bound to increase the prevailing tension and cause a set-back in the work of restoration of the traditional relations between the communities on which all the energeis of the Government are concentrated. It may lead to far graver consequences for which I am certain neither you nor anyone else in your position would like to assume responsibility. Above all, at a time when the Unity Talks between the two communities are proceeding, it may create controversies and be used by either party for the adoption of an extremism which may prevent the attainment of a solution of the communal problem on the only possible basis of mutual agreement and compromise.

For these reasons, I considered that this particular time would be most unsuitable for you to pay a visit to the State which, in circumstances other than those in which we now find ourselves, I might have welcomed. As promised, however, I consulted my colleagues upon my return to Hyderabad and they agree with me in advising you for the same reason to postpone your visit for the present, even though they appreciated the assurance you have given that you would not deliver public speeches or permit demonstrations or processions of any kind.

Yours sincerely,
(Sd.) A. HYDARI."

(7) Efforts of Sri Kashinath Rao Vaidya to lift the ban on the State Congress

S i Kashinath Rao Vaidya as the spokesman of the State Congress carried on negotiati ns with Government in the most constitut.onal manner His correspondence with Government is very interesting and illuminating. On 23rd September 1939, Kashinatha Rao Vaidya wrote to Sir Akbar requesting him to state whether Government were prepared to lift the ban on the Hyderabad State Congress provided the name of the body was transferred into something like National Conference. Kashinatha Rao had stated that Government were condemning the body as communal without citing a single case to substantiate their allegation. Vaidya further added that in their conference at Manmad on 12th and 13th September, 1939 he had exercised a great pressure upon the members and his colleagues that they should relax their determination a little to please the Government. But many of them viewed Vaidya's suggestion with disfavour urging that the name Congress was very dear to their heart and they had undergone hardships and courted arrest drawn by the fascination of that name. Vaidya wrote that when he had explained to them the whole situation they contemplated over the matter and came to the conclusion that they were prepared to accept the new name of the body in case Government allowed it to function without raising objection on other grounds or under Section 14 of the Public Safety Regulations. This question was to be formally discussed in the Standing Committee of the State Congress but till then Vaidya desired to have a hint from the Government. Azhar Hussain, Home Secretary, replied to Vaidya on 7th December, 1939 saying " On a suitable change in the name being effected, a recommendation will be made to the Government that the order under section 13 of Public Safety Regulations shall not be held to apply by reason of Section 14."

Upon the receipt of such a vague reply Vaidya specially urged upon Government to let him know whether Government would allow the body to function normally provided the name "Congress" was changed. Without such an assurance, he could not persuade or convince his friends in a body. Vaidya also had stated that the Working Committee of the State Congress was scheduled to meet on the 25th December, 1939 and the Standing

Committee on the 27th December, 1939. He had entreated the Government to enable him to know Government's intention before those dates. Azhar Hussain wrote back to Vaidya on 25th December, 1939 as follows :-

"I am desired by the Government to inform you that on a suitable change in the name of the State Congress being effected, the order under Section 13 Public Security Regulation shall not be held to apply by reason of Section 14, provided that it has no affiliation or association with any outside organisation".

Kashinath Rao addressed a letter of grateful thanks to Azhar Hussain, the Home Secretary, on 28th December, 1939 and enclosed a copy of the resolution passed by the Standing Committee. It runs as follows:—

"Whereas differences had arisen between the Government of His Exalted Highness the Nizam and the Hyderabad State Congress regarding the name and objection had been raised on behalf of H.E.H the Nizam's Government to the name, this Standing Committee hereby resolves to change the name to "Hyderabad National Congress" provided that the constitution and the rules of organization shall otherwise remain intact subject to the changes that may be made hereafter in the usual manner, and that the original books shall remain subject to verbal alteration being made therein".

Azhar Hussain responded to Vaidya's letter on 2nd March, 1940 as follows:—

" Please refer to your letter dated the 28th December, 1939 in which you expressed the hope that the wording of the resolution by your organization and submitted to Government with your letter will be satisfactory.

I am desired in this connection to invite your attention to the following, namely, to my letter No. 303-P dated the 25th December, 1939 in which it was stated that on a suitable change in the name the order made under Section 13 of the Public Security Regulation; would not be held to apply by reason of Section 14, provided that your organization had no affiliation or association with any outside organisation, and to the reasons for the

order made under Section 13 published in the Gazette dated the 19th Azur 1348F (24th October, 1938) under which your organisation was declared to be unlawful.

Government have since then examined the above resolution and desired me to say that the anomaly still remains of the name signifying a mixed composition representative of all communities, while the composition itself is not so. The Government is not aware of any attempt made in the meantime by your organisation to secure the support, by mutual understanding of representative members of other communities in the State, although the organisation appears to have been invited publicly to do so. Government feels, therefore, that in the absence of such an attempt of the conditions which alone could warrant the use of the term "National" the proposed name would be a misnomer.

I am also desired to refer you here to my letter No. 771, dated the 5th Isfandar 1349 Fasli (8-1-1940) in reply to your letter enclosing the above resolution. I had stated therein that your letter was under consideration of Government and I had told you also in person, even before its issue, that pending decision by Government no steps should be taken to bring into being the organisation under its new name or to start activities, like enrolment of members either here or in the districts. Government regrets to find that despite the case being still under consideration, the organisation under its new name has already in fact begun to function and enrolment of members is proceeding, although it is clear that such activities continue to be unlawful. The precipitate step thus taken in spite of the President's appeal last year for a common platform and the terms of the above letter has roused not only bitterness among certain classes but also the apprehension in Government that the spirit underlying the organisation is the same which invited the existing ban.

In view of the above and the results that may accrue from such an organisation functioning with the common support of two major communities, more especially as it has an object of far reaching significance to the future of communities as well as to the constitution of the State, Government desires again to emphasise the need for securing a measure of agreement which may justify the

new appellation. The responsibility for consequences that may otherwise ensue and for the suspicion which the activities of the National Conference, as named and so constituted, are bound under the above circumstances to engender, must rest on its promoters. The Government have recently, through the President drawn attention to the fact that the needs of war and of security must influence its policy in all matters and must be the concern of every citizen and it is hoped that, particularly at a time when a calm atmosphere is required, nothing will be done which may jeopardise the chances of mutual agreement between the two communities or lead to fundamental conflict with the State.

Since your organisation aims at a form of Government deriving authority from the majority in the legislature, it is directed against the principle, recently made the subject of an official pronouncement, that the needs of the people must continue to be determined by the undivided responsibility of the Ruler for the welfare of his subjects.

Lest Government's attitude in the matter should require further clarification, I am desired to say that the terms of the resolution sent with your letter are not satisfactory, that the existing ban still continues and that, therefore, the activities of the organisation are unlawful".

Kashinath Rao Vaidya addressed the Home Secretary on the 14th March, 1940, a letter which shows that he was perfectly disillusioned regarding any hopes of the ban being lifted. Vaidya said that the tone of the earlier letter was such that the members of the Hyderabad State Congress had least hestitation as to whether the ban would be lifted by Government or not. He further added that in accordance with the wishes of the Government, enrolment of the members had been suspended and the association with the new name had been disbanded. The critical hair-splitting regarding the phrase 'National' shall become quite clear by the following extract from a letter reproduced here: "You object to the use of the word "National" on the ground that "the Government is not aware of any attempt made in the meantime by your organisation to secure the support, by mutual understanding of representative members of other communities

in the State although the organisation appears to have been invited publicly to do so. Government feels, therefore that in the absence of such an attempt and of the condition which alone could warrant the use of the term "National" the proposed name would be a misnomer." Permit me to say that the condition you impose is not possible of fulfilment. A body composed in the manner indicated could hardly be called National. By 'National' I mean 'non-communal' in the sense that the association is open to all communities who subscribe to the object and the means. As a matter of fact, too, the defunct association contained members drawn from all communities.

If the Government is at all prepared to reconsider its decision I can say on behalf of my companions that we shall be willing to take any member whom the Government may induce to join us subject to the conditions named above.

But you further object to a Government deriving its authority from the majority in the Legislature. I suppose it means objection to Responsible Government even under the aegis of the Asaf Jahi Dynasty. If so, the objection cuts at the root of civil liberty and freedom of expression of opinion. We claim that the permanence of the dynasty can best be secured by the free co-operation of the people of the State. I hope the Government does not put the meaning I have put upon the paragraph in question. I shall be glad to know, if my meaning is not right, what exactly is the meaning of the paragraph ?

I should also tell you that the activities of the association were purely constructive such as khaddar, Hindu-Muslim Unity, drive against illiteracy and Harijan uplift. As to Responsible Government the object was only to formulate public opinion in the matter.

May I hope for a reconsideration of the whole matter and an honourable settlement between the State and those who represent the erstwhile association ? I wish to use my best endeavour to remove what threatens to be an impasse between the State and certain members of the public. I offer my services for what they may be worth".

The Home Secretary, Azhar Hussain wrote, in reply to Kashinath Rao Vaidya's letter in the following tone:—

"The Government is very glad to accept the apology conveyed in your letter on behalf of yourself and your friends and fully appreciates the action taken to discontinue the enrolment of primary members and to disband the association. This is an earnest to Government that on your side you and your friends have appreciated what my previous letter was intended to convey, namely, that it is Government's anxious desire that no programme should be pursued by any association which creates a gulf between communities and prevents the co-operation of the major parties in a truly national endeavour. At the same time Government regrets that you should regard as impossible the fulfilment of the conditions which alone would warrant the association of the term "National" with the proposed name of the organisation, now defunct. It regrets, further, that you should hold the view that a body composed of representative members of all the communities could hardly be called "National". If members of one community associated with political activities of that community could claim a "National" complexion merely by virtue of an organisation having objectives which are non-communal in appearance, their association with similar members of other communities should surely help to substantiate that claim in fact.

The first objective and the immediate problem before Hyderabad, not to speak of India, is no doubt the promotion of communal harmony. This must take precedence over all other considerations. Last week, His Excellency the President had occasion to speak on this matter with yourself and other representatives of both major communities in connection with the events at Bidar and to urge on both a fresh attempt to find common ground. Government confidently expects that all parties will now bend their energies to that end and thus promote what all have at heart, the peaceful and steady progress of all the peoples of the Dominions.

For the rest you will find my previous letter sufficiently clear and explicit to provide an answer to any other question that you may have intended to raise".

Kashinath Rao Vaidya's reaction to this letter expressed on 6th May, 1940 is reproduced here :—

"You have given to the apology a meaning it cannot bear. My friends and I have thereby merely corrected a technical error into which we were betrayed by the letter of 25th December, 1939 which was a clear promise to recognise the State Congress under its changed name. We had no notion whatsoever that the promise was not intended to be fulfilled or would be withdrawn. But we saw that we were wrong in acting upon the promise and the correspondence left no room for the hope that justice will be done. We not only tendered the apology but disbanded the association. But the bitter taste has been left that promise made on behalf of a big State cannot be relied upon. My friends and I would have appreciated a straight answer that the Government had changed their mind and that they could not recognise the association as a free body at all. Instead, reasons have been given which had already been thrashed out. Your letter under reply makes a regrettable position still more so. It misrepresents the attitude of the defunct body. It was never contended that a body composed of representative members of all the communities could hardly be national. These are the words of my letter. "The body composed in the manner indicated could hardly be called national. By national I mean non-communal in the sense that association is open to all communities who subscribe to the object of the association". It fills me with shame and sorrow that in order to support an untenable decision you should have seen fit to resort to misrepresentation. I suggest that a packed body cannot be called national. I suggest further that a body which has all the communities represented on it may conceivably be anti-national. The national character of an association can only be determined by its objective. Its behaviour may either confirm or deny the character. The composition of a body is surely the least part of its quality. A body composed entirely of self-less and impartial Muslims may well represent all communities and one composed of all communities who have joined it from selfish motives will hopelessly fail to represent any part of the nation. But it is useless to appeal to reason when considerations outside reason regulate action.

Events of Bidar are an eye-opener. They put the coping stone on what has been going on in the State for

some time. There is no security of life or property in the State for those who will not be practically slaves. Bidar in our opinion makes the case for Responsible Government irresistible. But the immediate object of a good citizen in such a case is to do everything in his power to secure redress and make a repetition of Bidar impossible. Some of us are convinced that violence is no remedy for securing redress and that non violence is the only remedy. In the circumstances we propose in the near future to adopt such means as may suggest themselves to us.

You have invited us to consider communal unity the first consideration. May we suggest that no unity is possible unless justice is done in the case of Bidar and a sense of security felt by the injured community? It will never come by ignoring ugly facts.

Unless you have any objection, we propose to publish the correspondence between us for public information".

This important correspondence came to termination in a very unsatisfactory way. There is every reason to believe that the Government authorities had shifted ground and were actuated by certain factors which did not influence them, when the negotiations started. The Home Secretary wrote on the 3rd June, 1940, the following letter to Vaidya:—

"With reference to your letter dated the 6th May, I am desired to say that Government does not feel called on to reply point by point to a communication couched in the tone and terms you have seen fit to employ, but that it has been compelled to note the threat it contains in the statement that "some of us are convinced that violence is no remedy".

As regards your proposal to publish the correspondence between us for public information unless Government has any objection, I am desired to say that Government has objections not because there is anything in the several communications to you which Government would not be prepared publicly to uphold but because the correspondence has throughout not been on an official basis, Government's object being to help in clearing the way for an understanding between parties on a truly national basis. Further the opening of controversy in the press

will make that object which Government is still pursuing even more difficult of attainment and will aggravate communal feeling".

Kashinath Rao Vaidya had addressed a note to Azhar Hussain, Home Secretary, on 10th June, 1940. Vaidya expressed surprise that any objectionable thing was discovered by the Home Secretary in his letter. The correspondence closed with the letter from Vaidya to the Home Secretary bearing date 15th August, 1940. The correspondence shows that Government was not prepared to lower down its highbrowed tone in dealing with the Hyderabad State Congress.

Vaidya's letter of 15th August, 1940 reads :—"I am sorry that I have not received any reply to my letter, dated 10th June, 1940. Now I consider that any further correspondence is unfruitful." He said "the correspondence between us was not confidential and as the negotiations have come to an end it is deemed necessary that the correspondence should be published in order to clarify the position of the defunct organisation". Reliable sources indicate that Kashinath Rao Vaidya's correspondence with the Home Secretary had the blessings of Gandhiji who had, on occasions, made suitable changes in phraseology and introduced certain amendments. The inevitable force of logic in the correspondence compelled the Nizam's Government to shift ground and disown a promise.

8. *Satyagraha again*

Swamy Ramanand Tirth who was watching the correspondence between Kashinath Rao Vaidya and the Nizam's Government decided to resort to Civil Disobedience once again so that matters may come to ahead. The State Congress or the Political Conference was an unlawful body and therefore to define the position either of Kashinath Rao Vaidya or of Swamy Ramanand Teerth was not possible. Though we know that Swamy Ramanand was the first President of the first session of the Hyderabad State Congress still it is difficult to say in what capacity he addressed the following letter to Rt. Hon'ble Sir Akbar Hydari on 10th September, 1940. Swamiji wrote as follows :—

"It is with deepest regret that I have to inform you that we feel compelled to offer Civil Disobedience

owing to the attitude of uncompromising opposition shown by the Government of H.E.H. towards the Hyderabad State Congress in spite of its efforts to placate the Government to the highest extent possible. The Government have made it impossible for the Congress to function normally. They have rejected every advance made by the Congress. There is, therefore, no course left but to offer Civil Disobedience in respect of the regulations or rules that interfere with our individual liberty.

"We had on the roll of the Congress ten thousand and odd members. We have numerous sympathisers. But it has been decided that only those who believe in complete non-violence and are able and willing to undergo any sacrifice that may be in store for them should offer Civil Disobedience. At the same time, it is deemed desirable that this action should be restricted to myself and about fifteen of my colleagues. We have chosen this course because we want to show that we have eschewed all violence, that our fight for Responsible Government under the aegis of H.E.H. the Nizam has no place for ill-will in it and that it is a fight for all irrespective of caste or religion.

"Had the authorities not interfered with free expression of opinion and organised peaceful effort for achieving the goal, we would not have adopted the course contemplated. Though it may be hoping against hope we would respectfully ask you to reconsider the Government attitude and enable us to suspend the contemplated action. A reply to this is expected within a week".

Swamy Ramanand Teerth issued a statement which placed before the public in clearest terms the circumstances which had compelled him to court arrest by Civil Disobedience. The following is the statement issued by him on the date on which he courted arrest:-

"It is with the deepest regret that we have to inform the public that we feel compelled to offer Civil Disobedience owing to the uncompromising opposition shown by the Government of H.E.H. towards the Hyderabad State Congress, in spite of its efforts to come to an honourable compromise with the Government. The Government have made it impossible for the Congress to function normally. They have rejected every advance made

by the State Congress. There is no other course left open for the Congressmen except to defy the orders, regulations and rules that interfere with individual civil liberty.

"The reimposition of the ban on the Hyderabad National Conference even in face of a written assurance from the Government clearly indicates that the Government changed their mind. In fairness to themselves and to the nation the Government should have lifted the ban, no sooner the name was changed. Instead they have made a vain effort in raising irrelevant and undemocratic issues which were not contemplated by them while imposing the ban on the State Congress or while giving the assurance. The correspondence is already before the public and they can best judge the relevancy and propriety of the issues raised.

"As an organisation, we are denied the right to preach the ideal of Responsible Government, even under the aegis of H. E. H. the Nizam and the Asaf Jahi Dynasty. We simply claimed the right to educate the people politically by popularising the ideal of Responsible Government. The ban which is reimposed is a denial of the most fundamental right of freedom of association and negation of all civil liberty although the Government have time and again declared that there is full liberty of forming political associations.

Organisationally the State Congress does not exist. But those of us who hold fast to the ideal and the spirit of the organisation claim the right to propagate the ideal in our individual capacity and we will not tolerate any limitation on the right. Our immediate demand to-day is for conceding the right of this political organisation to function normally by lifting the ban imposed on it and to grant full civil liberties.

During the very short span of existence that the Hyderabad National Conference (by which name the Hyderabad State Congress was known after the assurance by the Government) enjoyed, a very large number of members was enrolled. Besides these, there were several sympathisers. Through disbandment they have been absolved from all responsibility. The Civil Disobedience now contemplated will be individual in form, perfectly

non-violent and restricted. We are following this method only to show that we have eschewed all violence and have no intention to embarrass the Government.

We are today voicing the political aspirations of the large bulk of Nationalists in this premier State of India. When communalism of the most aggressive and provocative type is allowed to have full play and the Government have done nothing so far to check it, it passes strange that the nationalist elements should be ruthlessly put down.

We are confident that behind our action is the approval and sympathy of the Nationalist Hyderabad. We are certain that they would spare no pains in contributing their quota to the cause of Nationalism and Civil Liberties. While restricting the direct action only to me and about 15 of my colleagues, I recommend the rest to do their best in intensifying the basic constructive programme without let or hindrance from any quarter.

Let every one of us remember that "form may perish but spirit shall thrive." We should be prepared to pay the price for the ideal we hold dear."

When the negotiations for the change in the name and the abolition of the State Congress were progressing the Hyderabad papers and the Anjuman Ittehad-ul-Musalmeen were very active in seeking that the Government would not stoop to declare the Hyderabad State Congress as a lawful body only because a new appellation was assumed. His Exalted Highness the Nizam enclosed a paper cutting from a very well known local paper, *Rahabar-e-Deccan*, on 31st December, 1939 and advised the Council to deliberate over the question in the light of that article. The same Firman expresses an apprehension that decisions taken without considering every aspect of the problem might jeopardise the condition of law and order prevailing in the State. It also refers to the unfavourable attitude of the Anjuman in this connection. The extract from *Rahbar-e-Deccan* was captioned "Hyderabad National Conference, old body in new dress, corresponding to old wine packed in new bottles. It goes on to say "Ravi Narayana Reddy, Yella Reddy and Baswantha Rao who were the members of the Hyderabad State Congress have issued a statement in which they convince people that

the change does not affect the spirit of the Congress in any way, and therefore people should not think that the warm attachment to the earlier body should be made lukeworm in any way." The paper continues to refer to the well-known quotation from Shakespeare regarding a rose and asks " Would harmful activities of the political party be made tolerable in any way if only the name is changed." The proposal to change the name of the State Congress was suggested by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and was also acceptable to the Anjuman e-Ittehad-ul-Muslimeen because they expected with the change of the name, the change of the aims and objects and creed of the body. "If the objective of the association was to be the same Responsible Government, then its formation and career under any appellation are strongly detrimental to the Muslim interests. Our aim regarding the political goal of Hyderabad is to maintain permanently the Islamic State of Hyderabad as it is. Government should have insisted on the change of the spirit and not the appellation."

The paper further added that "the Hindus of the State shall have to place perfect trust on the Musalmans and banish the idea of their being in a majority. Any action of theirs which will endanger the Islamic character of the State will prevent the Musalmans from joining the National Conference and consequently the National Conference cannot be national. The Constitutional Reforms that the State may introduce will never be successful unless there is Hindu-Muslim Unity. The Hindus also should disabuse their minds of the intoxication of majority. It seems from the statement of the three Congress members referred to above that the Government has given the body an assurance that the National Conference shall be allowed to function upon the assumption of this new appellation but the paper makes it clear that this would mean the Government is communal and such a decision of the Government will not receive any assent from a single Musalman."

The general body meeting of the Anjuman Ittehad held on the 1st of December, 1940 passed a threatening resolution in thundering applause. The resolution said, "If the Hyderabad Government lifts the ban, so wisely and prudently clamped on the State Congress, only because a change is made in its name, the Anjuman makes

it manifest to the Government that the Anjuman shall resort to every such step as will make the existence of the State Congress and its formation abortive."

H.E.H. the Nizam issued a Firman dated 19 Ziqada 1358 A.H. corresponding to Decmber 31, 1939 in which it is unequivocally stated that the problems raised and discussed by the *Rahbar* seem to be right and worthy of consideration. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the Council that they would scrupulously weigh every aspect of the case; otherwise tension between the Hindus and Muslims which is already acute would destroy law and order. In the same Firman the Nizam says that a reliable source has given him to understand that if our Government were to show any disproportionate undeserving concession to the Hindus the Anjuman would challenge the decision and offer resistance.

The memoranda (Arzadasht) submitted to H.E.H. and the Firmans issued during these days relating to this subject freely introduce the names of papers like the *Rahbar-e-Deccan* and associations like the Anjuman. Their opinions are cited and threats held out. A dispassionate student of history is obliged to conclude that between the Government and there associations There se.nd to be some common understanding.

When the Government realised that the Satyagraha Movement was sure to be started in the State by different political and semi-political bodies, the President of the Executive Council desired to keep himself well posted with information, and take quick action against the fluctuating and fluid political situation. He also felt the necessity of consulting the concerned officers. As the Civil Disobedience was mainly the sphere of the Police, the Inspector General of Police, Deputy Inspector-General of Police (C.I.D.), the Commissioner of Police, the Home Secretary and the Revenue and the Police Members played a prominent part. Some other officers and members of the Council were also invited to participate in the deliberations and offer their views. The Government machinery had to be fully active and properly geared. Weekly meetings were arranged at which all important matters were carefully and exhaustively discussed and immediate orders passed.

By this time the political scene in India had changed with the "Quit India" resolution and the events in the world during World War II were morning with such rapidity that the struggle to lift the ban on the State Congress did not receive much public attention till 1945.

9. *Further moves to lift the ban on the State Congress :*

Pandit G. Ramachar seems to have made a constitutional approach to Government to lift the ban on the State Congress. The hearts of the patriotic and enlightened citizens were, on the callousness of the Government in clamping the ban, opened in other channels of activity and the Parishads and Sabhas, Andhra and Maharashtra, were fully active. But some persons had been conscious of the fact that a united and concentrated effort through the State Congress would be the best course, organising public opinion and Ramachar's negotiations were actuated by such a feeling. The Nawab of Chattari had come in the place of Sir Akbar Hydari as the President of the Executive Council.

Ramachar wrote to the President of the Executive Council on the 11th April, 1945 requesting to be permitted to have an interview at which he would discuss some points which might enable Government to come out of the political impasse. The Government had announced the Reforms but they were unacceptable to the three Sabhas. They could not be implemented. Ramachar desired to render some service to solve the tangle. A prompt response was given to this request and Ramachar was asked to see the President on 21st April, 1945. At the interview, it seems Ramachar discussed the political situation and promised to send a note on the history of the State Congress. This note was forwarded by him on 9th July, 1945. It ran as follows and gives in brief the history of the State Congress :—

"The Hyderabad State Congress has a long history. I do not like to take much of Your Excellency's precious time by relating to you its painful story. It is therefore enough I think, if I state the facts briefly thus :

STATE CONGRESS PURELY LOCAL

(1) In the first place, I think, it is necessary to state that the Hyderabad State Congress has no connection whatever with the Indian National Congress. It was

a purely State institution. In July, 1938, a provisional body named "The Hyderabad State Congress" was formed and it was resolved that when a sufficient number of members joined it, regular elections should be held and under the above name the institution should be formed. As per this resolution 1,200 members joined it and 9th September, 1938 was fixed as the date for elections and the passing of the Constitution.

Policy and aims

(2) In the draft constitution of the Hyderabad State Congress which was drawn up and published it was made clear that its object was "to attain Responsible Government under the aegis of H.E.H. the Nizam and his Asaf Jahi successors". The rule dealing with the membership said that "every such person who has more than 18 years of age and was in agreement with the objects of the Hyderabad State Congress, was eligible for membership". Its founders had made clear in their appeal that "the policy of this institution would be to promote communal harmony and to wean away the public from communal activities and to persuade them to engage themselves in national and political activities on the basis of a sincere patriotic urge".

(3) There was one more reason for the founders of this State Congress to be induced to form such an institution and it was this, that on 22nd August, 1938, late Sir Akbar Hydar Nawaz Jung deprecated, in very strong terms, in his address to the Legislative Council, the formation of communal institutions and said that His Exalted Highness's Government was not against the formation of national organisations based on national aspirations or for civil liberties. To amplify this statement, as it were, the Government afterwards published a list of communal organisations wherein the name of the Hyderabad State Congress was not found. All these things tended to make the founders of the Hyderabad State Congress believe that the Government had no doubt whatever about this institution being a non-communal and a national institution. They, therefore, deprecated in a statement of theirs communalism and communal institutions agreeing with the above referred to speech of late Sir Akbar, and they appealed to the public that all the nationalist-minded persons of all communities

should join the Hyderabad State Congress so that an institution named "The Hyderabad State Congress" may be formed.

Door Banged

(4) On the 4th September, 1938, Defence of Hyderabad Regulations were passed and under them, on the 8th September, 1938, it was declared that the Hyderabad State Congress was an unlawful association. In this declaration, the Government had also made it clear that they had no objection to the formation of political organisations in the State provided that they were formed strictly on non-communal basis and had no affiliations with organisations outside the State.

Satyagraha

(5) The members of the provisional body of the State Congress who were one in their minds and expresssions tried their level best to assure the Government that the institution was totally a non-communal one judging from its nature and its constitution and also that it had no affiliation with any organisation outside the State. But, alas, all these attempts of ours proved useless. As a result of this failure, the State Congress offered Satyagraha in Hyderabad. Nearly 400 persons went to jails and when it was realised that the Satyagraha which was directed only against the ban on it was mixed with the Satyagraha of Arya Samajists and that of the Hindu Maha Sabhaites, and thus the State Congress movement was being dubbed as communal, the State Congress called off the Satyagraha. The object in calling off the Satyagraha was that the misunderstanding created might be thus removed and doubts of the Government in respect of State Congress might be set aside and the ban lifted.

Change the Name

(6) Anyhow, a little while after, the Satyagrahis were released from Jails, but the ban on the State Congress remained as it was. The correspondence in this matter was again undertaken with the Government. On the 25th December, 1939—the Judicial, Political and Home Secretariat of His Exalted Highness's Government wrote to Mr. Kashinath Rao Vaidya, that if a suitable change

was made in the name of the State Congress the Government would have no objection. One more condition also was laid that there should be no affiliation of this institution with any organisation outside the State. Relying upon this assurance of the Government, the State Congress workers decided to change its name and instead of the name Hyderabad State Congress "The Hyderabad National Conference" was proposed and the Government was assured that it had no connection or affiliation with any institution outside the State.

One more hurdle

(7) It was being expected that now at least the Government would have no objection and that the ban would be lifted. But on the 29th February, 1940 the Judicial Police and Home Secretariat replied to say that "though you had changed the name, the object of the institution was the same as it was the object of the banned State Congress; that, therefore, the existing ban continued, and its activities also would be deemed unlawful." It was the first occasion on which the Government had objected to the aim of Responsible Government. Thus ended our correspondence which we had so far with the Government and the Hyderabad State Congress is still an unlawful association.

(8) I deem it necessary to place before Your Excellency the fact that the question of Responsible Government was neither ever brought before the Government nor was the Satyagraha offered on its basis. The whole struggle was in connection with the formation of the institution with the goal of Responsible Government before it and it does not need my telling Your Excellency that it is only a question of Civil Liberty. The public have a natural right to form an association with such a goal as Responsible Government. But this right of the public is taken away.

Keep Pace

(9) Your Excellency is himself aware that after the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms, the Government of India itself has now as its goal the introduction of Responsible Government. The State Congress is not founded with any goal of the Fascist party. On the other hand, its goal

is that which is recognised by the democrats all over the world, of whom Great Britain itself is one. And now all the States like Mysore, Travancore, and Kashmir have got State Congresses formed with the very same goal and they are all lawful associations.

(10) I beg to invite Your Excellency's attention to the fact also that the institutions which are admittedly representing communal interests and take to propaganda in communal struggles, find their existence in the State. They are allowed to continue their activities as institutions. Ittehad-ul-Muslimeen and Praja Mandal etc., are the institutions in point. They are lawful associations. Such being the case, it is left to Your Excellency to consider how unprincipled and unstatesmanlike it would be to ban the Hyderabad State Congress as an unlawful association which, uniting all classes and communities, desires, in its capacity as a political institution, to work for the political progress of the State, keeping pace with the other Indian States and British India.

(11) I am not stating all this as a complaint or grumbling. My only object in stating all these facts and disclosing all these matters is that I should place before Your Excellency, the justifying aspects of the case for the Hyderabad State Congress because I trust that Your Excellency would view such matters without being prejudiced in any way. I only request that Your Excellency may consider the justice of the case for the Hyderabad State Congress in a sympathetic way and allow it to function and engage itself in its proper activities as a lawful association".

This important political question must have been under deliberation for a very long time. Ramachar wrote another communication on 14th August, 1945 to refresh the memory. In this he added a few things. The World War II had ended in the meanwhile. He wrote:—"Your Excellency is aware that the world conditions are changing a bit quickly. By God's grace, not only did the European War II end successfully, but also did Japan surrender its arms. The Eastern War was also won on the defeat of the enemy. Changes for better should necessarily come in the internal and external conditions, which obtained during the War. In British India also effects

are seen of these changes for better and it is hoped that very soon all the Congress organisations shall begin to function in their own corporate capacities as before. On the complete co operation of the people of the State depends their success. Our Government can also tackle the post-war plans as conceived till now. To achieve this end, the Central and Provincial Governments of British India are trying to secure the co-operation of all the classes and communities of British India. It is not a secret for Your Excellency to know that if the constructive scheme for Hyderabad is to be made good, it will not prove useful to ignore the State Congress, banning it as an unlawful association and compelling it thus to non-cooperate with the Government—an institution which may not be now in its corporate capacity of the State Congress, but which is all the same working in fact through the three Provincial conferences and through other bodies. In any of the constructive programmes of the Government, a large body which cannot be refused to be called an influential body can be hardly ignored. To expect co-operation from it is only possible when that body is given the chance of living and functioning as a central institution ; especially when to allow it to function is in fact no concession to be shown to it but, on the other hand, is a matter of sheer justice shown to it.

Anyway, in my opinion lifting the ban on the State Congress needs the immediate attention of Your Excellency. I hope that Your Excellency shall consider this matter with sympathy and shall settle it immediately."

Ramachar again forwarded a request to have an interview with the President. But the Chief Secretary to the Government sent a reply in which he said that Ramachar's request to lift the ban imposed on the State Congress was fully considered by the President in the Council and that the Government could not grant his request.

Though Ramachar was favoured with a negative reply by the Government of H. E. H. the Nizam, yet Suleman Hussain of the personal staff of the President wrote to Ramachar stating that the President would be pleased to see him on 11th September, 1945. But in this

interview Ramachar could not discuss certain points and so he forwarded a note on 25th October, 1945 in which he wrote as follows :—

"I received a reply from the Home Secretariat on the 6th September, 1946, regarding the question of lifting the ban on the Hyderabad State Congress to the effect that the Government is not at present prepared to grant my request and lift the ban. But as regards Constitutional Reforms, I have not yet received any reply although it appears from a perusal of the notifications which are recently issued and published that the Government is sticking to its policy, and does not like to effect any manner of change on the Reforms. Your Excellency will remember there arose discussions on Reforms and elections and it was said of me that I had proposed nominations instead of elections and on this ground I and my colleagues were criticised which is still continuing. The Government, however, to clear its position, explained in a notification that it does not propose to have recourse to nominations, but, instead it is bringing into effect elections. I do not find any necessity to express here what all gossip is being indulged in by the public regarding myself and my colleagues. But to clear my position, I find it, however, necessary that all those proposals made in my letters regarding the State Congress and the Constitutional Reforms and replies to them should be published in order to remove the misunderstandings. I hope Your Excellency will grant me permission to do so."

Ramachar did not become disappointed but still attempted another knock on 19th November, 1945. In the early part of the letter he said he did not know why Government had not given any reasons why the ban was not being lifted from the Congress. He went on to say: "The Hyderabad State Congress was started in August and banned in September, 1938. The organisation never actually came into existence and the Government had absolutely no chance of examining its working and forming any opinion about it. It was branded as communal without giving it a 'dog" chance of proving that it is not its protestations to the contrary that were not heeded. May I ask Your Excellency whether the Government would be justified in disallowing the formation of this on the ground of its being communal when the

Ittehad-ul-Muslimeen, Hindu Praja Mandal, Arya Samaj and Sanatana Dharma Sabha and other professed communal organisations are not only legal but are allowed to carry on their work even in a political manner? The conclusion is irresistible that the Government is probably concealing the real reason that it does not want any real common political organisation to be started in the State. Your Excellency will, I hope, agree with me that it is an anomaly to disallow a political organisation to be started, while embarking on introducing political and constitutional reforms of a democratic nature and the sooner it is removed, the better both for the Government and the people. I may also point out that it is against the declared policy of H. E. H. the Nizam as expressed in a Firman dated 22nd June, 1944.

The second point which I desire to impress upon Your Excellency is that in spite of banning the Hyderabad State Congress, the Government have not been able to prevent the ideal of Responsible Government from spreading. The idea has been propagated and the three Provincial conferences, Andhra, Maharashtra and Karnatak, have passed resolutions approving the introduction of Responsible Government as the political ideal before them. The demand is being voiced from different platforms and is the result of changed political conditions and democratic aspirations of the people of all States including these Dominions. The ideal cannot now be banned subjectively though its full realisation may be postponed and it may not become an objective reality in the near future. If the Government is thinking that it is effectively preventing the ideal of Responsible Government from being propagated by banning this organisation, it is thoroughly mistaken. It is only producing increasing discontent and rancour among the people. In this connection, I may remind Your Excellency that the demand for Responsible Government is being freely made in all other States. Governments have nowhere raised an objection to starting organisations with such a political ideal. In Mysore, the ban on the State Congress has already been removed.

At one time the Government objected to the name State Congress on the suspicion of its possible affiliation or alignment with the Indian National Congress. This objection was removed by an open declaration that

the proposed organisation had no connection with any outside organisation and also by agreeing to change the name. We have already stated that we are willing to call it the "The Hyderabad National Conference" or by some other suitable name. Your Excellency will see that the sponsors of the organisation have been ever willing to adjust themselves by removing any possible objections of the Government.

It is no doubt true that failing to start a united and central political organisation with a common ideal and programme the three provincial organisations devised a means of co-ordinating their activities by forming a loose body called the joint co-ordination committee. But that is a mere advisory body without any decisive authority to formulate common policies and programmes. Besides this, there are several Hyderabadis, particularly the Muslims, Marwaris, and such others who do not speak any of the three provincial languages, and are thus outside the pale of the three conferences. They remain untouched by them and the joint co-ordination committee. We want an organisation which shall be open to all Hyderabadis, regardless of religion, language, caste or creed. The Hyderabad State Congress alone can fulfil this long felt need.

I shall draw Your Excellency's attention to the fact that Your Excellency's Government have withdrawn the ban on the Indian National Congress and its committee by recent order dated 11th Dai 1355 Fasli (15-11-1945). May I ask whether it will not be an anomaly to lift the ban on an outside organisation which has had no connection with the former? I am not speaking in a spirit of controversy or threat, but if the ban on the State Congress is not removed, will not the people be goaded to form organisations affiliated to the Indian National Congress which is not banned? I hope Your Excellency will consider this aspect also of the matter.

Considering the above aspects, I respectfully request Your Excellency to reconsider this important matter in a statesman-like manner. If the Government really mean to introduce constitutional and political reforms so as to meet the needs of the day, and if the Government have a real desire to rally round the thinking people of the State to co-operate with it in its plans for future

progress, the first step towards reconciliation and rapprochement would be to remove the ban on the Hyderabad State Congress. May I hope that Your Excellency will reconsider the matter in the light of my submission and undo a wrong done to a considerably large section of the people of the State? And in this connection, I shall feel very grateful if Your Excellency would grant me, along with my colleagues, an interview."

The President of the Executive Council Nawab Chattari asked Ramachar to see him along with his colleagues and naming them before the interview and getting their participation confirmed. Ramachar had a meeting with the President on 24th November, 1945. He had taken Kashinath Rao Vaidya and M. Narsing Rao with him. The minutes of the interview were as follows.

"His Excellency the President of the Executive Council granted an interview to-day, the 24th November, 1945 to Messrs. Ramachar, Narsing Rao and myself at 2-30 p.m. when Mr. Savidge, the Revenue and Police Member, Mr. Zahid Hussain, the Finance Member and Nawab Ali Yavar Jung, Nawab Moin Nawaz Jung, the Political Secretary and Mr. Razvi, the Home Secretary were present. Mr. Savidge remarked it was very long time since we had met last to which I replied that we had met in connection with the Gulbarga affair. The President then opened the discussion by saying that in the last letter we had said that the Government was not prepared to lift the ban on the State Congress for the present but now the Government was prepared to do so on certain conditions. Mr. Savidge read out the conditions to us. We could not take down wording of these conditions but the purport of the conditions was as follows:—

1. That the name of the Association should not have any resemblance to the Indian National Congress, the emphasis being on the word Congress.

2. It should have no affiliation with any outside organisation.

3. The office bearers of our association should not hold any office in any outside organisation.

4. The members of our association should have personal loyalty to the Ruler.

5. The membership should be restricted to domiciled inhabitants of the State.

6. The association should represent the grievances by peaceful and constitutional means.

There was discussion on every condition when it was read out. We said that the Government should have no objection to the word Congress as the Government has allowed the District Committee of the Indian National Congress to function in Hyderabad. We also said that in Mysore, the Mysore State Congress is functioning and the Mysore State has no objection for the same. Mr. Savidge said that we had already agreed to change the name before and as there was not much importance in the name there is no reason why the Government should object to it. Nawab Ali Yavar Jung said that when the membership would be enrolled ordinary people would not be able to discriminate between the Indian National Congress and your Association to which we said that Hyderabad State would precede the word Congress. Mr. Zahid Hussain said that in view of the sentiment prevailing at present the Muslims will try to be aloof from the word Congress and that as we wanted to have a non-communal institution it would be in our interest that we should not have the word Congress. The President said that there was much force in the name and Baden Powell gave the name Scout in order to distinguish it from a military institution. We said that we had agreed to change the name in 1939 but we have reverted to our previous position. Mr. Savidge asked why we should insist on the name Congress now to which we replied that we have named it so and our people may not agree for the change now. We then said that we will see after hearing all the conditions.

Regarding affiliation we said that we have no objection provided an exception is made in the case of the All-India States' Peoples' Conference. In one sense, it is an outside body but in the other sense it is not so as it is a body comprising all the States and Hyderabad cannot be aloof from it. The President remarked that Hyderabad has not joined the Chamber of Princes but he immediately remarked that it was a joke. We said that the Hyderabad Government will have to send a few members on the Constituent Assembly which will comprise

of members from different States as well. It was put to them whether they would like to exclude the people of the State from other Indian States under the present circumstances. We were told that the Government would consider this aspect of the case.

Regarding office bearers, the question was whether the members of the Working Committee and the Standing Committee were office-bearers. Regarding the Standing Committee we told that they were not office-bearers. As regards the Working Committee they were of opinion that they were office-bearers in the sense that they formed the Cabinet. We said that there may be a condition that the office-bearers of our association should not be the members of the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress but they should be allowed to be the members of the Standing Committee of the All-India States' Peoples' Conference. We were told that this question will also be considered by the Government. It was, however, made clear that there was no objection by the Government to any ordinary member of our association becoming an office-bearer on any outside body.

Regarding loyalty we said we had no objection as we do not want to be disloyal to the Ruler.

As regards restriction of the membership to the mulkis we said that we do not want to enroll members from outside the State as we want to solve our problems by ourselves but it was pointed out that the question of domicile is sometimes raised even in cases of Government servants. Nawab Ali Yavar Jung suggested that there should be a rule in our constitution that only the mulkis should be the members to which we agreed saying that if any non-mulki becomes a member, we should not be supposed to have caused a breach of promise. The President said that there should be no such thing. The Government will point out that a particular person is not a mulki and that the Government and the association should work in co-operation.

Regarding the representation of grievances by constitutional means we agreed to the proposal. It was said that the object in keeping this condition was that Satyagraha should not be adopted as the means of redressing grievances. We said that generally Satyagraha is not

declared on behalf of the association. But that a separate committee of action takes upon itself the responsibility of launching Satyagraha. The Government did not agree to the word legitimate instead of constitutional means.

After hearing all the conditions the first three conditions were again discussed. It was said that the Government was giving consideration to the question of public meetings to which we said that it was long overdue and that the restrictions should be removed as early as possible.

The President then opened the question of the reforms and specially election on territorial basis. We suggested that the question of reforms has to be fully discussed. And it may be taken up on some other date. All agreed on this point and it was suggested that Friday or any holiday may be fixed for the purpose but as it did not suit the Government, the 28th November, 1945, 12 noon was fixed. The interview came to close at about 4 p.m.

We were glad to note that no objection was raised by the Government to the ideal of Responsible Government. My correspondence with Government was referred to during the course of discussion and from the fact the Government had not resiled from the promise of lifting the ban on the ground of Responsible Government and no condition relates to the ideal of Responsible Government, it is clear that the Government has waived its objection regarding it. We think that this was a decided gain to the people of the State."

The Government upon this, again wrote to Ramachar on 29th November, 1945 that there was a possibility of the ban being lifted provided some of the conditions proposed by the Government are acceptable to the sponsors of the State Congress. The following conditions were laid :—

1. The name of the Association should be changed to one having no resemblance to that of the All-India National Congress and approved by the Government.

2. Its Constitution should embody a provision that there shall be no affiliation with any political association outside the State.

3. No office-bearer of the association may be an office-holder of any political association outside the State.

4. Every member of the Association must affirm his personal allegiance and loyalty to the Ruler.

5. Membership of the Association should be restricted to persons domiciled in the State.

6. Such grievances and aspirations of the Ruler's subjects as the association may wish to express should be in a peaceful and constitutional manner.

Ramachar very wisely said that though he and his collegues might agree to the conditions imposed, he could not give any guarantee regarding other members and so on 29th December, 1945 he expressed his willingness and difficulties in the following terms :—

"I may point out to you that at the outset that while we, as responsible members of a political body, are always prepared to discuss with the Government and come to a workable understanding regarding the peaceful conduct of our political movements, it is not within practical politics for a few individuals, however important they may be, to give an undertaking to the Government on behalf of a democratic body like our organisation. Anxious as we are to remove all misconception and doubts entertained by the Government you will realise that no assurance given by us can take the form of conditions to be imposed by the Government and accepted by us. It is neither becoming to the dignity or prestige of the Government to impose them nor is it honourable to the sponsors of the political and democratic body to accept them.

With regard to the six points raised in your letter and referred to during the interview we had given expression to our views more or less definitely. Regarding the name of the organisation we had submitted that it had acquired a sanctity with the people more especially due to the long continuance of the ban, and now that the clearing of atmosphere is necessary and most advisable, it would be graceful for the Government, to allow the Hyderabad State Congress to function in that name. We had also submitted that under whatever name it may function, it should have the liberty of affiliation at any rate with the all India States' Peoples' Conference and our

members should be able to become office-bearers of that body as a corrolary. H.E. the President has assured us that aspect of the question would be considered by the Government, but your letter does not make any mention of the matter. Besides this, you will realise that ordinarily such negative provisions are not incorporated in the constitutions of democratic peoples' organisation. Questions of affiliation are matters of policy to be determined from time to time.

We had also made it clear that the object of the organisation viz.,the attainment of responsible government under the aegis of H.E.H. the Nizam clearly implied loyalty to the Ruler which should be presumed in law and in fact. Therefore, it is not necessary for you to mention it as a condition precedent for removal of the ban especially when special form or method of affirmation of loyalty can feasibly be suggested. Moreover, no such condition has been imposed on any other organisation and there can be no justification for making an invidious distinction between different peoples' organisations. As a matter of fact, no other organisation in this State has been asked to give any such undertaking or submit to any condition precedent to its continuance as a legal body.

Membership of the body will certainly be limited to the citizens of the State and it had never been prepared to enroll members from outside. With regard to the last point we made it clear that under normal conditions no political body intended to educate the people politically claiming to represent them, would invite avoidable suffering and trouble to the people by having recourse to what are considered to be unconstitutional methods by law.

The question of the removal of the ban is after all a matter of mere justice, a question of civil rights of citizens. While I and my colleagues adhered to the views expressed and assurances given by us during the interview, I request to say that it is not possible for us to accept anything in the form of the conditions to be imposed by the Government and we are unable to give any "undertaking" in the sense in which the term is used in political parlance.

In conclusion, I sincerely hope that the Government will realise the advisability and necessity of removing the

ban on the Hyderabad State Congress without imposing any condition and thus lay the foundation of mutual trust and goodwill between them and the people."

Ramachar had endeavoured to convince Mr. Grigson, the Revenue and Police Member in the following way:—

"In the first place, I wish to impress upon you the fact that we of the Congress persua ion have always tried to form a central political organisation consisting of all classes and communities of people. I am sorry to tell you that the Government have themselves prevented the formation of such body every time that an attempt was made by us. The history of Hyderabad State Reforms Association and the Nizam's Subjects League will convince you of the truth of my above complaint. We started the Hyderabad State Congress in September, 1938 and enrolled a membership of more than one thousand among whom there were 150 Muslims and about dozen or more Christians. The organisation was banned on the eve of election of office-bearers without giving it a ghost of chance for working, on the extraordinary ground that it was communal because it did not include in it the bodies of Muslim opinion or the important sections of the other community. It is not necessary for me to urge that when Ittehad-ul-Muslimeen and Hindu Maha Sabha organisations are legal bodies and openly carrying on their avowedly communal activities, it is sheer injustice to ban a political organisation which is open to all without distinction of caste or creed, provided they subscribe to its aims and objects. The statements and declarations made by the provisional committee enclosed herewith will bear out the above facts.

The Government, I am sure, is not unaware of the fact that not only in the rest of India, Indians have made rapid progress, but in spite of suppression of civil liberties, there is a growing section of people both among Hindus and Muslims in this State which desires to take its due share in the administration of the State. The idea of Responsible Government, though outwardly opposed by the Ittehad-ul-Muslimeen and ruthlessly suppressed by the Government, has taken root in the minds of the people in general including Muslims. The Ittehad-ul-Muslimeen will have to give up its opposition sooner or later and line up with others who desire Responsible Government. The

force of the time will drive them to do so. I may remind you of your own speech when you addressed the members of the Advisory Board of the Agricultural Department on 17th Bahaman 58 F. and assured them that the appointment of the Board was a step in the direction of Responsible Government. You know how rapidly things are moving in the rest of India and if you desire to line up Hyderabad with other Provinces and States, the least that you should show as a preliminary of further chances, is to overhaul completely, the policy adopted towards people's organisation and popular demands. The only way by which Government can convince the people of their sincere desire to grant civil liberties is to remove the unjustifiable and unjust ban on the Hyderabad State Congress without imposing any condition whatsoever. By doing so, the Government would only be putting this organisation on a par with others and nothing more; for you know that the Government has not imposed any condition on any other organisations.

When the objects and aims of this organisation are perfectly legal and it wants to propagate and work for the attainment of its ideal by legitimate and peaceful means, there is no meaning in the Government insisting on imposing some condition or other for removing its ban after eight long years. Much water has flown under the bridge since 1938; the continuance of the ban is a standing stigma on the Government. It has not succeeded in stopping the growth of political consciousness, though it has put obstacles in our way of co-ordinating our activities and making effective contribution to the civic and political life of the State. I have consulted Mr. Vaidya and some other important workers of the Hyderabad State Congress and they are not disposed to accept any condition precedent for removal of the ban whether it is change of name or any other. Of course, after all of us have met and discussed the matter, the final decision will be made known to you in the course of the next week, but, as one who moved the matter before the Government last year, I thought it my duty to let you know the general views of the members of the organisation especially because you were not present when the questions were discussed with H.E. the President in our previous interviews.

I may also point out to you that when you have removed the ban on the district committee of the Indian

National Congress in Hyderabad, it is sheer anomaly to continue the ban on the State Congress, a political organisation of the State with local aims and objects. This anomaly will naturally attract large number of Congressites who will strengthen it and will work directly under the Indian National Congress. I do not think that from the Government's point of view you would welcome that position. I, therefore, request you to examine the position *de novo*, apart from past prejudices with an open mind and induce the Government to lift the ban on the Hyderabad State Congress without insisting on any condition so that this act of justice, belated as it is, may not be marred by lack of grace on the part of the Government.

I could not write to you earlier because I had gone to Bidar and other places to examine the food conditions there, a report of which has already been submitted to you. Mr. Vaidya was also unwell and we could not consult him. Please excuse this delay."

While these events were happening, the move to get the ban on the State Congress lifted received powerful support from the rest of India.

10. *Ban on the State Congress lifted*

Sir Mirza Ismail who was reported to take over charge of the Presidentship of the Executive Council of the Nizam was addressed by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru on the 18th of June, 1946 as follows :—

"I was going to write to-day to the Nawab of Chattari when I heard that you were going to take charge from him in a day or two. I am, therefore, addressing this letter to you. I am writing to you in my capacity as President of the All-India States' Peoples' Conference. The General Council of this conference has been holding its sessions here in Delhi. They have passed a resolution on Hyderabad, a copy of which I enclose for your information.

From many years past there has been a ban on the Hyderabad State Congress. There has naturally been considerable resentment at this ban, but we have consistently advised our friends there not to take any precipitate action. On several occasions there have been

talks between the State authorities and members of the State Congress. They came to nothing. Only recently there was some correspondence on this subject. It appeared that at long last the ban was going to be removed, but it still continues.

I do hope that it will be one of the earliest acts of your administration to remove this ban and to establish normal civil liberties in Hyderabad State. Of course such a removal should be unconditional. Hyderabad has gained an unenviable notoriety in regard to suppression of civil liberties and in the present circumstances, when people are talking of independence and Responsible Government everywhere, it is even more so. I am sure that you would not like Hyderabad to remain a symbol of reaction. I trust, therefore, that we shall soon hear that Hyderabad is turning a new leaf in such matters and that substantial reforms aiming at responsible government will follow soon after."

Panditji had enclosed two notes of resolutions passed at the All-India States' Peoples' Conference:—

"With reference to the resolution on Hyderabad passed yesterday by the General Council, the Standing Committee is of opinion that the following initial organisational step should be taken in Hyderabad. In view of the fact that the old State Congress has not been functioning for many years, a joint committee consisting of such surviving members of the old State Congress Executive as are willing to participate and who fulfil the provisions of the new constitution of the All-India States' Peoples' Conference and the members of the Executive of the recently constituted Regional Council should form themselves into the provisional State Congress Executive Committee. Swami Ramiamanand Teerth, the last Working President of the State Congress and the present President of the Regional Council shall be the President of this newly constituted State Congress Committee. This Committee will have power to co-opt additional members. The Committee will take the necessary steps to implement the resolution passed in the General Council."

"The General Council have learnt with amazement that in the State of Hyderabad the ban on the State

Congress still continues, when the whole of India is on the verge of independence and it is almost universally acknowledged that the States must have Responsible Government. This continuance of the ban in the way of peaceful and legitimate political activity is a significant indication of the utter backwardness of the Hyderabad State administration. The Council have noted that on behalf of this backward and feudal administration a claim is sometimes made for independence. Such a claim from any State in India is fanciful and totally unrelated to the existing situation in the country. It is a fantastic attempt to try to preserve the feudal administrations. The Council cannot tolerate such or like claims nor is it prepared to tolerate the denial of the most elementary civil liberties in the State. In the opinion of the council it is absurd to imagine that Hyderabad State can continue to remain as a backward, autocratic and feudal island in a democratic independent India. Any State which does not even recognise elementary civil liberties is out of court in any discussion about the future. The State of Hyderabad will have to change its ways completely before it can entitle itself to any consideration in assemblies determining the future of India.

In the event of the ban on the State Congress continuing and other civil liberties being denied, it will be the right of the State Congress to function in spite of this ban and assert their right to civil liberties."

Sir Mirza passed on the letter of the Panditji along with its enclosure to Nawab of Chattari, the outgoing President of the Executive Council. The Nawab of Chattari sent a reply to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru on the 25th June, 1946 as follows :—

Sir Mirza Ismail forwarded to me your letter of the 18th June which I received yesterday. As you are aware His Exalted Highness's Government was thinking for sometime to remove the ban on the State Congress and certain negotiations were going on but, however, one thing or the other delayed the decision and since March last my absence from Hyderabad was the chief cause of the delay. You will be glad to hear that even before the receipt of your letter, His Exalted Highness's Government had decided to remove the ban and I hope under your wise guidance they will conduct their activities with moderation and in a constitutional manner.

In your letter you have mentioned about lack of civil liberties in Hyderabad. I think you are not being correctly informed; otherwise I do not think that Hyderabad State deserves to be called 'symbol of reaction and unenviable notoriety in regard to suppression of civil liberties'.

I am soon going on leave preparatory to retirement and when I am back in U.P., I will get more opportunities of meeting you and I hope I will be able to satisfy you that Hyderabad is being tarred more black than what really is."

This letter was followed by another communication dated 3rd July, 1946 to the Panditji:—

"Sir Mirza Ismail forwarded to me your letter of he 13th June and I received it on the 21th June. The decision had already been taken to lift the ban on the State Congress, and before you receive this reply the Press will no doubt have made this public. It is naturally hoped, that the State Congress will reciprocate by displaying the same spirit of goodwill and co-operation, as has actuated the Government in removing the ban on the eve of the first elections to the new legislature.

The need of this spirit is apparent from the fact that you have clearly been given wrong information as to the lack of civil liberties in Hyderabad, and from the language of hyperbole in the resolution of the General Council of the All-India States' Peoples' Conference, which was an enclosure to your letter to Sir Mirza but as I am very shortly proceeding on leave preparatory to retirement I hope that I shall soon be back in the United Provinces and there have the pleasure of seeing you more often and therefore, opportunities of convincing you that the picture of conditions in Hyderabad painted by our detractors is not a true one.

Need I say, with reference to your letter of the 26th June, that I am in emphatic disagreement with you in your characterisation of Hyderabad as "backward, medieval" etc.? You could not have used these adjectives had you been aware of the many progressive features of the State's policy, such as the Co-operative reorganisation of our rural economy, the increasing State

control of our key industries, our housing scheme for the labourers and the poor, our town planning, the gradual introduction of compulsory primary education and the separation of the judicial and executive."

At long last, the Government of H.E.H. the Nizam lifted the ban on the State Congress in April, 1946.

Ramachar expressed gratitude to the Nawab of Chattari, Sayeed-ul-Mulk, the President of the Executive Council, for having lifted the ban and he in return thanked him on 6th July, 1946. He said: "It is indeed gratifying to receive such a nice letter from you on the eve of my retirement from Hyderabad." The Nawab of Chattari retired on 12th July, 1946.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE CRIPPS MISSION AND THE HYDERABAD STATE

Japan attacked Pearl Harbour on the 7th December, 1941, and her spectacular success in 1941 and 1942 led the British Government to realise that an understanding with the Congress was essential if public support to the war effort was to be enlisted. Realising the necessity for a fresh approach to the problem, Churchill announced the Cripps Mission on 11th March, 1942. Sir Stafford Cripps, a member of the British War Cabinet, came to India on 22nd March, 1942 with a plan for reaching an agreement, which was announced on March 20th. The plan envisaged that in the immediate implementation, there would be retention of power by British with consultative co-operation of Indian representatives. The plan for the post-war period, envisaged Dominion Status for India, with power to secede from the British Commonwealth. In addition, a constitution-making body would be set up, immediately after the war, with a provision for any Province or State to remain outside the Union. As there was no real transfer of power during the immediate war period, the proposals were rejected by the Congress. After its failure, Gandhiji started 'Quit India Movement' which reached its culmination after the arrest of all the Congress leaders on 9th August, 1942.

1. *The Reactions of Mahatma Gandhi*

The Cripps Mission and the negotiations that were conducted had different reactions in different quarters. Mahatma Gandhi, after a close and penetrating study of the offer, called it a post-dated cheque, and had rejected it summarily. Mahatma Gandhi's attitude towards the Indian States and their position in a free independent India became quite clear. The following extracts from *The Indian Express*, dated 18th July, 1944 represents the case of the people of the Indian States quite lucidly :—

"Two explicit statements which have emanated from Gandhiji in the last few days show how, in the midst of his present urgent pre-occupations, the question of

the freedom of the people of the Indian States is never absent from his mind." "One fundamental element in my attitude is", he said in the course of his talk with press representatives at Panchgani, on July 13, that "I shall never be a party to the sale of rights of the people of the State for the sake of the freedom of the people of British India. At the same time, I am no enemy of the princes. I consider myself to be their friend, and if any body cares to understand, I am quite prepared to suggest a solution at once honourable to them and to the people." Two days after, in an exclusive interview to the United Press special representative, he again referred to the Indian States when he said :

"In my opinion the Cripps plan meant the dismemberment of India, the Indian States being set up as an all-extensive disintegrating factor." The relevant paragraph in the Cripps proposal which referred to the position of the Indian States in the making of a post-war Constitution for the whole of India was as follows :—

"The Indian States shall be invited to appoint representatives to the Constitution-making body in the same proportion to their total population as in the case of representatives of British India as a whole and with the same power as British Indian member." According to the Cripps proposals, therefore, while one third of the Constitution-making body would consist of the nominees of the Rulers of Indian States possessing equal status with British Indian representatives in the matter of shaping the destiny of British India, the British Indian representatives were to be denied any corresponding opportunity to influence the fate of the millions living in the Indian States. It is this anomaly which Gandhiji has rightly characterised as "an all-extensive disintegrating factor."

The criticism has often come from the leaders of the movement for Responsible Government in the States that the Haripura resolution of the Congress proved that the Congress preferred to take the line of least resistance in regard to the question of the freedom of the people of the States.

The Haripura resolution laid down that the branches of the Indian National Congress in the States should undertake only the constructive programme of the

Congress and that for the purpose of agitating for Responsible Government, independent internal organisations should take up the responsibility. Though there was strong opposition to the resolution both in the Subjects Committee and at the open session of the Congress at Haripura, subsequent events proved that by shifting responsibility directly to the people of the States the resolution only helped to call forth their innate strength. Immediately in the wake of the Haripura decision internal organisations of the people sprang up in the States of Mysore, Travancore, Rajkot, Jaipur etc., which took upon themselves the full responsibility for agitating for Responsible Government so much so that Gandhiji himself called the year following the Haripura Congress as an year of awakening in the States. The Congress attitude towards the Indian States was made clear once again at the time of the Cripps proposal. One of the grounds as stated by the Congress Working Committee for the rejection of the Cripps proposal was the provision in it relating to the Working Committee which touched upon this question in clear and unequivocal terms stating :

" The complete ignoring of the 90 million of the people of Indian States and their treatment as commodities at the disposal of their Rulers is a negation of both democracy and self-determination. While the representation of an Indian State in the Constitution-making body is fixed on a population basis, the peoples of the States have no voice in choosing those representatives nor are they to be consulted at any stage while decisions vitally affecting them are being taken. Such States may in many ways become barriers to the growth of Indian Freedom, enclaves where foreign authority still prevails and where the possibility of maintaining foreign armed forces has been stated to be a likely contingency, and a perpetual menace to the freedom of the people of States as well of the rest of India. Gandhiji's latest statements only re emphasize the point of view taken by the Congress."

The paper adds further comments :

" It is possible that the Rulers of States might think twice before accepting Gandhiji's claim that he is no enemy of theirs, just as the British Government to-day seem to be not unwilling to recognise his friendship. But it is worthwhile

remembering that Gandhiji has stated times without number that in his view there is a place for the Rulers even in a free India as the Constitutional heads of their States. His quarrel has always been with the autocratic rule in the Indian States and his plea has always been that such rule should give place to Constitutional government under the aegis of the Ruler. But, whatever might be the reaction of the Rulers themselves to Gandhiji's point of view the people of the States will be considerably heartened by his assurance that he would never consent to barter away their freedom for the freedom of British India."

2. *The reactions of the Chancellor of the Princes Chamber*

The Chancellor of the Princes Chamber became anxious to safe-guard the interests of the princes. He wanted to consult a few leading representatives of the States and then address a letter to the Viceroy. The representative of the Nizam's Government had also his own say in the matter. A communication from the Chancellor read in parts thus:—

"We should ask the Viceroy in plain language what is the policy and plan of His Majesty's Government and the Crown Representative, about the future of the States. We have a right to know this so as to enable us to mould our future in the light of the policy of His Majesty's Government. We must demand an answer, particularly in view of the uncertainty of events in British India.

We were on the verge of being wiped off our feet when Cripps came with his proposals regarding which we were never consulted and no indication was given to us as to what these proposals would contain. On paper, it looked as if we have been protected. In fact no protection was given and if British India had accepted those proposals we all felt that we were all doomed as States. Events indicate that something of that nature might happen again in the near future. If Jinnah and Gandhi come to terms we shall again be lost. We cannot be spectators to this and I would urgently and at-once consider whether we should not write a letter to the Viceroy now saying:—

We have history, we have treaties which we have respected. We have a record of loyal and

devoted service to the Crown as friends and allies and we cannot allow our future to be jeopardised by the Crown without our consent or at any rate reasonable and sufficient warning which would enable us to adjust our relations and our future with British India of the future. Before the Crown commits itself to any arrangement we have a right to know how far the Crown will honour and protect our treaty rights and in what manner and what would be the sanction and force behind the pledges which the Crown may give to us now on paper etc."

There is a letter from Joseph Bhore addressed to His Highness the Nawab of Bhopal. The Nawab Saheb was requested to have an interview with the Viceroy; in case of the interview not being possible a letter was to be addressed. In both the cases an *aide memoire* was to be presented to the Viceroy. The *aide memoire* runs as follows :—

"DRAFT AIDE MEMOIRE

The release of Mr. Gandhi, for reasons of health, has given rise to some speculation in the British and Indian Press with regard to the possibility of talks between him and Mr. Jinnah and between them and His Excellency the Viceroy. In case the speculation proves correct and it is decided that there should be further discussion with these political leaders, whether as a result of any settlement between the leaders or otherwise such discussions however ostensibly confined to British India, are likely to take into account permanent or temporary form of the Provincial and Central machinery, the latter of which is mainly responsible for the regulation of matters of common concern. These and other matters may come into the picture, including the all important questions of Defence and the question of a Defence Member.

In such an event, it is necessary, both constitutionally and politically, that the States should be consulted before understandings are reached with regard to the matters which may affect them, their rights and interests, or their treaty rights, whether directly or indirectly. The weighty reasons stated in the historic letters from Sir John (now Lord) Simon to the Prime Minister for consultation with the States still hold good and have throughout been recognised. The Chancellor was informally consulted

by Lord Linlithgow before final recommendations were made by him to His Majesty's Government in respect even of the interim arrangements relating to the expansion of the Executive Council and establishment of a National Defence Council.

The States have no desire either to interfere with purely British Indian matters or in any way to impede the possibility of settlement. His Excellency is, however, fully aware of the importance to them of their rights and interests, including their Treaty rights, and of the manner of regulation of matters of common concern to British India and the States. In addition, even assuming that the direct relations of the States with the Crown will in no case enter within the ambit of the discussions, it is a matter of great consequence to them to know how far, as a result of any arrangements that may be entered into even for the interim period, the Crown would continue to be able to protect the States and their rights and interests. At the time of the Cripp's proposals, there were many of them who felt that, though the proposals seemed on paper to protect them, such protection as was proposed thereunder was in reality likely to prove illusory and ineffective.

It is obvious that the States cannot be mere spectators of developments in these fields. Still less can they be confronted with understandings reached in those fields which, however provisional, may conceivably prejudice their point of view or embarrass their position. They have a long history of their own, their administrations are becoming more and more progressive, they have proved to be effective factors in the maintenance of stability in the Indian Empire, they have treaties with the Crown which they have respected and they have a loyal and devoted record as friends and allies of the Crown. In the unsettled present and the possibly more unsettled future, their stake in the country is perhaps the greatest. Their interests must be safe in any settlement that may and take place particularly the manner in which such settlement may affect matters of interest to them, can easily be appreciated. His Excellency has himself assured them in his own address to the Central Legislature that the States are entitled to due consideration and even besides, they are a recognised party to any settlement of the constitutional issue. Before understandings are

reached, therefore, full information should be supplied to the States, in sufficient time, of any discussions that may take place, and the direction which they may take, so far as the above matters are concerned, the time factor being important as the States should obviously be in a position to give the matter due consideration before putting forward their point of view."

Then, there is the draft letter to be addressed to the Viceroy which runs as follows :—

" Your Excellency,

I am writing to Your Excellency as a result of the references made in the British and Indian Press to the possibility of contacts between Your Excellency and the political leaders and between the political leaders themselves, following certain recent developments in India.

The necessity to consult the States with regard to any settlement of the Indian Constitutional problem has throughout been recognised and the Chancellor was informally consulted before final recommendations were made to His Majesty's Government in respect even of the interim arrangements relating to the expansion of the Executive Council and the establishment of the National Defence Council. In case, therefore, there is any reality in the above press references the need arises of the Indian States being consulted before understandings are reached with regard to matters impinging on their rights and interests or matters affecting them, either exclusively or in common with British India. Your Excellency is fully aware of the importance of these matters to the States as also of the emphasis laid by them on their treaty rights. In addition, it is a matter of great consequence to them to know what their position would be *vis-a-vis* British India and how far, as a result of any arrangements that may be entered into even for the interim period, the Crown would be able to discharge its obligations to the States.

As a recognised party to any settlement of the constitutional issue, it will be conceded that the States cannot be mere spectators to developments in that field or left to face a *fait accompli* in respect of agreements reached with the British Indian leaders. Your Excellency has also assured them in your own address to the Central

Legislature that they are entitled to due consideration. I have, therefore, thought it necessary to write to your Excellency and request that, before understandings are reached, full information may kindly be supplied to the States and in sufficient time of such discussions and the direction which they may take, so far as the above matters are concerned. Importance is attached to the time factor as the States should be enabled to give the matter due consideration before putting forward their point of view."

The desire of the States becomes very clear. Whatever the constitutional change introduced in India, the States not only liked to maintain the status quo but if possible, wanted to gain more rights and privileges.

The conditions in India were reduced to such a miserable pass that even if the Britishers were willing to leave India and give freedom to the people, the difficulty was there were three parties, the Hindus and the Mohammedens and the Indian States. If public leaders became dominant at the centre, the Indian States either Hindu or Muslim did not like to be under the control of the Central Indian power vested in Indian hands. The pull for retaining power was the strongest on behalf of Hyderabad.

3. *The reactions of the Hyderabad Government*

The attitude of the Hyderabad State was clearly recorded in the following brief summary :

"The Executive Council agreed unanimously that such discussions would be exploratory and unless any definite proposals emanate from Cripps, H.E.H. cannot give any mandate. But essentials were to be roughly discussed so that Hyderabad's line of thought could be clear.

(1) Hyderabad's case was a case by itself and it cannot be classed with the other bigger States. Good offices of the Crown Representative should be solicited so that problems of special interest can be solved satisfactorily.

(2) Whatever powers the United Kingdom may transfer to India the relations of Hyderabad with the Crown should be direct and they cannot be transferred to any power to be newly set up in India. If the United

Kingdom finds it difficult to bear the responsibilities and commitments made through treaties etc., Hyderabad should be allowed to maintain its status before such treaties.

(3) Matters of all-India concern shall be settled with future Indian Government by fresh treaties and if differences arise issues will be settled by arbitration, the body of arbitrators to be mutually agreed upon.

(4) Paramountcy not provided by treaties shall have to be revised. If provinces are to be autonomous, the States also should not have any interference in internal matters.

(5) Defence should be the concern of the Crown in general agreement but specifically to Hyderabad in lieu of Ceded territories and Berar (1800 to 1853). If these specific guarantees become ineffective and they should naturally be, Hyderabad should be allowed to augment forces and to arm and equip them for internal purposes.

(6) Free use of Masulipatam Port and other rights under Article (3) of the Commercial Agreement of 1802. A Railway Corridor upto the harbour. To own all foreign lines in the State and to develop Hyderabad's industries.

(7) If Federation is yet contemplated, it is sure to injure the separate entity of the State and certain of its sovereign power; so it must be made clear that Hyderabad cannot join any Federal Union.

(8) Hyderabad cannot contribute to any defence expenditure as long as sea customs revenue according to Article (3) of the 1802 Agreement does not come back to her and also Ceded territories and Berars etc

It was further agreed that the conversations would be exploratory in the first stage and contact would be effected immediately afterwards with His Exalted Highness. In order to obtain his mandate, it was necessary to have some idea even at this stage of the essentials required by the State so that, in case the necessity is felt, the Delegates may be able to indicate Hyderabad's line of thought. Council finds it difficult, in the absence of any definite proposals from Sir Stafford Cripps to suggest a scheme as such, but agrees with the Secretary, Constitutional Affairs, that the essentials should be determined at this stage, however, roughly so that whatever the proposals

they may be examined in the light of those essentials. The essentials suggested by Secretary for acceptance of Council and gracious approval of His Exalted Highness are stated below and Council unanimously recommends their acceptance :—

(1) We should keep our case separate, however much we may co-operate with other States to the extent that they fall in line with us ; and Hyderabad's distinct entity should be emphasised even in the procedure for which purpose the Delegates should seek the good offices of His Excellency the Crown Representative to have also a separate talk with the Lord Privy Seal as the State is a class by itself even among the larger States and has, therefore, problems and special interests of its own.

(2) Since Dominion Status will mean the creation of a new entity—the " Crown in India "His Exalted Highness's relations must continue to be with the Crown in the United Kingdom which, whatever powers with respect to British India it may choose to transfer, cannot transfer our relationship with it to any other authority except with His Exalted Highness's consent. If the Crown in the United Kingdom finds itself unable to exercise any of the powers vested in it these powers with regard to them must revert to the State, thus reviving the position obtaining before the treaties were concluded.

(3) With regard to matters of all-India concern. the State should be in a position to setttle them with the future Indian Government by means of treaties except that where even in those matters, we possess the right guaranteed to us by treaties with the Crown in the United Kingdom, those rights shall continue to be so guaranteed. In the event of differences between Indian Government with regard to treaties between it and the State, recourse should be had to arbitration by a body mutually agreed upon.

(4) The aspects of Paramountcy not provided for by treaty must be revised and defined. Dominion Status would lead to the ousting of the powers of the Crown in the United Kingdom over British India and it would be inconceivable that when, in British India, even a Province will be completely autonomous, Hyderabad should still have the intervention of Paramountcy in its intervel affairs. The need for revision and definition in this direction is, therefore, necessary in the light

of treaties, specially bearing in mind the fact that treaties with the Indian Government and the procedure of arbitration will itself tend to eliminate paramountcy functions in so far as they are exercised at present for regulating matters of all-India concern.

(5) As far as Defence is concerned, the Crown in the United Kingdom is under an obligation to defend us under two sets of guarantees, namely, the general guarantee extending to all States and the specific military guarantees given in lieu of Ceded territories and Berar (1800 and 1853). In actual operation, the distinction between the two is immaterial and no special benefit accrues to the State by continuing the specific military guarantees. Bearing the above in mind and also the fact that the possible transference of Defence to the Indian Legislature under Dominion Status will make the specific military guarantees ineffective in view of the State, a position will arise whereby the conditions obtaining would be revised. Whether or not the State will insist on those particular territories actually reverting to the State or may prefer to choose more suitable territory and also claim other compensations in the economic and political field is a matter for the State so long as the principle is accepted. Simultaneously, the State should also secure the right to augment its own forces and to arm and equip them for its own internal purposes, specially as the restrictions now imposed are not according to any treaty and have, side by side with our commitments to the Crown, led to a weakening of our position with regard to internal security in such times as these when external aggression happens to coincide with the possibility of internal trouble.

(6) We must exercise our rights with respect to the free use of the seaport of Masulipatam and must also insist on interpretation by an independent judicial tribunal of our rights under Article 3 of the Commercial Treaty of 1802, as it confers certain exemptions on the State which are of great value. The essence of economic freedom is an outlet to the sea which cannot be secured even with the free use of the seaport of Masulipatam and for which we must endeavour to obtain a railway corridor connecting the State with the seaport. Similarly we must be allowed to purchase the foreign Railway lines in the State as they not only take away their earnings

derived in the State but control our communications and trade and compete with our own Railway system. The vesting of their ownership in British India gives it the power of economic strangulation which it must not retain. Industrially too we must be in a position to develop our industries so as to become self-supporting.

(7) As it is possible that Federation may still be in the mind of the British Government and as, whatever, the reservations and no matter how limited the scope of Federation, entry in any Federal Union is bound to injure the separate entity of the State and also to detract from certain of its sovereign powers, it should be made clear that the State cannot contemplate joining any Federal Union.

(8) If, in view of the cost of defence, and defence of India involving also the defence of the State, any scheme is proposed of regular contribution by the State to that expenditure it should be made clear that the State already contributes (*a*) by way of its share of sea customs revenue, (*b*) by way of ceded territories and Berar, (*c*) by assistance for outside purposes through the State's armed forces, and (*d*) by assistance in the matter of guarding strategic Railway lines. *Ad hoc* assistance is afforded in other different ways too, by contributions of money and other war effort. So long as our share of the sea customs revenue of India, on the basis of Article 8 of the Treaty of 1802, and the ceded territories (or other quid pro quo) do not revert to us there can be no question of any contribution from us towards Defence which in any case, has been guranteed to us."

The Nawab of Chattari was the President of the Executive Council and he conducted the diplomatic negotiations on behalf of the State Government of Hyderabad. The following correspondence would prove to be of interest in this connection.

The Nawab of Chattari, the President of the Executive Council of H.E.H. the Nizam's Government, addressed a letter dated 21st March, 1942 to the Residency of Hyderabad a day before the arrival of Sir Stafford Cripps in India. Excerpt from the letter is reproduced below :—

" In connection with the visit of Sir Stafford Cripps it has been reported that the Chamber of Princes intends appointing a committee to place the case of the States

before him. As, in the event of such a Committee being formed, there might be some misunderstanding as to the extent to which the views of His Exalted Highness's Government may be represented by it, I am desired to write and request you kindly to make it clear to the Political Adviser to His Excellency the Crown Representative that, although Hyderabad shall have no objection to participation in such a committee so far as it may be capable of speaking for the States as a whole and is also found in general matters to share such views as may be arrived at by His Exalted Highness's Government, the special interests and views of Hyderabad shall not be represented by any such body except by the representative or representatives of the State whom His Exalted Highness may be pleased to appoint for the purpose."

Again on 3rd April, 1942, when the Nawab of Chattari had gone to New Delhi and had interviewed Sir Stafford Cripps, he addressed the following letter regarding their conversation :—

"With reference to the talk which the Hyderabad Delegation had with you on the 28th March, 1942, I am writing to say that His Exalted Highness has since examined the proposals of His Majesty's Government relating to the future Indian Constitution, and in the light of the elucidation offered by you to the Delegation, desires to express his satisfaction at the assurance that it is not intended to transfer his treaty or other relations with the Crown in the United Kingdom to any other authority without His Exalted Highness's consent or affect in any way his status as a Sovereign or his position as Faithful Ally. Since as you explained, the proposals are intended to leave His Exalted Highness free to adhere or not adhere to any of the Unions that may be set up, or in the event of not adhering to maintain or cease to maintain the relations at present subsisting with the Crown in the United Kingdom, His Exalted Highness, as at present advised, considers the proposal to be very fair. Further, while His Exalted Highness's consent is implicit in any negotiation for such revision of treaty-arrangements as may be required in "the new situation", it may be made clear that, to the extent that His Exalted Highness may wish to retain a particular treaty right, such right will be provided for and arrangement made, in case of dispute or difference arising from

it, for recourse to arbitration by a body mutually agreed upon. Moreover, as Berar, the Northern Circars and the Ceded Districts are linked with the question of defence of His Exalted Highness and his Dominions, His Exalted Highness will have the right to reopen the question of the future of those territories in the light of the new situation."

Upon this, Sir Stafford Cripps sent a reply to the Nawab Saheb. The reply dated 5th April, 1942 is reproduced below:

"I have received your letter of the 3rd April, in which you are kind enough to convey to me the views of His Exalted Highness in regard to the proposals which I have been discussing with the leaders of Indian opinion. I fear, however, that there are some points on which there appears to have been some misunderstanding at our interview. It is the case that His Exalted Highness will be free to decide whether Hyderabad should adhere or not adhere to any Indian Union which might be set up under these proposals if they are given effect. If, however, His Exalted Highness decided that Hyderabad should not adhere, to the relations at present subsisting between the Crown and His Exalted Highness he would not be free, as suggested in your letter, to cease to maintain them. Any revision of the existing treaty arrangements which might be required as a result of the creation of a new Indian Union would be by negotiation between the Paramount Power and His Exalted Highness as clearly it might involve modification of particular treaty rights in the light of the new situation. The question whether any particular point which might be difficult to resolve by negotiation should be submitted to arbitration would be for the Paramount Power to decide and I can give no assurances at this stage in regard to it.

As regards Berar, the Northern Circars and the Ceded Districts, I note the views of His Exalted Highness."

On the 16th June, 1942, the Nawab of Chattari expressed the desire of his Government in a short letter addressed to the Resident, Sir Claude Gidney. This is what he wrote:—

"His Exalted Highness has already sent you copies of my letter to Sir Stafford Cripps and of

his reply dated the 5th April. His Exalted Highness's Government would like it to be on record that they would have replied to the points dealt with by Sir Stafford Cripps in this letter, had it not been for the fact that the proposals themselves have since been withdrawn by His Majesty's Government.

Further, on the 15th August, 1942, the Nizam's Government addressed the Resident in the following terms :—

"The attention of His Exalted Highness's Government has been drawn to a report in *the Times of India* dated 30th April, 1942 of a speech delivered the previous day in the House of Commons by Sir Stafford Cripps, the Lord Privy Seal. Sir Stafford is reported to have said :—

" Unfortunately in my view representative institutions have not yet developed in a great majority of the Indian States. I am certain this House would wish the British Administration in India to do all it can to encourage and expedite the development of suitable representative institutions in all Indian States" and the London correspondent of the newspaper mentioned that Sir Stafford was particularly forceful when he made this statement.

That it conflicts with previous authoritative declarations is apparent from the following quotation from His Excellency the Viceroy's speech in the session of the Chamber of Princes held in 1939.

" Your Highness will have seen the declarations recently made in Parliament on behalf of His Majesty's Government, declarations which I have myself repeated in public utterances, in regard to constitutional changes or developments in the Indian States. Those statements will have made clear the attitude in this matter of His Majesty's Government, which is, I repeat, that the decision as to the constitution best suited to the needs of his people and his State rests with the Ruler himself to take, and that no pressure will be brought to bear on him in this respect by the Paramount Power. Nor will any obstruction be placed in his way by the Paramount Power should he wish to give effect to constitutional advances consistently with his Treaty obligations.

Similarly, in the statement of constitutional and administrative reforms introduced in the State as issued by the Political Department, it is stated :—

"In regard to Constitutional developments, the policy of the Paramount Power has been clearly laid down and repeated in recent declarations in Parliament. It is for the Ruler himself to decide what form of Constitution is best suited to the needs of his subjects, and the Crown Representative and his officers refrain from offering advice in this respect unless they are invited to do so. Several Indian States already possess highly developed Constitutions and the general tendency is to advance in a genuine attempt to associate the subjects of the State with the Administration."

There is an obvious conflict between these previous declarations of His Majesty's Government and the statement recently made by the Lord Privy Seal, and His Exalted Highness's Government on its part is certain, having regard to these declarations, that Sir Stafford's above statement was meant to be an expression of his own personal views. If so, His Exalted Highness's Government would invite the attention of His Excellency the Crown Representative to the need for reiteration of the policy of His Majesty's Government in the matter, as it would remove any possible misunderstanding that may have arisen. Besides, as you are aware, His Exalted Highness's Government is committed to a certain scheme of Constitutional Reforms, a part of which has already been inaugurated. It has, even otherwise, at different stages, endeavoured to increase the associations of its people with the Government, the latest instance being the formation of the Hyderabad Defence Council on which are represented, in a numerical majority, the leading spokesmen of the different political parties in the State and leading citizens. It is the object of His Exalted Highness's Government to bring the two major communities still more closely together and to give effect to the remaining parts of its scheme of reforms, but a statement such as that made by the Lord Privy Seal may conceivably be misinterpreted by certain interested sections who may be encouraged thereby to make extreme demands which may provoke both political and communal controversies and retard instead of accelerating the pace of reforms.

His Exalted Highness's Government will be obliged if you will kindly communicate its views to His Excellency the Crown Representative for favour of transmission to His Majesty's Government."

On the 20th December, 1942, the President of the Executive Council of the Nizam's Government expressed the anxiety of his own Government to Sir Arthur Lothian, Resident at Hyderabad, in the following way:—

"His Exalted Highness's Government views with some concern the recent developments in the political situation in India and their possible bearings on the constitutional proposals of the future. It fully appreciates that the requirements of the war and of the internal situation demand the undivided attention of His Excellency the Crown Representative, but as His Majesty's Government has recently reaffirmed the broad intentions of the last constitutional offer and a movement has since been launched by the major political party in British India which aims at striking at the root of the British connection, His Exalted Highness's Government consider it necessary, even at this stage, to invite His Excellency's attention to certain points of principles which vitally affect Hyderabad.

The broad intentions of the proposals of March, 1942, include the possible establishment of more than one Union enjoying status of a variety implying "free association" with, and even the right of secession from the British Commonwealth. While His Exalted Highness's Government welcomes the recognition, implicit in the proposals, of the right of any Province to determine whether it will join the Indian Union or form a separate Union, and would welcome similar option being given to the Indian States, it is a matter of anxious concern to Hyderabad that it is likely to have, contiguous to its territories, a Union dominated, even more than the last Congress Ministries of the three neighbouring Provinces, by a party hostile towards Hyderabad as well as the British Government. Hostility towards the latter in fact makes it probable that, within a measurable distance of time, such a Union may even secede from the Commonwealth. Moreover, Dominion Status must imply a greater degree of adherence than what was contemplated in 1935, and the organic union of the State with any such Union of British India must lead either to constitutional restrictions on the power of the

Union or the abandonment by the State much of its sovereignty and many of its cherished rights and privileges. Any endeavour to escape the implications of the latter must inevitably result in limitations and safeguards which, if they are to be effective, will curtail the free exercise of Dominion powers by the Union Government and thus cause dissatisfaction to British India as the major partner in it. Hyderabad does not wish to stand in the way of the legitimate aspirations of British India and feels that, as things now are, the most appropriate and the safest course for it would be to preserve its separate identity, organically unconnected in any Union with British India and in the enjoyment of direct treaty relations with the Crown in the United Kingdom with such modifications of existing treaties as may be mutually agreed upon.

The State recognises that subject to its consent, arrangements, more particularly in the economic sphere, will be required, in the light of the new conditions involving revision of existing treaties and the conclusion even of fresh agreements. While, His Exalted Highness's Government is confident that, in the changed conditions of the future, the settlement of disputes or differences arising from treaties and agreements must and will be by conciliation or arbitration where such methods were advocated even in the past, by the framers of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report and by the Butler Committee, it considers that a precise ascertainment of disputed rights by impartial enquiry, such as was urged by the State for the interpretation of its Commercial Treaty of 1802, must naturally precede and will, indeed, become necessary for the purpose of revision itself. Moreover, with Dominion Status in the picture, the stage has been reached for the position to be readjusted. In a future which admits the possibility not only of an all-India centre but even of the secession of any of the Unions from the Commonwealth, the existing extra-territorial arrangements for such matters requiring co-ordination as Railways, Posts and Telegraphs, will become all the more anomalous and should be regulated by agreements as between different administrative entities.

His Exalted Highness's Government desires particularly to invite attention to the Treaties of 1766, 1768,1800 and 1853, read in the light of the Supplemental Treaty of 1860 and the Agreements of 1902 and 1936. It is not

intended to go into the details of these Treaties by which certain territories were ceded or assigned in lieu of specific military guarantees, but two basic facts must be stated, namely, that these cessions and assignments were for military assistance and that they were made to the British Government. The privilege of enjoying the cession or assignment goes, therefore, hand in hand with responsibility of fulfilling the obligations effectively, and His Exalted Highness cannot acquiesce either in the separation of the privilege from the responsibility or in their transfer to any other Government. This position applies equally to all the territories ceded or assigned by the State, and any idea of their inclusion in the territories of any Dominion on the basis of the continuance of the military guarantees by the Crown in the United Kingdom will be repugnant to the spirit of the Treaties and be unacceptable to His Exalted Highness. Such an argument arrived at, by no matter what formula, would present the anomaly of the Dominion concerned acquiring possession of the cessions and assignments while not being responsible for the defence of the State, and, even if the Dominion were willing and able to provide such defence, the choice of a defensive alliance must rest with the State. The position of the territories, if absorbed into the Dominion, would become all the more untenable should it decide to secede from the Commonwealth, in which even the territories in question would be lost both to the British Government and to the State. Separation at that stage would not be constitutionally or politically feasible, and it would indeed be an irony of history if treaties, concluded once with a mutual desire to "improve" relationship and a sense of security, were, in the course of political change, to ensure, on the one hand, to the weakening of the State's position and the loss of its possessions, and on the other to the strengthening of forces not responsible for securing to the State its treaty guarantees and in many respects hostile both to the British Government and to the State.

In his letter to His Excellency the Viceroy dated 1st August, 1931, His Exalted Highness drew attention to the significance of the part played by Hyderabad in the maintenance of stability in the Indian Empire and in the evolution of the British connection with India. Much has happened since then, and much is likely to happen in future, to test even further the strength and mutual

value of the alliance which has so far stood the strain of almost two centuries of chance. The State does not desire to recount here its past or present services as it bases its case more upon the inherent justice and reasonableness of its claims which leads it to believe that the position or status in the future dispensation will become in no way inferior to the Union or Unions of India. With its alliance strengthened, its territories saved in a manner to be negotiated, its economic life assured against the possibility of strangulation by the State securing thus an access to the sea, it looks forward to the role it may be enabled to fulfil in the future of promoting still further the interests of stability and of providing, in the heart of the Indian peninsula and in the midst of the growing change both the nexus of its own " perpetual friendship " for the continuance of a historic connection and a position of even greater security and honour for the Faithful Ally."

Upon this, the Resident Sir Arthur Lothian replied to the Nawab of Chattari on the 23rd January, 1943 in the manner given below :—

" With reference to your letter No. 1763, dated the 15th August, 1942, I am desired to state H.E.H. the Nizam's Government are doubtless aware of the view to which the Crown Representative has already given public expression (and which is fully endorsed by His Majesty's Government not so much in their own interest as in that of the Princes themselves) that effective machinery be established in all States whereby the legitimate wants and grievances of their subjects can be brought to notice. I am, however, to make it clear that it is for the Rulers themselves to devise what precise form of machinery is best suited to achieve that object and that there is nothing in Sir Stafford Cripps speech to indicate a change of policy in regard to abstention from the imposition upon States of constitutional reforms."

The Cripps mission failed and events in India and in Hyderabad moved with bewildering rapidity and ended in the Quit India Movement of 1942.

CHAPTER XIX

QUIT INDIA MOVEMENT IN HYDERABAD, 1942

The Quit India Movement of the Indian National Congress under Gandhiji's guidance placed Hyderabad in a very embarrassing position. The State Congress was officially banned and yet had carried on vigorous activities in the State. The glamour and fascination of the Quit India agitation were such that Hyderabad could not escape its influence. There were several reports from all over the districts which indicate how the movement had fired the imagination of the people.

Amir Ali Khan, Collector from Osmanabad District, wrote on 18th September, 1942 to the President of the Executive Council that two boys from the Latur High School offered Satyagraha. Both were Brahmins. The Headmaster of the High School Shri Iyer did not behave like a loyal Government servant but gave evasive replies to the District authorities. The Taluqdar stated that the Headmaster was politically-minded and disseminated Congress ideology among the students and therefore he should be transferred immediately. The Taluqdar further proposed that putting those two boys in jail would not proveadeterrent. They would only enjoy holidays. Parents should also be not fined because that would mean no punishment to the boys. The Taluqdar therefore suggested that such boys should be caned to strike terror in their hearts. It would look bad but prove effective.

Mohammad Vali Hasan, Collector, Parbhani, wrote on 26th September, 1942 that Rama Rao, Nana and Vinayak offered Satyagraha at Parbhani. Again, the Taluqdar from Osmanabad informed on the 30th of September, 1942 that Babu Rao and Hiralal offered Satyagraha and they were arrested. The Satyagrahis declared: "Brethren, no stone should be left unturned in securing independence for India. Unless we strike, British Government will never leave its hold."

Shahabuddin, the Collector of Aurangabad, reported that on the 1st of October, 1942, the students of

the Maharatha hostel were calm. But there was likelihood some may offer Satyagraha next day, the Gandhijayant day. Phatak, Waghamare, Ratilal and Vaishampayan were in jail. Mr. Deshpande and. Choudhary had gone to see the Satyagrahi prisoners. Some questions were put to the prisoners. Their replies were that they did not like mass Satyagraha during war. They also did not approve the Fascist enemies of India.

On 2nd October, 1942 Rahamat Yar Jung, Commissioner of Police, reported that Hindi and Urdu posters carrying Quit India slogans were pasted in Sultan Bazar, Gowliguda and Akbar Jah Bazar. Two Congress flags were suspended from a tree in the Residency Compound. They were removed by the Police later.

On Victoria Ground, a meeting was announced against the ban. But Padmaja Naidu was arrested and therefore the meeting could not be properly held. I in the evening Mr. and Mrs. T. Ramaswamy, Mrs. Heda and Mrs. Melkote went tc the Victoria Ground. Mrs. Gyanakumari H da made a speech. Ramaswamy and his wife held the Congress flags. They were all arrested. Abul Hasan Syed Ali and Akbar Ali Khan brought a letter from Padmaja Naidu and had dissuaded Ramakrishna Rao from presiding over the meeting. Satyagraha was offered by Munnalal, Shriram, Jhoomarlal Gandhi and Amulchander and they were arrested.

On 4th October, 1942, Shahabuddin, Collector of Aurangabad, reported that Vishwanath Govind, Brahmin, was putting a poster at Paithan. He was arrested. Seth Sendhi helped Government by giving anti-Congress information to Government. Vishwanath was sentenced to six months rigorous imprisonment. He did not disclose the name but he said he got the poster from Aurangabad. Govinddas Shroff and Abiduddin were transferred from Aurangabad Jail. People could be persuaded to give apology but men like Govinddas Shroff were hard nuts to crack. Seth Sendhi *alias* Sakharam Rao was given Rs. 20 a. reward for giving anti-Congress news. Such methods were also tried in other parts.

On 5th October, 1942 the Commissioner of Police, Hyderabad, reported that Hakikath Roy and Hanumantha Rao offered Satyagraha. They shouted slogans "Gandhika Charka Chalana Padega"—"Goronko London

Jana Padega". The Satyagrahis were from Chitgopa they were under the influence of the Arya Samaj.

The British Resident had asked Government to give publicity to meetings which condemned violence and lawbreaking through the Deccan Radio.

Abdul Hameed Khan, the Collector of Nanded, wrote on 3rd October, 1942 that 1. Chintamani Sadhu Maharaj, 2. Manohar Gurudev, 3. Balraj Bhagwan 4. Sitaramakrishna Rao Pappu, 5. Devidas, 6. Damodar, 7. Kishan Sadashiv had offered Satyagraha at Nanded.

Vali Hasan, Collector of Parbhani, reported on 4th October, 1942, that Rambhau of Mominabad and Nagaiah of Jalna had offered Satyagraha.

Rahamat Yar Jung, Commissioner of Police, wrote on 16th October, 1942 that Manikappa and Chandrappa offered Satyagraha in Sultan Bazar shouting slogans, distributing leaflets and both were arrested.

Hameed Ali Khan, Collector of Nanded, reported on 19th October, that in his district at Umri, Mallikarjun, son of Jayaram and at Ardhapur and the Dharmapur Maharaj coming from Pandharpur with a large procession in a palkhi offered Satyagraha. In the same district, it was reported, Abdul Hameed and Abdul Razak Dindar preachers collected Rs. 25 for a Conference at Hyderabad.

Elections of the Arya Samaj took place at Umri. At Nanded, there was an Akhada (gymnasium) at which a few girls and boys aged 6 to 9 were drilled by Madhava Rao Bhokar. They had lathis and flags with the Shivaji emblem. Shahabuddin Khan, Collector of Aurangabad, reported on October 19, 1942 as follows :—

"Two boys at Phulambri had prabhat pheri and shouting violent slogans were carrying on propaganda. They were arrested but it seems they were misled and so gave apologies and were released with a warning".

"The Dasara passed away peacefully. The Subedar Saheb of Aurangabad had gone to grace a function at the Anatha Vidayarthi Griha"

In the Hindi daily newspaper "*Vishwamitra*" dated the 6th October, 1942, an elaborate report of the

activities of the Satyagrahis was published. But the names did not agree with those in the official reports.

On the 6th of October, 1942, the Commissioner of Police, Hyderabad, wrote that a Hindi fortnightly bulletin was being published by Congress called *Azad Hind*. Two specimens of the 9th and 24th were submitted. One of the numbers contained a very well worded and inspiring Hindi poem which conveys the following ideas :—

"Congress has become a matter of pride and glory in India. Enemies of India seeing its vigilance and sacrificing spirit are stricken with panic. Mahatmaji is the soul of the Congress and he who is touched by his message is converted into a nationalist. Gandhiji is the friend of all and silently acknowledged as leader by everybody. It is a matter of shame that one who is adored by 40 crores of Indians is put in jail and people are silent over it."

The Congress Bulletin says that on the 2nd of October, 1942, Padmaja Naidu was arrested in the morning. Two Congress flags were put on the Residency Building and Sarojini Naidu also was arrested on the same day. It further reports how women offered Satyagraha on Gandhiji's birthday at the Victory Ground. They put the men to shame. Women were arrested with dignity and taken in cars. Four boys came with Gandhiji's picture and they too were arrested. On 8th October, 1942 B. Ramakrishna Rao and Ramachari were arrested. On 9th Gangadhar Krishna Khannya was arrested in Satyagraha Chowk. On the same day arrests took place all over the State at Aurangabad, Parbhani, Nanded, Gulbarga, Selu, Raichur, Kushtagi, Manvi and Warangal. At Kushtagi, the Collector addressed people to keep themselves away from Gandhian advice. Many people had assembled but their behaviour from the next day disclosed they did obey the Collector. The Collector of Nanded reported on 3rd November, 1942 that Hanumanta Rao Dhed of Hadgaon expressed his loyalty to the Nizam before 150 persons and exhorted people to be careful about the Arya Samajists who misled them. Ganpat Rao Waghamare addressed the students in a Harijan Hostel where he said the first of Azur, the Muslim New Year Day, was a more auspicious day than Ugadi and Dasara.

At Bichikonda, one Prasanna Kumar, Arya Samajist, addressed a meeting and advised people to wear home-spun cloth, not to marry early, and further said high caste was not polluted by the touch of low caste.

The policy of the Government of India, immediately after the declaration of the Quit India Movement, was to see that greater publicity was not given to the activities of the Satyagrahis. Special instructions were given with an idea that people should not carry an impression that the movement had become more and more powerful and was gaining in intensity and volume. But this policy had to be changed. When the activities of the Satyagrahis intensified, they brought about a change in their policy. They desired to give as much publicity to violent activities as possible, so that the public at large may begin to detest the Satyagrahis. One of the Government of India circular letters said in parts: "Hitherto, it has been necessary, mainly for military reasons, but partly also to prevent "putting ideas into other people's heads" to deny publicity to many of the more serious aspects of the disturbances. It is generally known that Government have taken and used most drastic powers but the manifestations of violence against which those powers have had to be exercised have been largely concealed with the result that public, both in India and abroad, are in a danger of forming an entirely wrong impression both of the seriousness of the situation itself and of the measures taken to restore order. The majority of provincial Governments themselves are probably unaware of the gravity of the disturbances in Bihar and parts of the United Provinces or of the extent of the damage done which must run into a great many lakhs of rupees. Further there is the fact that the forthcoming meeting of the Central Legislature will afford an opportunity for much criticism and atrocity-mongering under the privilege of the House and even though steps will be taken to prevent its repetition in the Press an impression may well be caused which the Government spokesmen may find it difficult to dispel within the time at their disposal unless a further picture of events has previously made its way into the Press.

For all these reasons some change of policy is necessary in the direction of gradually giving greater publicity to what has occurred. The necessity for suppressing

news that would be of value or comfort to the enemy remains; and even if the "imitation" danger has receded, that there is still danger of provoking competition must be accepted; but both it and the military danger can be minimised, while securing the main object of "lifting the veil" to a certain extent, if certain principles are followed.

In the first place, it may often, if not indeed invariably, be desirable to postpone publication of news of serious events until the position has been restored in the area in which they occurred. It will be necessary to suppress permanently news of grave damage to military installations or factories engaged on important war industries or of strikes in such factories. It will always be necessary also to avoid announcements showing that important communications are interrupted and any details which would enable an enemy to identify the location and extent of damage. But there is not the same objection to giving some account of the events which caused such interruptions when at the same time it can be stated that the damage has been repaired. Similarly, the threat to industry or public utility companies due to the cutting off of coal or oil supplies, or the hardship to the people resulting from difficulties in the transport of essential commodities, may be mentioned in general terms after the threat or the hardship has been removed.

In the second place, it may often be desirable to describe what has occurred by reference to localities or areas without actually giving place names and it may sometimes be possible to give the news a limited publication and not broadcast it all over India. As regards the latter, however, it should be understood that details of news from newspapers reach the Axis *via* Afghanistan very rapidly.

Lastly, there may be particular aspects of what has occurred which can better be put over in the form of special articles or "stories" than as news releases, for example, a list of murders of Government officials in the form of a bare chronicle of the facts; or some instances of wanton destruction of valuable or useful property such as hospitals, churches or public utility installations; or an account of a particularly heroic defence of a police station; or cases of co-operation by

the public in helping to quell disorder ; or statistics of the value of property destroyed.

Of the three points mentioned above, the first two are for the consideration of Provincial Governments in drafting and issuing their communiques and also in varying the pre-censorship of non-official news contemplated."

Closely following the Quit India Movement, the following gentlemen had issued an appeal:—

1. Kashinath Rao Vaidya, 2. Thirmijee 3. Vinayak Rao Vidyalankar, 4. M. Narsing Rao, 5. Ganpathlal. 6. Antha Rama Rao, 7. M. Ramachandra Rao, 8. Harilal Waghray, 9. Fathaulla Khan, 10. M. R. Patny, 11. B. Ramakrishna Rao, 12. Ravi Narayana Reddy, 13. Syed Alam, President Comrades Association, 14. Janardana Rao Desai, 15. L. Ganeriwal. 16. Sridhar Naik, 17. Anna Rao Ganamukhi, 18. Hanumantha Rao Kakkeri, 19. Aswatha Rao, 20. Digambar Rao Bindu and 21. G. Ramachar.

The gist of the appeal was as follows:—

"Churchill, in a statement dated 10th September, 1942, said "the Indian Congress cannot speak for all India. The Congress may want independence but others do not. The people in the State certainly dislike independence". But Churchill should remember that the States Peoples' Conferences have proved this to be a lie. Hyderabad is independent. We celebrate the independence day annually. Even the Hyderabad cabinet should consist of elected Ministers from all groups. The Constitution can be changed after the great world war. According to treaties Hyderabad is free. Even the paramount power so called, cannot interfere with its internal administration".

The Nizam was deeply interested in the declaration issued by 21 local leaders after the statement of Mr. Churchill on 10th September, 1942. He instructed the Council on 24th September, 1942 to bestow careful thought on this matter, as published in the *Rahbar-e-Dakan*, of which a cutting was enclosed, when there would be a full sitting of the Executive Council. The memorandum submitted by the Constitutional Affairs

Secretariat with apologies for the delay and for not having placed it for consideration in the Executive Council, this being a very important matter and permitted to be discussed only by the Constitutional Affairs Committee read as follows :—

"The real motive underlying the issue of the statement by the Hyderabad leaders was on the one hand to demonstrate that the so-called opposition of the Muslim leaders to paramountcy was merely verbal and that where there was a question of taking practical steps it was only the Hindu leaders who had the initiative. On the other hand, it was intended to impart local colour to the Congress. 'Quit India' agitation started in British India so that public opinion in the State might also be won over for the movement and Hyderabad in general, irrespective of caste and creed, might get involved in it. It is necessary to submit here that this statement was issued at a stage when the Hindu leaders in question had despaired of Muslim co-operation upon the conclusion of their mutual talks. The Hindu leaders, therefore, wanted to win over the Muslim youth by endeavouring to drive in a wedge between them and the Muslim leaders and to demonstrate that even in the matter of paramountcy they were prepared to go further than the Muslim leaders. Besides, when the local Congressites saw that the 'Quit India' agitation is started in British India, attempts were made to spread the movement in Hyderabad. The local public felt that the movement had no basis in the State as it was not part of British India and consequently the question of the British quitting Hyderabad did not arise at all. It was only to ensure the success of the movement locally that the slogan of paramountcy was adopted so that by thus giving the movement a local colour the agitation could gather public feeling which would thus hearken to a 'local cry'. In reality it was intended to become a part of the British Indian agitation and by way of aid to it. The Hindu leaders anticipated that this slogan would particularly influence the Muslims and would lead to the setting up of a common front against the British Government and in support of the Congress. With this end in view the "Hyderabad spirit" was played upon but the motive underlying the move could not remain concealed. The statement made by a group which was responsible for the letter written to me by Dr. Melkote (dealing as it

did among other matters with Responsible Government and the demand for an independent centre for India to which this State should be subordinate pleading its loyalty to it) helped in unmasking and revealing the real motive.

It is obvious that utterances which are insincere and are merely based on political tactics can have no lasting influence. This statement of the Hindu leaders proved abortive, for Muslims particularly remained unaffected. Muslim leaders in their speeches made it explicit that the independence demanded in the statement meant in reality subordination to the Congress. The Muslims were correct in their assertion. The kind of independence envisaged by H.E.H. and H.E.H.'s Government differs considerably from and is in fact even contrary to the conception of freedom which these Congressmen have in their minds. They want Responsible Government and in common with the surrounding provinces desire to be subordinate to a centre controlled by men belonging to their own school of thought. Their aim is rather to barter away the real freedom of the State to the majority in India and Hyderabad on the establishment of a kind of freedom which may or may not mean independence of the majority in the Dominions but will certainly not mean the Independence of the State.

Events which have happened in British India since the publication of the statement also strengthen this opinion of the Constitutional Affairs Committee. But irrespective of all these considerations the proper course for Government is on the one hand to endeavour and widen the gates of justice so that with the co-operation of the public the country's internal unity and integrity may be strengthened and on the other hand while thus increasing its power to pursue consistently with its traditional ties and alliances, its legitimate demands so that the status of the ruler and the position of the State may be further elevated and the State strengthened and safeguarded against all the trials and tribulations to come. I am also in agreement with this opinion.

But in spite of all efforts of the Government, the 'Quit India Movement' in Hyderabad continued to gather momentum.

CHAPTER XX

PROPAGANDA BY PROFESSOR RUSHBROOK WILLIAMS

Professor Rushbrook Williams was a well-known figure, particularly interested in the problem of Indian princes. He had written very useful and informative books, like *Handling of Original Sources for Writing History* etc. He was always picked up by intelligent diplomats for enlisting his talents for propaganda purposes.

The Hyderabad Government also conceived the idea of enlisting the services of Prof. Rushbrook Williams in order to counteract the propaganda in the country against the suppression of civil liberties in Hyderabad. They had, therefore, engaged his services and had given him an honorarium of £200 annually.

It was satisfied because Prof. Rushbrook Williams, who was an employee of the B.B.C., could not associate himself with certain newspapers. However, the inspiration for them emanated from Prof. Rushbrook Williams. It was also a fact that on several occasions he had given publicity to Hyderabad even from the B.B.C. Prof. Rushbrook Williams wrote several articles in different papers, through which he could carry on a subtle and intelligent propaganda against the introduction of Responsible Government and democracy in the State of Hyderabad.

As an example of the insidious and subtle propaganda carried on against the agitation of the people for Responsible Government, by engaging the services of competent journalists, who were prepared to associate themselves with such moves, the following two articles from the pen of Prof. Rushbrook Williams are given below :–

"ARE THE INDIAN STATES PATRIOTIC ?

It is sometimes said that the Indian States are obstacles to the fulfilment of Indian nationalism inasmuch as they are allied to the foreign bureaucracy. They are accused of being hostile to the Nationalist Movement, of favouring reactionary ideas and of failing to move with the times.

But it is significant that such charges as these are made in general by two classes of people; and those

who have grievances, whether well or ill founded, against particular princes. The most respected leader of the Indian Nationalist Movement, Mahatma Gandhiji, has never countenanced attacks upon the States, and has gone so far as to say that a well-governed State is the nearest approach to "Ram Raj", that the world can show to-day. And if the question of the patriotism of the State is carefully examined, it will be realised by every impartial observer that their contribution to the cause of Indian Nationalism, if less vocal than that of British India, is at least as substantial, and perhaps conceived on better lines.

This indeed is what might have been expected. The Indian States are self-governing, which British India has not been, and will not be until the governance of the provinces is as autonomous as that of the States. In consequence, the political ideas of the States have always been Indian, rather than foreign in their inspiration. They have not slavishly copied Western institutions just because they are Western; but have insisted upon the maintenance of the traditional conceptions which are truly national. Where they have opposed the aims of British Indian nationalism, they have done so because they have feared that it was on the wrong lines; that it was animated by a servile imitation of Western ideas and Western institutions, and was thus doing a serious disservice to the country as a whole. For the States have felt themselves, and who can deny their claim, as the custodians of truly Indian traditions in politics and in culture, as the homes of the ancient learning of our country and as the refuge of Indian autonomy in thought and in institutions. If the history of the Indian nationalist movement is carefully examined, it will be found that the Indian States lost sympathy with Congress when the British Indian leaders became obsessed with the idea that the only salvation of India lay in a highly centralised form of parliamentary government, based upon manhood suffrage and dependent upon foreign imported institutions. The Indian States which had enjoyed for centuries the experience of ruling according to Indian ideas, knew well that the genius of the nation did not lie along such lines as these. The national culture of which we are so proud, and which includes so many diverse elements, has grown up under a decentralised system, which permits each unit of the larger whole to make its characteristic

contribution to the common experience and to the common good. Our culture, and apart from our culture, where is our nationhood It could not be preserved, far less could it be enlarged and enriched, by any sedulous imitation of Western institutions put forward for building up Indian self-government on foreign and artificial lines; and this is the real reason why the people of the Indian States are sometimes accused of lacking patriotism.

But as a result of the developments of the last five years British Indian opinion has moved nearer to our point of view. Instructed quarters now realise that the fruition and fulfilment of the Indian genius are largely dependent upon a form of policy which does not run contrary to Indian political ideas. Concerning the details of the new Constitution, there is much that can be said by way of severe criticism; but inasmuch as it seeks to realise the principles of local autonomy which run right through Indian history, and for which the States have always contended, it is at least a step in the right direction."

"REPRESENTATIVE SYSTEM : INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE

The association of the governing classes with the governed is everywhere recognised as a desirable feature of modern administrative system; but it is less generally realised that there are more ways than one of achieving this end. In fact, representative systems broadly fall into two classifications, according as they are based upon the individual or upon the group.

Of the two, the group system is older, and has worked for longer periods with success. The fact that in certain countries it fell into disfavour in the course of the nineteenth century must not be taken to imply that its utility is outworn. For, if careful examination is made of the circumstances in which the plan of individual voting for a parliamentary type of Government made its appearance, it will be found that these circumstances were preceded by a weakening, through powerful economic or political factors, of the fundamental structure of society. Where the individual is cast adrift, as it were, from group and communal integration, the principle of individual voting based upon territorial constituencies necessarily makes its appearance. But it is to be noticed that in the handful of countries where this system has yielded satisfactory

result which are mainly countries governed by the Anglo-Saxon tradition the strength of the local ties and the tradition of voluntary State service has gone far to effect the apparent isolation of the individual citizen as postulated by the system itself. Moreover, the functioning of representative institutions based upon the vote of the individual citizen has given rise to an increasing body of criticism even in those countries where it seems most firmly established. Bound up as it is with the conception the will of the majority of individuals, who have equally nothing in common, it leaves important special interests unrepresented altogether; and what is worse, it weakens instead of strengthening, the ties of common interest which do in point of fact regulate the relations of man to man, in every day civilised life. Further, the voice of the individual is a weak voice except where it pronounces upon matters of which he knows something. Even if this voice is multiplied by a million the views which it expresses may still be unworthy of serious consideration. As a wise French writer said: "Folly repeated by thirty seven million people does not cease to be folly." Such defects as those here indicated are much more serious under modern conditions, when it is important for administrations to receive sound guidance as to the real feelings and sentiments of the peoples whom they govern, than was the case at the time when the world was less closely knit, and when mistakes in policy due to misinterpretation of national feeling were less disastrous and more readily rectified.

No doubt, it is for these reasons that many modern constitutions have turned their faces away from parliamentary systems with accompaniments of the individual voter and of the territorial constituency and have based themselves upon the common interest group. Provided these groups are sufficiently comprehensive in their range, they are more truly representative of organised opinion among the governed than any parliamentary body composed of individual citizens. For internally, the groups are to a large extent autonomous, and being composed of persons brought into intimate association with one another by community of interests, are in a position to make a really intelligent choice when it comes to selecting a spokesman to acquaint the administration with the views they hold. Further, these views being group views based upon the possession of large interests in common are always worthy of attention. They differ

entirely in value from the haphazard expression of individual sentiments and personal reactions which characterise the procedure in Parliaments of the Westminster type.

In Italy and in Russia, to take examples, ranged at the opposite poles of political sentiment, the group system of representation has been tried with great success. A Government of the authoritarian type is entirely dependent for its position upon the efficiency with which it operates; and while much can be done by mass-education and by organised exposition of official policy to ensure that the sentiment of the people is in harmony with the trend of administration, it is from time to time necessary to ascertain the precise operation of administrative measures, to enlist the active support of particular interests, and to invite suggestions for the improvement of existing conditions. For all these purposes, the group system has been found in practice to be more efficient than the parliamentary system. For one thing, it enables particular groups to be called together for particular purposes; those who are not affected are not summoned. Thus time is not wasted, and the discussions are of the "informed" type which is impossible in the ordinary assembly of amateurs who together make the average parliament. For another thing, the interests represented by the groups are real and living interests and when their co-operation is enlisted, the official policy obtains the backing and support of the particular section of the opinion which counts so far as the matter in hand is concerned. Finally, if it is ever necessary, in times of emergency, to secure a really adequate representation of every important shade of interest throughout the whole nation, all that is required is to summon a common meeting of the representatives of all the organised groups.

When these notes were last written, there was good hope that the Congress Party might sink their private differences with the Government so that the war effort of the Commonwealth might not be hampered. Now, however, it appears that this desired end is not yet in sight. Mr. Gandhi continues to assert his good wishes for the conquest of Nazism, but at the same time, his announcement that the Congress Party is not prepared to give active support to the war does give unpleasant point to the truism "that he who is not with me is against me." It is perhaps natural that such a convinced pacifist as

Mr. Gandhi should cling to the pathetic belief that anything is better than taking up arms, even though it be in the cause of freedom and liberty, but the effect of this doctrine can only add to the confusion of his adherents, and indeed puts his whole party in the most invidious position. He asserts that he and his party is as much opposed to victory for Nazism as any Briton can be, but the Congress party demands the right to give full expression to its views in relation to the Indian war effort, provided that they are expressed non-violently. Apparently, Mr. Gandhi does not propose to preach himself to workers at munition factories with the object of deterring them from their labours, but he evidently regards it as a necessity that any of his party who feel the urge to do this should be entirely untrammelled. Naturally enough, the Viceroy could not agree to a proviso, which, to put it mildly, might have a hampering effect upon the nation's war effort, nor could he permit a freedom of speech which at such a time of crisis might have the most unfortunate results. It is a paradox, and a sad one, that Mr. Gandhi, on resuming the direction of the Congress party, while repudiating any desire to add to the difficulties of the Commonwealth at war, should persuade his partisans to pass a resolution which commits them to an anti-war policy. Certainly the position of both party and leader is a difficult one. On the one hand, a campaign of open civil disobedience would arouse widespread disapproval in an India which is loyally supporting the struggle against Nazism. On the other hand, to do nothing at all might mark the weakening of the party as a political factor. Mr. Gandhi has met the Viceroy and has found himself unable to abandon his conscientious objections to war in favour of what Mr. Amery described as "The Viceroy has no less conscientious conviction and duty to allow nothing to stand in the way of India's whole hearted effort to play her part in the struggle." Meanwhile, the Moslem League, contrary to expectation, has rejected the Viceroy's offer of places on his Council and in the Advisory Council which is to associate Indian public opinion with the conduct of the war. While asserting their desire and that of all Indian Moslems to give the maximum of help to the Commonwealth cause, they state that they are not satisfied with the Viceroy's offer, which they maintain, does not concede real power. The position is still further complicated by the fact that the League asks for equal treatment with Congress Party in any constitutional

settlement that may be reached, while the Congress party insists on considering the League as a minority and asserts that to give it equal status goes against the principles of democracy. While the sincerity of both parties cannot be questioned it does seem as though some sections of the Indian community are so blinded by the importance of their own immediate desire for the constitution, that they can no longer discern the very real danger that lies in their divisions. It has been repeatedly pointed out, by Indians and Europeans alike, how completely destructive to the principles both of Hindus and Mohammadans would be the Nazi rule that they are inviting by their lack of unity with the common cause.

It is refreshing to turn from these warring factions to the loyalty and devotion of the Indian States, whose generosity has been one of the most heartening features of the war. A leading article in *Times* gives some impressive figures of the extent of the war effort of th princes. The writer says in the introduction to his subject " The material support already given by the Princes has reached remarkable proportions. Its value is enhanced by the fact that the Indian States are not British territory, and their subjects are not British subjects. The Princes have voluntarily and unanimously offered their services and their resources because they realise that the political, social and economic evolution of India is ultimately associated with the maintenance of the British Commonwealth. A Nazi-Fascist victory, they know, would spell disaster, not only to their own regimes but to the political future of all India."

With this realisation, the Princes have laid aside political differences and have devoted all their resources to the common good. In a statement made by the Jam Saheb of Nawanagar this point was well set forth. He said, " India can ill afford at this juncture to postpone, even for a single day, her united and sol d war contribution, and to fritter away her energies in other channels, when the law of the jungle threatens the basic foundations of civilisation and the ordered progress of humanity, including India and the Commonwealth." The contributions in money alone have reached immense proportions. During the first ten months of war, the Princes contributed more than a crore of rupees, excluding recurring donations of Rs. 8,680,000 to the Viceroy's War Purposes Fund. These

gifts do not include donations made to the Red Cross and similar organisations. The contributions from Hyderabad, Gwalior, Bhopal and other great States are parallelled by generous gifts from States of lesser magnitude. The Air Squadron provided by the Nizam of Hyderabad in addition to his other magnificent gifts, has brought particular glory on itself and on its donor, while other States including Bhopal, Mysore, Baroda, Patiala, Bikaner, Bahawalpur, Sirmoor and Khairpur, have made notable contributions for the purchase of aircraft. The generous support given in money and in men to the cause, the outpouring of money to help the wounded and to relieve the distress caused by the merciless bombing of London, are only a small part of the tireless efforts to defeat Nazism. Active recruiting, an enthusiastic participation in the Air scheme for India, and an over-whelming response to the Government's appeal for assistance in road making, are further marks of the active co-operation of the Princes. States which enjoy complete sovereignty in their own dominions have shown a most willing desire to adopt the various war measures introduced by the Central Government. If Hitler's informers dare to tell him the truth, he may well be aghast at this great body of sympathy and help that is flowing from the Indian States. Nor is it all on the side of material gifts. The Princes are setting their subjects the highest examples of unselfish devotion. Many of them have offered their personal services, many have appealed to their co-religionists to support the Allied cause on the ground of moral considerations, and from Hindu and Moslem alike prayers have risen up for the victory of the cause of justice and freedom. In Hyderabad and Bhopal, organisations have been set up to canalise the resources of the State for the more effective prosecution of the war effort. In Gwalior, there is a Central War Committee with branches at the headquarters town of every revenue district. The very practical functions of the Committee are to promote the right sort of propaganda, to encourage war effort, both by contribution to funds, and by enlistment, and in general terms, to bring home to the people of the State that the cause of Britain is also the cause of India.

From the other nations of the Commonwealth there comes the tale of a war effort still further increased by the anger at the bombardment of London. Recruiting has gone up by leaps and bounds, and money has been

poured out for the relief of the victims. Perhaps it is in the air that the greatest advance is observable, and there are many places throughout the Empire which are putting their utmost effort into the raising of money to buy the aircraft that are so necessary. A typical example comes from Nigeria, where the Governor has received the following letter from the Sultan of Sokoto, who is the spiritual head of the Moslems of the Northern provinces of Nigeria. He said "I wish to inform you that we heard recently that the German wireless had said "the slave-driven natives of the English colonies are compelled by force to contribute to the Win-the-War Fund." That is a lie, and I would like to ask Hitler whether it is by force also that we gather in our mosques and our schools and offer up prayers from our hearts, day and night, for the success of the British arms and for the downfall of His Majesty's enemies. When we in Sokoto heard of the Win-the-War-Fund we took counsel together, and we agreed that everyone who wished to do so should make the contribution which seemed proper to him. It was made very clear that no man should give if he did not wish to do so. I have the honour to inform Your Excellency that £ 6,216,11.1 has been collected from all sections of the community. This spontaneous contribution from the people of the Sokoto Emirate is a token of their loyal prayers for victory. We hope it will be possible to buy a fighter aeroplane with this money and that it may be called "Sokoto" so that it becomes our representative in defending the United Kingdom and in fighting the Empire's enemies."

Canada, which was in some sense the cradle of the Empire Air Scheme, is now the proud possessor of ten schools for the training of the Royal Air Force. Captain Harold Balfour, the Under Secretary of the State for Air, has emphasised the great advantage of Canada as a training ground, and goes on to say "I could not help seeing this great training scheme in the light of our life after the war. There is romance in this scheme. New-zealanders, Canadians and Australians, together with pupils from Great Britain, meeting not on British but on Dominion soil. There must be some benefit to our post-war Imperial problems in these thousands and thousands of young men getting to know and understand each other"

It is a strange paradox that out of the evils of war should spring up this sense of fellowship throughout the Commonwealth. In Australia, the Labour party has signified its intention to sink their differences and join hands with the Government in mutual plans for help and defence. In Delhi, in the very week in which these notes are written, the Eastern Group Supply Conference is being opened by the Viceroy, when all the lands under the British flag in Asia join with Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and the territories represented in the East African Governor's Conference. The object of the conference as stated in last month's notes is to make the best possible use of the combined resources in one common aim for victory. A close relationship will thus be set between the lands represented to ensure that the best possible use is made of their resources, existing and potential, for the purposes of the war. The requirements of each country will be considered in the light of the contribution that can be made by other members of the scheme, and the co-operation will be particularly valuable in view of the unexpected defection of France and the intervention of Italy which have raised a crop of problems which can only be solved by the mutual assistance of the countries of the conference. It is the purpose of the meeting to find those solutions and to establish permanent machinery to make them effective. While Great Britain herself is fully occupied with the war in her own boundaries these members of the Commonwealth are planning a collaboration which will help both themselves and her. In the words of The *Times*: "The vast resources of the British countries in the East will be organised on a full war basis under a scheme which aims at making the participating countries self-supporting for war supply purposes, the deficiencies of one being made good from the resources of the others." It is a plan as inspiring as it is practical, and is yet another manifestation of that drawing together in the face of danger for the common welfare of all which has always proved a puzzle to the observant foreigner, who expecting colonies, in the words of Turgot, to drop when they are ripe, finds to his consternation that in a time of storm they cling the tighter to the parent stem".

CHAPTER XXI

SIR WALTER MONCKTON AND THE CABINET MISSION, 1946

A Cabinet Mission consisting of Lord Pethic Lawrence, Secretary of State for India, Sir Stafford Cripps, President of the Board of Trade, and Sir A. V. Alexander, the First Lord of the Admiralty, came to India on 16th March 1946, and gave out its proposals in the form of a memorandum on 12th May 1946. In between, the Mission had interviews with the Indian States also. Three States were selected for having exclusive interviews *viz.*, Hyderabad represented by the Nawab of Chattari, Travancore by Sri C. P. Ramaswami Iyer and Jaypore represented by Sir Mirza Ismail. The Hyderabad delegation consisted of the Nawab of Chattari, President of the Executive Council, Nawab Ali Yavar Jung, Medical and Constitutional Affairs Member and Sir Walter Monckton, the Constitutional Adviser to the, Hyderabad Government.

Sir Walter Monckton during his visit in the first fortnight of April, 1946, discussed the question relating to the future constitution of India and its relation with Indian States, in general, and Hyderabad in particular. He met the members of the Cabinet Mission individually and also met the Viceroy, the Commander-in-Chief, PoliticalAdviser, Mr. Jinnah and other prominent leaders.

Sir Walter Monckton, after studying the problem in all its aspents, submitted a Memorandum to the Executive Council of the Hyderabad Government on 21st April 1946. This memorandum is an able and excellent summary of the whole position. His assessment of the discussions was accurate and to the point. He had not glossed over any unpleasant thing, but had presented the case in a lucid manner, driving home his points with great deftness. The memorandum is a well-reasoned and memorable presentation of the case from the view-point of the Government and is reproduced in full below, since it is an important landmark in the history of the freedom struggle of Hyderabad.

"From a welter of rumour, speculation and uncertainty a few cardinal points have now emerged with comparative clarity. It cannot, I think, be doubted—

(*a*) That His Majesty's Government are prepared, if independence is preferred to Dominion Status, to withdraw eventually from India altogether;

(*b*) That H.M.G. will then transfer sovereignty to British India to an authority or authorities to be constituted;

(*c*) That whatever the extent to which Pakistan is conceded as a principle to be adopted in the establishment of a new Indian Union or Unions, there will have to be some unitary machinery at the Centre for purposes at least of Defence and External Affairs and such other subjects as cannot be separated from them;

(*d*) That, before a new constitution or constitutions are set up to which H.M.G. can transfer sovereignty, there must be an interim period during which India will have to be governed under some modification of the existing constitution and it is probable that this interim period will be considerable.

The main obstacle to the establishment of a Constitution Making Body or Bodies and also to the settlement of the basis of interim constitution is the communal conflict between Congress and the Moslem League in British India. These political parties have taken up positions which seem irreconcilable. But some way of composing or overcoming their differences must be found if there is to be any interim or final constitutional solution. The Princes may possibly be able to use their good offices in this connection but the problem is not one primarily for them but for British India. Nevertheless, the Princes are, of course, directly interested both in the interim and the final solutions of the constitutional issues."

Then Sir Walter stated how it was essential to proceed further bearing the long term matters in mind. He continued—

"It is convenient to deal first with the long term solution. I shall, in the main, confine my observations to the points which specially concern the States, but it may be of interest to note one or two salient points which are beginning to emerge from the Congress-Moslem League discussions. I do not think it at all likely that Pakistan

will be conceded in such a form as wholly to preclude some sort of an Indian Centre. No doubt, however, that Centre will have a strictly limited field and is likely to be a small body whose functions will be mainly executive, dealing with Foreign Relations and Defence. It is not yet clear whether a small indirectly elected Legislature will be needed to deal satisfactorily with such matters as Finance and Supply.

The view is gradually coming to prevail that, when India is independent, Paramountcy ought to disappear automatically. It would be impossible for the Crown in the United Kingdom to retain such a responsibility without any sanction to enforce its decisions and, in any case the retention of such responsibility would be unacceptable to British India and incompatible with the idea of a complete British withdrawal. It was thought in some quarters that the Paramountcy powers of the Crown could, in some way, be transferred to the new Union or Unions contemplated in British India, but there is nothing in the treaties or in usage or in any other source of law to justify the transference by the Crown of Paramountcy powers to some other sovereign authority without the consent of the State concerned and that consent would not be forthcoming. The probable result, therefore, is that when the interim period is over and sovereignty passes from the British Crown, Paramountcy will disappear and the Princes will resume complete independence."

The disadvantages and advantages of the policy of isolation and association are described with great realism.

Says he, " It is, however, essential to understand clearly from the outset that this resumption of Independence, though it has obvious advantages, will be accompanied by hazardous isolation in the position of the Rulers when the British withdraw. The political forces which are now most powerful in British India will be able to exert considerable pressure on the State and the subjects of the States will inevitably become more vocal and politically-minded. Pressure from critical neighbouring sovereign powers and from critical subjects will become the spurs to administrative and political reform and the bulwark against mal-administration, which

the Paramount Power has hitherto afforded. Moreover, whatever the position in theory, the Rulers cannot in practice effectively resume in isolation, control of External Affairs and Defence. Hyderabad, by reason of its size and resources, is in a different position from the other States, but even in its case, it would be extremely difficult to pursue a Foreign and Defence Policy different from that of the rest of India.

In relation, therefore, to the long-term solution of India's political future, it would be necessary for those who advise His Exalted Highness to have clearly in mind the choice which confronts him. His Exalted Highness will have to contemplate either standing aloof from the rest of India in isolation or being prepared to associate himself with the rest of India on the most favourable terms which he can negotiate. If he should decide to stand aloof, he would probably be the only Ruler or almost the only Ruler, to do so and particularly if his decision became known at an early date, he would earn the hostility of the political parties in the rest of India as being the one obstacle to the freedom and unity of India and as trying to retain British forces in India; and he would be subjected to the pressure likely to be exerted from within and without his State as a result of such resentment. On the other hand, if he is prepared to contemplate eventual association upon suitable terms and in respect of a limited number of subjects (in particular those like foreign policy and defence which he has already transferred to the British Crown), he may be able to secure comparatively satisfactory terms. I think that H.E.H. ought not to be advised at this stage to reject any ideal of association. On the contrary, there is much to be gained from showing a disposition to join if satisfactory arrangements can be made. Moreover, if the Centre eventually takes the form of an agency Centre to which the Muslim League agrees, many of the constitutional disadvantages inherent in the Act of 1985 will be avoided and the State would be safer in accepting association with such a Centre. I am stating these conclusions here so that all the considerations which may tend either way in respect of each alternative decision may be carefully weighed by the Executive Council before they advise H.E.H."

The Government of H.E.H. the Nizam always referred to the Treaties and reposed its faith in them. The

explanations given should have disillusioned anybody. He further said—

"I made it plain during the discussions referred to in the first paragraph of this Memorandum that if H.M.G. contemplate withdrawing from British India in circumstances which make it impossible for them to continue to implement their Treaty obligations to the State, they ought at least to bring such pressure on the rest of India as to ensure that Hyderabad can face the future with reasonable security. I said this in reference to the defence of the State and the dynasty generally and also with reference to our claim to an outlet to the sea in particular. The view that H.M.G. (I think) entertain is that, though they could use their good offices to encourage the rest of India to negotiate reasonably with the States, the attempt to exert pressure would defeat its own object. Such pressure would be resented and the resentment would be felt not only against H.M.G. but also against the State and we might be worse off in the end. On the other hand, it was pointed that British India would have plenty on its hands for the next few years and was, in any event, not so badly disposed towards the States as often in the past. The important point (it was suggested) was to engage in friendly negotiations with British India to secure our future, while the auspices were still good. Such an opportunity may arise as soon as the interim picture becomes clearer. Meantime, the State should, in my opinion, avoid any indication of inclination to stand aloof. Even if eventually H.E.H. finds it impossible to reach an agreement, no harm would result from expressing at every suitable opportunity now his readiness to co-operate for the good of India as a whole and for that purpose to associate himself, if satisfactory arrangements can be made, with the new Indian constitutional body or bodies.

There is one further point about the negotiations for a long term settlement which I should like to make before I turn to the interim problem. If H.E.H. decides that, on balance, he would be better off in association with the rest of India rather than aloof from it, his advisers should bear in mind that it does not always pay to allow negotiations, once they have begun, to drag on for an indefinite period in order to fight each point, large or small, to the last gasp. The wise statesman is he who is ready to make some sacrifices in order to make what is in his judgment, on balance, a favourable settlement,

especially if he thinks that by postponing a decision in the hope of getting one more advantage he may let slip a good opportunity which is unlikely to return because for instance, the atmosphere is likely to deteriorate or the goodwill of the other party to evaporate. I do not suggest that the present is such a moment for decision but when that moment comes, as it may well do, after the interim picture is clearer, I should be sorry to see it slip away unused."

The final form of the Constitution for Independence arrangements were to be made for the period of transition regarding which he said—

" I now turn to the interim problem which is of great importance, for t may well last for a number of years and may, in large measure, shape the final constitution which will be adopted. The interim Government will, I think, necessarily take the form of a modification of the constitution established by the Government of India Act, 1935. The modification will be designed to make the Government as responsive as possible to the main elements in the present political life of India. In effect, the link between Whitehall and New Delhi will be largely cut and this makes it important to consider the position of the Crown Representative in his relations with the State on matters of all-India concern. H.E. the President raised this matter when we met the Cabinet Mission and it became clear that H.E. the Viceroy was fully aware of it. It will be difficult for the Crown Representative, even in cases where he feels that States ought to be assisted, to resist the pressure of the Governor-General with his ministers behind him. It is likely, therefore, that the Crown Representative will be strengthened by a small committee including representative of the States who will be appointed to assist him on matters of all India concern."

Expression of the views of the Constitutional Adviser after taking both the alternatives into consideration is given as follows :—

"I pointed out in my Memorandum of February, 1946 that H.E.H.'s main policy was concerned with two objects: (1) the preservation of the integrity of his Dominions, and (2) the maintena ce of his connection with the British Crown. It will be seen from the contents of the present Memorandum that the negotiations of April 1946 are based upon a complete withdrawal of the British

power from India and the Cabinet Mission are here to offer, not Dominion Status, but Independence. This, as I have indicated, makes it impracticable to negotiate for H.E.H. upon the footing of retaining the British connection which H.M.G. with all the goodwill in the world, may find it most difficult to maintain. Nevertheless, it is too soon to assume as a foregone conclusion that the long connection between the British Crown and India is necessarily now to be severed for ever. It is still possible that the Union or Unions in India when they have secured independence may prefer to seek admittance to the British Commonwealth and will do so on terms which H.M.G. may be able to accept. Such a result is the more likely to follow, the more plainly it is understood that the British mean to give absolute and unconditional independence. India may then feel unwilling and perhaps unable to stand wholly alone. It may be that it has been the British domination and the British Government rather than the British and their way of life which have been the targets of objection. If so, when the new Union or Unions wish to be associated with one of the Greater Powers, a free entry by choice into the association of the British Commonwealth may be the eventual result. I add this note to my Memorandum of the discussions in New Delhi because I appreciate how deeply H.E.H. would deplore the severance of the tie which unites him with the British Crown and because it is not yet wholly certain that the severance must come.

H.E.H.'s primary purpose, as stated above, is to maintain the integrity of his Dominions. It is plain that, in the light of the possibilities which the discussions with the Cabinet Mission have disclosed, the achievement of H.E.H.'s primary purpose needs consideration in a new setting. In order that a State may survive securely and indefinitely as a unit in the new India, without the old safeguard of the strong right arm of the British, it will need to be able to rely on three sources of powers :—

(*a*) Sufficient size in area and population;

(*b*) Sufficient resources, economic, industrial and financial; and

(*c*) Sufficient elements of internal stability."

After offering a penetrating analysis like this Sir Walter tenders the most wholesome advice regarding

Constitution. It illustrates the great adage that truth is never vehement. It is straight and cold—

"Hyderabad possesses (*a*) and (*b*) and would, I believe, by vigorous efforts find a firm basis for (*c*), internal stability. It is true that at first sight a population which is 85% Hindu may not appear a very solid foundation for a Moslem dynasty. But if the Nizam's Government, with its long ruling tradition, could establish and maintain a system of administration which secured for H.E.H.'s subjects a standard of life and progress (especially in such matters as education and public health) fairly comparable in quality and efficiency with that prevailing in what is now British India, H.E.H.'s rule, even without the British connection, would be soundly based. It is a mistake to assume that the only satisfactory method of Government for the whole of India is Responsible Government on the model of western democracy. H.E.H. intends by his constitutional reforms to take his subjects, Hindus and Moslems, more closely into partnership. They will have opportunities not only of advising him and his Executive Council but also of expressing their opinions on political questions and airing their grievances. But, more important still, there is a chance to build up a strong democratic, predominantly elected administrative machine from the bottom, from the village panchayats and the local and district boards and taluks. This type of organisation if particularly Indian, and vigorously encouraged may well provide H.E.H. with a firm and reliable element of internal stability in the testing times which lie ahead.

I ought to add that I found in Delhi a disposition to criticise the present position in Hyderabad on two points on which it is desirable that the State should be able to preserve a plausible answer. It was said (*a*) that Executive Council consisted overwhelmingly of official members and that this was open to objection on the ground that Government should not be virtually confined to departmental heads, and (*b*) that in a State where the subjects were 85% Hindus 10 Muslims to 1 Hindu on the Executive Council was an indefensible disparity. It is for the Council and not for me to advise H.E.H. on such questions. But I am bound to say that I do not see any obvious answer to (*b*) in particular and it appears, at any rate on the surface, to be a source of instability which it would be well worthwhile to remove as and when vacancies occur."

CHAPTER XXII

VISIT OF JAYPRAKASH NARAYAN TO HYDERABAD IN 1947 AND THE SATYAGRAHA CONNECTED WITH IT

Jayprakash Narayan was requested to visit Hyderabad by the local Socialist party and a programme was chalked out for him. He was expected to arrive on the 7th May 1947 in the morning and address a Public meeting on the evening at Jeera Compound, Secunderabad. On Thursday, the 8th, in the morning, he was going to address workers of the Socialist Party at the Burugu Mahadev Hall, Secunderabad. In the evening there was going to be a workers' rally at Chikadpalli and a public meeting was to be addressed by him in the evening at 7 o' clock at the Raghunath Bagh.

The Deccan News Agency of Hyderabad had circulated the news that the Congress Committee of Hyderabad was not going to participate or co-operate in the reception to be accorded to Jayprakash Narayan. But the General Secretary of the City Congress Committee issueda press statement saying that this news was mischievous and misleading. Jayprakash Narayan addressed a largely attended public meeting at the Karbala Maidan, Secunderabad, on the evening of 7th. His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Government took strong objection to his speech and served the General Secretary of the Socialist Party of India with an order under 25 (1) (*a*) of the Defence of Hyderabad Rules and he was asked to leave the State by emplaning in the morning for Bombay on 8th of May. The news that Government had arrested and externed him spread like wildfire in Hyderabad and Secunderabad. The Hindu Congress circles seemed greatly perturbed over it and feelings apparently began running high. To add fuel to the fire, B. S. Mahadev Singh and Narender Pershad Saxena who addresseda gathering of Congressmen on May 8, 1947 held in connection with flag salutation ceremonies, respectively at the Secunderabad Congress Committee's Office, Secunderabad and Raghunath Bagh, Sultan Bazaar, made spirited speeches. They said that the order was a challenge to the rights of the citizens, and that they should meet it in a brave and fitting way.

Soon after the flag salutation ceremonies, batches of Congressmen, with the tri-colour flag and wearing black

bands or ribbons, began going round the City shouting slogans of 'State Congress Zindabad' 'Jai Prakash Narayan Zindabad' and asking shopkeepers and other people to suspend business for the day as a mark of their protest against Government's order on Jayprakash Narayan. Some of these batches included young men who were armed with lathis, swords or spears and who behaved very rowdily.

Their going about in the City thus armed and shouting provocative slogans was likely to disturb public peace. As far as possible attempts were made to disperse these batches peacefully, but they soon showed fight and grew violent. Stones and brickbats were pelted at the Police pickets and patrols. The Kingsway, Market Street, Shubrick Street etc. in Secunderabad and Sultan Bazaar, Begam Bazaar and Gowliguda were particualrly affected in this respect.

The public meeting which the Jayprakash Narayan Reception Committee, Hyderabad, had organised for the evening of May 8, 1947 in Raghunath Bagh was, in view of the indications of likely violence and disturbance of the peace, banned. Notwithstanding the ban, people began to congregate near the Raghunath Bagh. Ram Murthi, an enthusiastic worker of the Congress, addressed the congregation and said that the meeting would take place despite the ban and that Swami Ramanand Teerth and Narender Pershad Saxena would address the meeting.

By about 5-30 p.m. the crowd had swelled to about 5,000 and slogans of "State Congress Zindabad", "Inquilab Zindabad", "Zimmedarana Hukumat Lekar Rahenge" began to rend the air. Mr. Badruddin, Magistrate, who was on the spot along with Police Officers, announced that Section 145 Cr. P. C. would be promulgated and asked the mob to disperse. The mob, however, refused to obey and began throwing brickbats and stones at the Police Officers, whereon tear gas was used to disperse them. All the same, brickbats and stones continued to bethrown at the Police parties from nearby house-tops.

In the meanwhile, a batch of five Congressmen led by B. Ramakrishna Rao, Advocate, emerged from Harischander Heda's house, followed by a large crowd. They offered Satyagraha by addressing meetings in contravention of the Public Meetings Rules and breaking other

laws. The Satyagrahis whose names are B. Ramakrishna Rao, R. V. Bedap, Ram Murthi, Basavaraj and Eshwarayya were taken into custody and subsequently released. Seven other persons also were arrested for such offences as obstructing a Police Officer in the discharge of his duties, mischief etc. A paper containing the draft resolution which was perhaps meant for placing before the proposed public meetings was found on the person of one of the Satyagrahis. The resolution purported to condemn Government's order against Jayrakash Narayan, to assert the right of every Indian to visit any part of India without let or hindrance and to call upon the people to prepare themselves for sacrifice under the lead of the State Congress.

The destructive rowdiness of the mob, however, showed no signs of abatement, despite police efforts to check and disperse them. At about 8-15 p.m. the mob attacked a Railway bus, assaulted the conductor and driver and set fire to the bus. The street electric lights along the Sultan Bazaar main road, the Kingsway etc. the traffic island 'sunshade' at the Clock Tower Cross Roads and cement fencings round the saplings recently planted on the roadside along the Shah Rahe-I-Bazaar police lines were damaged. H.E.H. the Nizam's post office at Hashmatgunj was broken into and a post office cart wis burnt. The police took very prompt action in this matter, effectively preventing further damage and destruction.

The Railway workers too had earlier in the day come out of their offices and workshops as a protest against the arrest of Jayprakash Narayan. They held a meeting in the Union Office, which was addressed by Raghavendra Rao and a resolution was passed protesting against the arrest of the leader and condemning the attitude of the Government.

The situation was brought under control by about 9 p.m. At about 11 p.m., however, a communal fracas took place in Nallagutta in which one Muslim, Ghafoor Mian, President of the Local Branch of the Anjuman-e-Ittehad-ul-Muslimeen and two Hindus were killed and another Muslim received serious injuries to which he subsequently succumbed.

Police and Military pickets had been posted at necessary points and disturbed areas were patrolled.

Section 145 Cr. P. C. was promulgated in particularly affected areas like Sultan Bazaar, Afzal Gunj, Musheerabad, Kingsway, Shubrick Street, Market Street, General Bazaar etc. for a period of four days i.e., from May 8, 1947 to May 11, 1947.

As a result of the above violent action of the Congressmen and their volunteers about 25 Policemen, 1 Inspector, 1 Head-constable and 18 other ranks in Sultan Bazaar area, 1 Head Constable and 3 Constables in the Secunderabad area received injuries.

In addition to the above-mentioned arrests in Hyderabad, 33 demonstrators were arrested under Section 127 A.P.C., Section 27 P.S.A., Rule 33 and 37 D.H.R. and 226 persons—50 for rioting and the remaining for disorderly behaviour etc.—in Secunderabad.

Total Number of arrests made	..	311
Total Number of Policemen injured	..	24
Total number of casualties (deaths)	..	4

Jayprakash Narayan in his speech at Karbala Maidan, Secunderabad, on the 7th May, 1947 said that he was called Commander of the battle for freedom by Swami Ramanand Teerth but he considered himself to be an humble soldier. It was said that this State is a land of sorrows but he would assure, J. P. Narayan stated, that the condition of the whole country was similar. The speaker confirmed that exemplany sacrifice, martyrdom and death at the gallows of the hundreds of worthy sons and daughters of India had brought freedom at the threshold. He added, sorrows were certain to disappear.

J. P. Narayan said he did not know much about the Indian States but he could understand that the condition was not different, if not worse. Continuing, he said, the country was passing through revolutionary transformations. The British Government had made a declaration that they were going to quit India. People asked the speaker wherever he went whether there was any truth in such declaration and what had made them do so. Jayprakash remarked that they should remember that there was no such thing as truth and sincerity in politics. All political moves were based on self-interest and compulsion. Continuing, he said, the British had only two

alternatives : (1) they should come to terms with India and save what little they can from their investments in the country, or (2) to try to govern India in the old fashion and face another revolution. The second the British could not do. The British had become exhausted and powerless. The people living in the States like Hyderabad might not know so intimately but after the revolution of 1942 a new India was born. The Britishers who correctly felt the pulse of India have realized it. Subhash Chandra Bose's Azad Hind Fouz had infused a new spirit into the nation and had struck terror into the hearts of the rulers. The Britishers had an accurate estimate of the political situation. Not that the peasants and workers were sure to stand against the Britishers but even the services which were their backbone had been possessed of a rebellious spirit. Jayprakash Narayan further went on saying that the Britishers had witnessed sparks of rebellion in the Army and the Navy. At Bombay, the members of the Indian Navy had disobeyed their officers and were determined to cause a havoc but they respected and obeyed the national leaders. The British Empire where the sun did not set, is afire with revolt from Cairo to Singapur. The slogan of Mahatma Gandhi's Quit India had assumed alarming dimensions The Britishers were expert traders and they had taken a correct stock of the situation. Before the war, they were a first rate power in the world but now they had become a third rate nation. The British owed 416 crores of rupees to a poor country like India. And even a British child knew that unless they borrowed money from a rich country like the United States of America, they would become a tenth rate power. The British were anxious to make peace with India. In the light of these facts, continued the speaker, we must admit that India is certainly going to be free. The Indians were driving the British and compelling them to leave us free. But the British were trying to create splits. They knew that the British Indian Provinces were well organised. There were Qoumidals and organisations of peasants and workers. They were conspiring to reap the highest advantage from the weak spots in India.

But the Nizam Saheb intends to keep Hyderabad an independent State. But in the first place the Britishers should remember the Nizam's action goes against the wishes of his people. The people of Independent India

also would not permit the Nizam to remain independent. If some Princes request the Britishers to keep their forces, they might say that they wanted to leave the country but some of the Indians desire that they should stay. The British intend to invest their capital for carrying on business in some of the Indian States. If the States do not integrate with India, it would naturally mean that we are not going to get complete independence. But we are fighting for complete independence and we cannot tolerate such fractional independence. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel have issued an appeal to the Princes saying that joining the Indian Union is not derogatory to them in any way. But appeals and requests serve no purpose. What is required for success is force. The Nizam of Hyderabad likes freedom, wants to keep his Government independent. But he should read the writing on the wall and adjust with the spirit of the times. The world is marching towards democracy and socialism. But will Rajahs and Maharajahs whose rule has been a faked rule and who have really been slaves to the British choose to line themselves up against the country at a time when it is marching towards independence or freedom? If the Rajahs and Maharajahs intend to retain their thrones they should respect the will of their people. If the people realise that the throne impedes their onward march, they are bound to brush aside the throne itself.

Mountbatten, the new Viceroy, has come with great promises and we have to see whether he would also play the same old tricks. It is not possible that there can be a free Government in New Delhi and servile Government at Hyderabad where the rights of the people are trampled and suppressed. If the Nizam does not understand this, the way of the people is quite clear.

The Hyderabad State Congress has so far made a demand for Responsible Government under the aegis of the Nizam. And the Nizam will have the same position as the King in England. But it should be remembered that the King of England is only in name. The Government should rest in the hands of the people. The Government of England is now in the hands of labourers. The people of Hyderabad want such a Government."

This speech of J. P. Narain had an intense effect on the people of Hyderabad.

CHAPTER XXIII.

SIR MIRZA ISMAIL

Sir Mirza Ismail was one of the ablest Prime Ministers that His Exalted Highness the Nizam could secure for his Government. Sir Mirza was a seasoned administrator who had efficiently directed State affairs in Mysore and Jaipur. From his reminiscences entitled *My Publick Life* it can be gathered that he had been requested several times to accept the reins of Hyderabad administration. But it was ordained that he should come in the first week of August, 1946 to Hyderabad. The liberal views of Sir Mirza were so pronounced that it was quite impossible that Muslim Leaguers would welcome his appointment in such a key position for Musalmans.

The bold adventure attempted by Mohammad Ali Jinnah to prevent this arrangement can well be appreciated from Sir Mirza's words :—

"Mr. Jinnah wrote and telegraphed to the Nizam exhorting him not to appoint me and threatening him with dire consequences if he disregarded this advice. When he came to know a month or so later, that I was being appointed, he rushed to Hyderabad to see the Nizam and made a determined effort to stop him from proceeding further. It was common knowledge that Mr. Jinnah behaved rudely to the Nizam and the latter did not conceal his resentment of such conduct. I do not think, they ever met again.

A detailed account of the interview was given to me by Nawab Hosh Yar Jung who was present on the occasion. He told me that Jinnah entered the room smoking a cigar and seated himself on the chair in front of the Nizam with legs outstretched. Immediately there was an explosion. H.E.H. exclaimed, "Do you know who I am? Is this the way you behave towards the Nizam of Hyderabad?" The attack was so sudden and unexpected that the visitor was completely flabbergasted; he withdrew his legs, threw away the offending cigar and apologised. But the storm having burst, apology did not ease the situation. The Nizam swamped him with angry questions.

"What do you want? What do you want to tell me?" and so on and so forth. Jinnah sought to say something against the appointment, but before he could utter a few words, the Nizam said—

"I do not want any outside interference in my affairs. I can take care of the interests of my own people. I do not wish to discuss this matter with you."

I was told that the whole place resounded with the angry voice, so much so that the oldest retainers said that they had never seen the Nizam in such a temper before. In between the explosions, Jinnah somehow managed to play his last card by uttering the warning that the Muslim League would never extend any support to Hyderabad, either in his internal affairs or in the Constituent Assembly, if his advice was disregarded. That only made matters worse. "What do I care? You were never helpful. I am not going to ask for your help." Jinnah then said something about constitutional reforms. The Nizam cut him short:

"I am a busy person, Mr. Jinnah. I cannot go into details with you. If you wish to discuss the reforms, please go and see the Minister in-charge. Anything more? No? Then good-bye."

"The interview," wrote the Nawab, "lasted just twenty-five minutes. But this new side of the Nizam's character came as a surprise to all of us. We never thought that he could be so firm and so furious. The Quaid-i-Azam had the lesson of his life. But we know that this does not end here. He is a very vindictive man, and immediately after the interview, he started long conferences with local leaders."

Hyderabad had the privilege of enjoying the fine fruits of the enlightened and wise administration of Sir Mirza Ismail for ten months. Hyderabad citizens who had witnessed the spell of the liberal regime of Sir Ali Imam in the first three years of the third decade of the twentieth century were delighted to see history repeating itself. Sir Mirza broadcast a message to the people of Hyderabad which captured the hearts of the majority of the Hyderabad citizens. But the reactionary elements among the people were struck with panic and correctly

apprehended what to expect from him. The closing sentences of his message were as quoted below :—

" Hyderabad is a very big city. It has the makings of a great city, in the noblest sense. It can well become a renowned centre of Eastern Culture and civilization, of intellectual activity and of common harmony in this country of perpetual discord. And this State has vast potentialities. It is capable of becoming a very powerful element in the India of future, and of playing a great part in the building of it. But such glory is not to be had for the asking. It will need, if I may speak with the utmost candour, an effort of a kind which has never before been made by the people of Hyderabad. There is no hope of anything worthwhile unless we are all determined to purify this place of personal and party strife.

I hope and pray that we may above all desire unity and consistently seek it and that working together in a spirit of brotherhood, we may succeed in achieving for Hyderabad that moral and material pre-eminence which is her due."

When the so-called Reforms in the State were announced, on the 17th July, 1939, the majority of leaders were disappointed as the reforms fell short of their expectations, while the minority community in power detested the Reforms as they felt the uneasiness of having lost all chances of controlling the destiny of Hyderabad for the benefit of the few at the cost of the many.

Gandhiji wrote to Sir Mirza Ismail immediately after he had settled as Prime Minister, partially in the following terms :—

" Representatives from Hyderabad have seen me. They are Shri Kashinath Rao Vaidya and Swami Ramanand Tirtha. They have discussed with me the so-called reforms contemplated in the State. I have studied them somewhat as they appeared in the Press. The reforms seem to be only so-called. To me they appear to be a step backward rather than forward. I do not know that you can do much to alter them, but I wonder why you cannot scrap them altogether. The least that any State can do at this time is to recognise the status of and influence of the States' Peoples' Conference, of which

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru is President and secure its endorsements before proceeding with any popular measure. This ensures smooth passage for any such thing.

Rajakumari has already drawn your attention to Shrimati Padmaja Naidu's pamphlet on political atrocities in some of the Hyderabad villages. I like you to enlighten me on these two points.

I am sorry to have to worry you when you have just begun your new career".

Sir Mirza explained the situation to Gandhiji and also his own difficulties. He said he would effect transformations suitably in the Constitution and instil a new spirit in the field of education, industries and public health. He promised to Gandhiji, " You may be sure that I shall try always to practise democracy in this singularly undemocratic age, and will do all I can to further the interests of people and establish constitutional government in the State. I can only hope that you will be satisfied with this assurance from me and rely upon me to do all that is possible or advisable in the present circumstances to achieve our common aim."

Sir Mirza Ismail was 63 when he had arrived to direct the affairs in the Hyderabad State. He was a veteran in the art of administration and knew perfectly the methods of obviating delays and the serpentine courses of red-tapism, and was determined to see that the commonest citizen in the State would feel the warmth of his administration immediately. He had made himself available to all and sundry who were anxious to ventilate their grievances by announcing his accessibility on two days in a week in the mornings to all who desired to see him. His enquiries regarding the requests and grievances were prompt and penetrating. This was the easiest and the best way of arresting corruption and prevent delay in the judicious decision of cases. The stubborn officers in the State who were exercised in their old methods became uneasy and shocked. Notwithstanding the great exertion that such interviews caused to Sir Mirza indicating his sincerity in inaugurating a new era in the State, endeavours were made to poison the mind of the Ruler that Mirza was seeking self-aggrandizement through such tactics. In the city of Hyderabad, Sir Mirza introduced the practice of

carrying on weekly inspections of localities and roads. He himself was a great visionary in the field of art and architecture. He ordered the top-ranking executive officers of the Municipal Corporation, town planning and P.W.D. to accompany him in his excursion and took expeditious decisions in consultation with them. Things which were stuck up in a rut began to move briskly and practical changes were observed and felt by people. He inspired great expectations but unfortunately this was not the universal feeling in the State. Let us read what Sir Mirza himself had to say about this :

" What an enormous amount of work there was to be done in Hyderabad and what a wonderful country it could become ! This hope, this ambition, was not destined to be fulfilled. Although I was there for only ten months, I am neither sorry I went nor that I left so soon. With the withdrawal of British control, I found, as I had anticipated, that it was impossible to stay. The Nizam was bent upon independence. Even more so were that wretched band of foolish Muslims called the Ittehad-ul-Muslameens. A few sentences from an intercepted Press telegram sent to the Ittehad paper in Hyderabad (reproduced below) will show what a poisonous lot of people I had to deal with. They were bent upon moving heaven and earth to see me out of Hyderabad.

"While Muslims of India are boycotting the so-called Constituent Assembly which has lost all its importance as constitution-making body and has been reduced to the position of All India Congress Committee, Sir Mirza Ismail, Prime Minister, himself a Muslim and Chief of Muslim Dominion of Hyderabad, is hobnobbing with Congress leaders in lobbies of Constituent Assembly almost every day. Sir Mirza is seen in corridors flirting with Congress members and greeting them with folded hands like Hindus. Sometimes, he was heard saying " Namasthe " " Namaskaram." He is also believed to have said that the Hindus being in a great majority, would rule in the long run despite all difficulties. "

Sir Mirza realised that though he was exerting to harness his energy and talents fully for the cause of justice and fairplay he was not certain he could prevail against the mischievous onslaughts of unscrupulous and

imprudent people upon the Nizam, whose firmness and trust was his last resort. He writes—

"I found that even senior officers of the State, many of them, had lost their heads. I should have been a thorn in the flesh of these people. So, when I came to Bangalore for summer recess, I reviewed the position and came to the conclusion that I should not go back to Hyderabad. I had also a suspicion that the Nizam would not regret my departure."

Sir Mirza Ismail wrote on May 15, 1947 to H.E.H. the Nizam as follows ;—

"It is with the deepest regret that I have to ask Your Exalted Highness to relieve me of the high office with which you have been pleased to entrust me.

At a time which is perhaps, the most critical the Dominion will ever know, I came to Hyderabad at Your Exalted Highness's invitation, full of enthusiasm and with deep attachment to Your Exalted Highness's person and dynasty. I was determined to devote my lifelong experience and the capabilities which God has given me to the right solution of the many problems with which the future of the Dominion is beset. In the pursuit of this earnest desire I had planned many things which in the fullness of time would have assuredly contributed to the greatness and glory of Hyderabad and to the happiness and prosperity of your people. I could only succeed in such a task if I were assured of Your Exalted Highness's full support and sympathy.

I have had the misfortune to find myself opposed at every turn by a certain section of the local Musalmans who, in my opinion, are set on a course that is suicidal to the State. I have not taken a single step that has been detrimental to their real interests. On the other hand, I have done all that is humanly possible to serve, but in vain. At the instigation of arch-conspirators who have other ends to serve, they have carried on a vigorous and calculated campaign of vilification against me.

It has been my further misfortune to find that I have lost the confidence of Your Exalted Highness. The intrigues and agitation to which I refer are, I firmly believe,

directed as much against the interest of Your Exalted Highness as against myself. But, while a word from you would have stopped the campaign at once, you have maintained silence, and the agitators have given the impression that they enjoy Your Exalted Highness's goodwill aud patronage.

Only recently, I wrote to Your Exalted Highness from Berar saying that unless Your Exalted Highness could give me your fullest confidence and support it would not be possible for me to carry on.

As that support has not been forthcoming, there is no alternative for me but to ask to be relieved. In spite of the sad memories of my stay in Hyderabad, I shall always pray that God, in His mercy, may protect the Asafjah Crown from the dangers that I see looming ahead."

When Sir Mirza Ismail left Hyderabad for Bangalore apparently on account of summer, H.E.H. the Nizam suspected that he might resign his position and would not return to Hyderabad. Hosh Bilgrami, the author of the *Mushahidat'* says he was ordered to go to Bangalore and persuade Sir Mirza on behalf of the Nizam to pay a visit to Hyderabad at least for three or four days. Hosh says that he and his colleague Shahid went to Bangalore and enjoyed the hospitality of Sir Mirza and found how usefully he was spending his retired life reaping the spiritual advantage of receiving blessings from those for whom he had done so much good there. Hosh Bilgrami returned to Hyderabad and reported to the Nizam that Sir Ismail had received a message from Sir Walter Monckton that Sir Mirza should not tender his resignation unless they met each other. So, Sir Mirza whose decision in the matter was final was sure to send his resignation in a week. Thus Hyderabad Musalmans and the Nizam lost the mature guidance of a sagacious administrator.

Chapter XXIV

HYDERABAD ON THE EVE OF INDIAN INDEPENDENCE

The freedom struggle in Hyderabad formed an integral part of the freedom struggle in India, though in its objectives, methods and immediate tactics, it differed in details from the freedom struggle in India due to local conditions. There were three factors that impeded the speedy emergence of Hyderabad from a semi-feudal State to a fully grown democracy, *viz.*,

(*a*) Hyderabad was a stronghold of British imperialism;

(*b*) The communal forces received support from some irresponsible elements in the public life of Hyderabad.

(*c*) The Hyderabad State Congress to was unable function vigorously on account of the peculiar circumstances in which it found itself.

The freedom struggle and political awakening in Hyderabad were led by several stalwarts including Sri Vaman Naik, Sri Kesav Rao, Sri Madapati Hanumantha Rao, Sri K. S. Vaidya and others in its earlier stages. Even in the early days some people like Tuljapurkar and others suffered banishment and persecution at the hands of the then rulers.

The later phase of the freedom struggle was led by Swami Ramanand Teerth who was a great mass leader. His work was greatly facilitated by the valuable groundwork prepared by the leaders of the previous generation. The work of the liberal politicians of Hyderabad also deserves to be mentioned. These liberals stood on a different footing from the liberal politicians of India though from the very beginning they identified themselves with the Congress ideologies even before the State Congress took its birth in 1938. It is true that the period between 1920-38 in the history of Hyderabad lacks that vigorous political activity which is evident in the rest of India, and in some other more forward States. That period was a formative period for Hyderabad politics and was devoted to preparing the ground for political

awakening. The Government which was semi-feudal took stern measures and adopted a policy of total suppression of all popular movements. While the comparatively more leftist section led by Swamiji and others reacted in one manner, he rightist section preferred another method of approach. .While the Government adopted the policy of suppression and negotiation simultaneously, the popular leaders also adopted a double policy of agitation and negotiation. Thus the work of all sections of the people engaged in the freedom struggle culminated in the Police Action which finally led to the liberation of Hyderabad.

The State Congress in Hyderabad was under continuous ban for a number of years and it was only in 1947 or so that the State Congress was able to meet in a plenary session after eight years of unlawful existence. The lifting of the ban imposed eight years ago was the first victory of the freedom struggle in Hyderabad. Naturally the continued ban on the people's movement agitated the minds of the political leaders of India also and there was continuous correspondence and agitation for lifting the ban and for allowing the democratic forces in Hyderabad to function in a normal manner. The then Government of Hyderabad was bent on completely divorcing the State Congress from the parent body in the rest of India, and in fact one of the main conditions suggested by the Government of Hyderabad for lifting the ban was that the State Congress should change its name and adopt some other nomenclature. Though this had some importance, still the main struggle was for conceding the substance of freedom to the State Congress so that it could function in an effective manner. As late as March 1946 Pandit Nehru had written in a private letter to Sri Krishnacharya Joshi that the question of the name was not important and that what was really important was that full freedom of organisation and activity should be recognised and admitted. Thus this agitation for lifting the ban went on and it was not till after eight years of unlawful existence that the ban was formally lifted.

The six months after the lifting of the ban was a period of great importance in the freedom struggle. Swami Ramanand Teerth played a prominent part in this. The Swamiji came from a middle class family and started his life as a teacher in a private school at Hipperga

in the Osmanabad district and in Mominabad in the Bhir district. He was not a wealthy person and neither did he have any high social status. He was a staunch Congressman having implicit faith in Gandhian philosophy. He courted arrest in 1931 along with others and was the only man who was selected by Mahatma Gandhi during the individual Satyagraha to court arrest in 1941. During the "Quit India" movement, he came to Hyderabad and was immediately arrested and put in jail where he languished for two years and came out only in 1944. Pandit Nehru, the President of the Indian National Congress, with a view to revive the activities of the State Congress by defying the ban nominated Swami Ramanand Teerth as the President of the Provincial Executive with seven members.

The Government of Hyderabad lifted the ban on the State Congress in July 1946 and Swamiji very promptly began to mobilise the people for the freedom struggle. Progressive political workers, students, youths all rallied round him. The three regional conferences readily resolved to merge with the State Congress. Enrolment of members was taken on hand and Swamij was elected as the President of the first session of the Hyderabad State Congress. In his presidential address at the first session of the State Congress, Swamiji made it clear that the people of Hyderabad stood for union and integration with India and that the Princes had to join the Indian Union through the Constituent Assembly. In a reasoned and eloquent address he examined the question of the possibility of Hyderabad remaining independent and came to the conclusion that both from the point of view of economic stability and defence an isolated Hyderabad was impossible. He put his demands in a nutshell that the Hyderabad Government should immediately join Free India and participate in the Constituent Assembly and that it should install an interim Government and confer full civil liberties.

The plenary session had authorised the Working Committee to take necessary steps to implement the resolution and it also empowered the Working Committee to guide and conduct the movement to achieve its objectives. The Working Committee reviewed the situation and after discussing the organisational aspect of the impending struggle, appointed Sri M. Ramachandra Rao, Govinda Dass Shroff and Dr. Melkote to be in charge of

Andhra, Maharastra and Hyderabad-Secunderabad areas. A Committee of Action of five persons with Sri D.G. Bindu as Chairman was formed to explore the possibilities of the struggle on the basis of the discussion by the Working Committee. It was also decided to start a Central Co-ordinating and Publicity Office at Bombay.

Shri M. Ramachandra Rao visited Madras where he was promised full support. He then visited Bezwada and held discussions with Prof. N. G. Ranga, Sri A. Kaleswara Rao and others. The Andhra Provincial Congress had appointed a sub-committee for Hyderabad and later organised a "Hyderabad Day" on its behalf. The publicity office for Andhra was also kept in the Andhra Provincial Congress Committee's building.

Similar tours were undertaken by Swami Ramanand Teerth and others in the Central Provinces, Maharashtra and Bihar. Sri Pranesacharya, the General Secretary, visited the Karnataka parts.

From the first week of July 1947, group meetings were organised in several localities of Hyderabad and Secunderabad. Large meetings of students were held and addressed by Dr. Melkote and Swamiji. The Government started its policy of slow arrests and placing restrictions on civil liberties. On 26th and 27th of July Sri Krishna Dubey and Jagannatha Rao Bandapurkar were arrested. Pandit Narendraji, Kamtikar and three of his colleagues were arrested on 30th July. This created popular resentment and a procession taken out by students was lathi-charged by the police.

The Working Committee of the Hyderabad State Congress decided to launch a struggle on 7th of July throughout the State by observing the " Join Indian Union " day. The Government of Hyderabad on the other hand was carefully following the march of events and was carrying on negotiations with the Government of India on the one hand to maintain an independent state for Hyderabad and on the other was waiting for the zero hour when British paramountcy would legally lapse and Hyderabad would become legally independent. An elaborate programme of the day was prepared and people were asked

to observe the day by defying the laws prohibiting the meetings. Swamiji issued the following appeal :

" As a last resort, I had demanded that the issue of Hyderabad joining the Indian Union should be decided by a referendum. The Government have not cared even to think of it. It is therefore high time that we go ahead with our own programme. It is that of asserting our will and expressing our dissociation with a policy pursued by the Government in a non-violent manner. I therefore call upon the people of the Hyderabad State to observe 7th August, 1947 as " Join Indian Union " day. On this day there should be peaceful hartal, labourers in the factories should stop work, students should abstain from schools and colleges etc. etc."

The function on the 7th August was observed at many places and was a tremendous success. Swami Ramanand Teerth, President of the State Congress, and Sri Krishnacharya Joshi, member of the Working Committee, defied the laws and were arrested and released afterwards. Sri Kesava Rao, President of the Andhra Provincial Congress, was arrested while Sri Mukundarao Pedgaonkar, President of the Maharashtra Provincial Congress, was not arrested. At Aurangabad, Sri Manikchand Pahade, a prominent member of the Working Committee, was not only arrested but was also belaboured and beaten severely.

A large section of the student population joined this. Hundreds of students were arrested in Gowliguda and were immediately convicted and sentenced on the spot for one month and for fifteen days.

The tension mounted as the 15th of August drew nearer. The people were anxious that Hyderabad should become an integral part of India on that day. Swami Ramanand Teerth had given the call that the people should defy all bans and should continue the agitation. He appealed to the population to hoist the Indian National Flag and observe Independence Day on 15th August 1947. His appeal ran as follows :—

" Observe Independence Day. We in Hyderabad cannot share the joy with the rest of our fellow countrymen who are our own citizens of Independent Democratic India. We still continue to suffer under autocratic rule.

All the same we share the same sentiments and hail the dawn of Indian Independence. As an expression of this sentiment, we will hoist the Indian National Flag in large gatherings and also individually. We will offer our respectful allegiance to it. We refuse to be slaves. The Hyderabad State Congress has now given the call. It is the duty of each of its constituents to respond to it. I call upon every patriotic soul, man or woman, to do all that he or she is capable of at this juncture, when the destiny of one crore and sixty-three lakhs is at stake. We will not subject ourselves to an autocratic regime. We will see that Responsible Government is established in Hyderabad and it joins the Indian Union."

The climax of the struggle came on the 14th and the 15th of August. The Government of Hyderabad was preparing for a general suppression of all people who wanted to join India. The ceremonious hoisting of the Union flag was banned and the State Congress issued a bulletin resenting it as follows :—

" The Nizam declared his independence and through a notification of August 13 has banned the ceremonial hoisting of the Union flag. This was a challenge to the people of Hyderabad, a challenge to our national honour." Swami Ramanand Teerth issued a statement condemning the above order and announcing the determination of the people to accept and meet the above challenge.

Big demonstrations were held on 15th of August. The orders of the Nizam's Government were strongly resented by the people who resisted the efforts of the police by openly hoisting the Indian National Flag and hoisting it in public places and by ceremoniously organising processions and meetings on 15th of August. Lathi charges and firing were resorted to by the police at many places. Arrests were made on a mass scale. Swami Ramanand Teerth, President of the State Congress, along with Dr. Melkote and Sri Krishnacharya Joshi and others were arrested. On the 15th of August, Swamiji anticipating that he and his colleagues would be arrested and prevented from celebrating the Indian Independence Day had nominated Sri Motilal Mantri to celebrate it on 15th of August morning at 10 a.m., in case he was arrested.

The response of the people was immense. Illiterate Kisans came out to honour the Indian flag at the risk of severe punishment and arrest. The Union flag was hailed by the people as a symbol of all their cherished objectives for which the people of Hyderabad had laboured for so long. Women also took a leading part in this. Srimati Yashoda Bai and Brij Rani were arrested on the 15th and 16th of August for hoisting the Indian flag. After this, three or four batches of women followed up and led the campaign. Srimati Vimalabai Melkote, wife of Dr. Melkote, Srimati Gyanakumari Heda, along with Usha Pangrikar, Ahalya Bai and others broke the curfew and faced lathi charge and tear gas. Srimati Lakshmi and Radhabai Deshmukh hoisted the Indian flag at Itakalambi. The struggle continued remorselessly till a Standstill Agreement was signed and some prominent leaders were released on the 30th of November 1947. However, Hyderabad was still not free, and the struggle had to be continued for a year more, till finally Police Action restored civil liberties to the people of Hyderabad.

CHAPTER XXV

CONCLUSION

When India attained freedom on 15th of August, 1947 the Indian States had acceded to the Indian Union and Hyderabad was carrying on negotiations but was obliged to sign the Standstill Agreement on 29th November, 1947 after which K. M. Munshi was appointed as Agent-General in Hyderabad. This was the period when the visions of all the people in power were dimmed with imprudence and ambition. All the well-wishers of the Nizam saw facts which the Nizam and his misguided advisers could not see. The force of events and strategy was inevitable yet who knows what other turn destiny might have taken.

Sir Mirza who had great regard for Hyderabad and the Nizam had become deeply anxious at the deterioration of the Nizam's rule in Hyderabad and he considered it to be his duty to rush to the assistance of the Nizam to save the situation as much as possible.

Sir Mirza wrote a letter to the Nizam on the 1st of May, 1948. He stated in the letter very emphatically but politely that the Nizam should invite Lord Mountbatten to pay a visit to Hyderabad when there could be fruitful discussion as to what steps Hyderabad should take to derive maximum benefit out of the present crisis. Sir Mirza added that as his heart was over-burdened with gratitude towards the Nizam, he had emboldened himself to write so. Sir Mirza said that Mountbatten was well disposed towards the Nizam and he also knew that the position of the Nizam among the Indian States was unique. Sir Mirza had further written that the attitude of the Governor-General towards "Accession" and "Responsible Government" was reasonable. Invitation from the Nizam would strengthen his hands.

The Nizam wrote to Lord Mountbatten extending invitation but the Governor-General expressed his inability. Sir Mirza Ismail wrote to the Governor-General but it was of no avail.

On the suggestion of His Exalted Highness the Nizam, Sir Mirza Ismail proceeded to New Delhi and met V. P. Menon, Sri Vallabhbhai Patel and the new Governor-General C. Rajagopalachari to carry on negotiations on behalf of the Nizam, unofficially, and in a friendly manner. But Laik Ali and his cabinet were annoyed at this. On 26th of July, 1948 Sir Mirza had heard from the All India Radio that Hyderabad proposed to plead its case before the United Nations at Lake Success. Resort to such an unwise step on the part of Mir Laik Ali sowed impediments in the course of Sir Mirza Ismail. Sir Mirza conveyed his request to Laik Ali to go to New Delhi and accept the terms. But this could not be. Zain Yar Jung was sent to Hyderabad to explain the details and to persuade the Nizam to sign the agreement. But even this step proved of no use. In the meanwhile, the Nizam sent a telegram asking Mirza Ismail to come to Hyderabad and discuss matters personally with him. But Mirza did not like to take the risk of going to Hyderabad and so pleaded his inability very emphatically and politely. The Nizam sent a telegram to the Governor-General requesting him to help him to bring about a peaceful and honourable settlement between the two Governments. C. Rajagopalachari wrote the following persuasive letter to the Nizam on the 31st August, 1948 :—

"I thank your Exalted Highness for your telegram acknowledging due receipt of His Majesty the King's letter sent by me from Bangalore. I write this after returning to Delhi. I need not assure you that I am entirely in favour of a peaceful settlement of all conflicts wherever they may arise. I have therefore been greatly distressed by the course of developments in Hyderabad and repeated failures of attempts to bring about a peaceful settlement. It is for my Government to deal with this, as well as other matters But I would have no hesitation to do all in my power to help a peaceful settlement.

The most urgent phase of the problem as I see it, and as I know my Government sees it, is the state of insecurity and alarm that prevails. That is the urgent issue. Allowing for exaggeration, there is no doubt that unrestrained activities of private armies, allowed to be armed with weapons and enjoying the support of official

authorities, have created a state of terror for the vast majority of the people in Hyderabad and on the borders thereof. There has rapidly grown a feeling of utter insecurity among all classes of people and a demand for intervention by the Indian Union. It is morally impossible for the people of India to ignore the conditions prevailing in Hyderabad and affecting its people as well as endangering the peace of South India. It is not possible to allow the sense of terror and insecurity to continue. Disturbances of civil economy consequent on this movement of migration of people, breakdown of trade, commerce and communications that have followed, with a necessary corollary of insecurity of life and honour and property are intolerable in view of the position of Hyderabad, right in the centre of India.

It appears to me clear, and it must be equally clear to Your Exalted Highness, that to allow this to go on will spell ruin. It is important to remember in the confusing context of today that there is no conflict between the interests of the people of India and the people of Hyderabad. In the present as well as in the future the interests of all concerned are common, and the Government of India have repeatedly given assurances that in any political solution Your Exalted Highness's prestige and position will be safeguarded. I would request Your Exalted Highness to ponder over the situation and to do something courageous and wise to terminate the state of alarm and insecurity and to restore full confidence and normal conditions of life and business. There is no loss of dignity involved in doing what the happiness of the people demands.

In order effectively to terminate the state of alarm which has made public opinion so clamorous for armed intervention and to restore general confidence, I would endorse the suggestion reported to have been made for this purpose by Sir Mirza Ismail who came here on Your Exalted Highness's encouragement and on your behalf. He is a statesman of wide experience and balanced judgement, with intimate knowledge of affairs relating to Hyderabad, and what is more, he is as concerned in the welfare of Your Exalted Highness as in the welfare of the people of this land, including Hyderabad. Your Exalted Highness should ban Razakars, and, as Sir Mirza Ismail advised, invite the reposting of adequate

military forces of the Government of India in Secunderabad, so that there should be no doubt in the public mind in Hyderabad and outside as to the security of person and property, and the basis for friendship may be laid. This should be entirely on Your Exalted Highness's own initiative. I see no other effective way of restoring security and confidence. The steps which you have recently taken serve only to add to the irritation of previous dilatory procedure, without bringing in substantial good. What is required is speedy decision and friendly trust, and not controversy and delay"

This letter is purely personal and from one whom it has pleased Your Exalted Highness to trust as a true friend. The happiness of our people is within easy reach. May God guide us both."

In response to this, the Nizam replied in his usual strain as is clear from the folllowing sentences from his letter :—

"It appears from your letter that a very wrong impression of insecurity of life, honour and property in Hyderabad prevails at your end. I presume it is the result of persistent false propaganda of certain parties and persons with the object of other than agreement between the Indian Union and Hyderabad."

An eminent statesman like Sir Mirza Ismail has made the following observations on the whole situation with his mind weighed with all sympathy and veneration for His Exalted Highness the Nizam :—

"It was obvious that the Nizam was more or less a prisoner in his palace, and unable to act independently in accordance with his own better judgement. I felt that the only way of getting him out of the clutches of Razvi and his satellites, who included some of the Ministers, was to get the Indian troops back in Secunderabad. But the Nizam would not, or (more probably) could not, ask for them. When I made this suggestion, he expressed surprise that I should ask him to look to the Indian army for protection, as if he could not rely upon his own army for this. My answer was 'Alas, that is only too true.'

In a heterogeneous country like India, with its diverse castes and creeds and races, safety lies in a

judicious "mixture" of all the elements—whether in the army, in the police, in the civil or judicial service, in the municipalities, in the legislature or in the Cabinet—no particular caste or community or region being allowed to have too preponderant a representation or influence. That way lies both safety and contentment—a rare instance of justice and expediency going together. It was for this reason that I wanted to dilute the Hyderabad army which was composed entirely of Muslims, with at least 25 per cent of Hindus. So also the police force, with British officers at the head of both. If this had been done, the Muslim oligarchy would not have lost their heads and run amok as they did."

It was unfortunate that the Nizam could not see which way lay his own interest and the interest of the people of his own State. It was also unfortunate that a communal group should have come to have a dominating voice in the Government of the State. The disruption of orderly life in the State due to the activities of the Razakars, and the more or less complete breakdown of the law and order situation in the various parts of the State, had their repercussions on the conditions of the border States like Bombay, Madras etc. The Government of India could not look on helplessly on these events. Reason and good sense did not prevail with the Nizam. Rather the communal group in Hyderabad that had assumed a dominating voice, would not allow him to act according to his choice. The result was complete anarchy in the State and the necessity for the Police Action which finally ended the internal troubles in Hyderabad in 1948.

Hyderabad then followed the rest of India and became literally and fully free.

INDEX TO PERSONS

A

Abdul Ali, 28.

Abdul Hameed Khan, 241.

Abdul Haq, Dr., 84.

Abdul Kareem, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58.

Abdul Razak Dindar, 241.

Abdullah Khan, 85.

Abdullah Yusuf Ali, 19.

Abul Hasan Syed Ali, 240.

Acharya Ramadev, 89.

Adavirao, 129.

Ahmad Mohiuddin, 85.

Akbar Ali, 41.

Akbar Ali Khan, Mir Nawab, 240.

Akbar Hydari, Sir, 84,99,101,102,109,110, 112, 114, 115, 131, 138, 139, 144, 151, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 177, 180, 182, 183, 191, 197, 198.

Alexander, A.V., Sir, 258.

Ali Imam, Sir, 1, 3, 5, 16, 18, 19, 31,53, 278.

Ali Yavar Jung, Nawab Bahadur, 110, 128, 139, 140, 141, 142, 151, 206, 207, 208, 258.

Amir Ali Khan, 239.

Amrit Rao, 22.

Amulchander, 240.

Anand Krishna Waghmare, 120.

Anand Rao Waghmare, 86, 120, 121, 122, 123.

Annand Swamy, Mahatma, 92, 98.

Anant Govind Kulkarni, 158.

Anant Rao Jayawant Rao Deshmukh, 157.

Anant Rao Kulkarni, 120.

Andhori Nivritti Reddy, 92.

Anna Rao Gynamukhi, 127, 245.

Appaiah Sastry, Chivukula, 80.

Appa Rao Shelkar, 151, 152.

Aravamudu Iyengar Dewan, Bahadur, 181.

Arthur Lothian, Sir, 285, 288.

Asaf Jahi, 30, 59, 65, 180, 183, 185, 187, 146, 187, 193, 198, 278.

Asghar, Mohammad, Barrister, 38, 40.

Askari Hasan, 88.

Aswatha Rao, 245.

Azhar Hussain, 183, 184, 188, 191.

B

Babu Rao, 289.

Badruddin, 267.

Badrul Hasan, 21, 23, 24.

Baji Rao, 84.

Balagovindadas, 25.

Balakrishna Reddy, 83.

Balaprashad, 21.

Balaraj, S.K., 157.

Balmukund Sahib Rai, 54.

Balraj Bhagwan, 241.

Balwanta Rao, Galgale, 120.

Bankim Chandra Chatterjee, 109, 110.

Bansilal, 89, 90, 98.

Bapi Raju, Adavi, 81.

Baswantha Rao, 127, 157, 194.

Bedap, R.V., 268.

Benton, 82.

Bhadradev, 96.

Bhagya Reddy, 79, 80.

Bharucha, 144.

Bhaskar, 79.

Bheem Kale, 157.

Bhim Rao, 21.

Bhopatkar, L.B., 63, 65.

Bhujanga Rao, 21.

Bhulabhai Desai, 90, 159.

Bipinchandra Pal, 15.

Brahamachari, 129.

Brij Rani, 285.

Brija Behari Tanakkuli, 90.

Buchiah Linga Shastri, 79.

Butler, 286.

Chandra Bhan, 89, 97.
Chandrappa, 241.
Chandu Lal, 89.
Chari, B.R., 81.
Chelmsford, Lord, 4, 29, 82, 84, 86, 87, (Montagu) 68, 200, 286.
Chintamani Sadhu, Maharaj, 241.
Choudhary, 240.
Chuniram Motilal, 171.
Churchill, Sir, 219, 245.
Claude Gidney, Sir, 282.
Crofton, R.M. 111.

D

Dadabhoy Nowroji, 7.
Dalmia, 171, 174.
Damodar, 241.
Dass, Deshabandhu, 15, 58, 95.
Dass, D.R., 98.
Dattatreya Prasad, 92, 95, 97.
Dattatreya Rao, 94.
Dattatreya Sharma, 80.
Datto Appaji Tuljapurkar, 59.
Dattopant Tuljapurkar, 64.
Dayanand Saraswathi, Swami, 87.
Desai, V.S., 157.
Deshpande, Dr., 129, 240.
Devdass, 117.
Devi Sinha, 91.
Dharma Prakash, 91.
Dhirendra Shastri, Raja Guru, 92.
Digambardass Choudari, Pandit, 24, 38, 56.
Digambar Rao, 117.
Digambar Rao, Bindu, 121, 123, 157, 170, (Bindu, D.G.) 245, 282.
Digambar Rao, Latkar, 92, 98.
Digambar Shankar Rao, 157.
Digambar Rao, Shivangirkar 92.
Duryanendra, 92.
Dwarakanath Mishra, 110.

E

Eknath Maharaj, 64.
Eshwarayya, 268.

F

Faridoon Mulk, Sir, 9.
Fathaulla Khan, 245.

G

Ganapat Kashinath Shastry, 95.
Ganapathi Sharma, 157.
Gandhiji, Mahatma, 8, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, (Mahatmaji) 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 38, 39, 40, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 111, 116, 117, 128, 131, 144, 156, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 168, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 174, 177, 178, 191, 219, 220, 221, 222, 228, 239, 242, 249, 252, 253, 270, 274, 275, 281.
Ganeriwal, L, 245.
Gangadhar Krishna Khanaya, 242.
Gangaram, 94, 97.
Ganpathlal, 245.
Ganpat Rao Kathle, 92.
Ganpat Rao, 94.
Ganpatrao, Kumaraj, 106.
Ganpat Rao, Waghamare, 242.
Ghanashyam Singh Gupta, 94.
Ghous-ud-Din, 24.
Giri Rao, 26.
Goad, L.B., Mr, 16, 17, 19.
Gopal Rao, 157.
Gopalrao Kalyani, 98.
Gopal Sastry Dev, 158.
Govinda Pershad, Bahadur, Raja, 23.
Govinda Rao Nanal, 120, 149, 150.
Govindlal Pitti, 97.
Govind Naik, 98.
Govind Das Shroff, 122, 123, 240, 281.
Govind Rao Ghare Patil, 120.
Grigson, 212.
Gunde Rao, Almekar, 120, 157.
Gyanachandraji, Prof., 26.

H

Hafiz Wajiuddin, 89.
Haji Hyder, 89.
Hameed Ali Khan, 241.
Hanumantha Rao, 240.
Hanumantha Rao, Dhed, 242.
Hanumantha Rao, Kakkeri, 128, 245.
Hanumantha Rao Laxman Rao, 156.
Hanumantha Rao, Madapati, 23, 43, 44. 46, 49, 53, 54, 80, 83, 131, 140, 141, 142, 279.
Harilal Waghray, 245.
Harischander Heda, 267.
Hazarat Ayub Ansari, 42.
Heda, Mrs, Gyanakumari, 240, 285.
Hiralal Pandey, 96.
Hollins, 160, 162, 163, 165.
Hosh Bilgrami, 272, 278.
Humayun Mirza, 88.

J

Jaffer Hussain, 24, 25.
Jagannatha Rao, Bandapurkar, 282.
Jagirdar, 129.
Jaisoorya Naidu, Dr. 24, 111, 153.
Jamil Ahmad Saheb, 41.
Jamnalal Bajaj, Seth, 141, 168, 169, 172, 178, 174, 175, 178, 179, 180.
Janardana Rao Desai, 126, 127, 129, 139, 140, 142, 149, 150, 160, 245.
Jayaprakash Narayan, 266, 267, 268, 269, 271.
Jayaramkrishna Reddy, 83.
Jhoomarlal Gandhi 240.
Jinnah, Mohammad Ali, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 222, 223, 258, 272, 273.
Joshi, E.V., 157.
Joshi, P.V., 139.
Joshi, Y.D., 116.
Joshi, Krishnacharya, 280, 283, 284.

K

Kaleswara Rao, A, 282.
Kale, Y.M., 59, 63, 72.
Kamtikar, 156, 282.
Kanakaprasada, Gupta, 157.
Karam Singh, 116.
Karmavir, 98.
Kashinath Rao, Vaidya, 55, 111, 120, 121, 122, 123, 130, 131, 140, 141, 142, 158, 159, 160, 163, 183, 184, 186, 188, 189, 190, 191, 199, 206, 213, 214, 245, 274, 279.
Kazi Abdul Gaffar, 85.
Kedar, 110, 112.
Kelkar, N.C., 63, 65, 67.
Kesav Rao, 279, 283.
Keshav Rao, Koratkar, Pandit, 21, 23, 25, 38, 42, 47, 80, 83, 88, 89, 93.
Keshav Rao Jamalapuram, 52.
Keshav Rao, Shrikhande,129.
Khushal Chand 92, 162.
Kishen Pershad, Maharajah, Sir, 85, 120, 172.
Kishen Sadashiv, 241.
Konda Reddy, 157.
Koteswara Rao, M, 49.
Kripalani, Acharya, 169.
Krishna Dutt, 97.
Krishna Rao, P, 89, 126, 129.
Kshitish Chandra, Vedalankar, 97.
Kulkarni, M.H., 157.
Kumar Chandrakaran Sarda, 91.

L

Lachmayya, Devgiri, 117.
Laik Ali, 287.
Lajpat Rai, Lala, 15.
Lakshman Appaji Wanjari, 157.
Lakshman Sharma, Chidire, 47.
Lakshman Rao, Waluskar, 83, 122.
Lakshmi Narasimha Rao, Gandham, 22.
Lakshminarayan, 21.

Lala Deshabandhu Gupta, 93.
Lalji Meghji, 21.
Laxminarayana Rao, Vutukuru, 46.
Linlithgow, Lord, 224.
Lloyd George, Lord, 29.

M

Madanmohan, 98.
Madhav Rao, Aney, 54, 63.
Madhava Rao, Bhokar, 241.
Mahadev, Burugu, 266.
Mahadev Singh, B.S. 266.
Mallar Vasudev Dhotrikar, 157.
Mallikarjun, 241.
Mangaladèv, 88.
Manick Rao, 116.
Manikappa, 241.
Manikchand, Pahade, 283.
Manohar Gurudev, 241.
Maulvi Mazarul Hassan Gilani, 106, 107.
Mehdi Yar Jung, 84, 99, 101, 102, 110, 112, 114.
Melkote, Mrs, 240.
Melkote, Dr, 246, 281, 282, 284, 285.
Menon, V.P. 287.
Mir Mahboob Ali Khan, 59.
Mirza Ismail, Sir, 97, 214, 216, 217, 258, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 286, 287, 288, 289.
Mohammad Ali, 19, 24, 25, 26.
Mohammad Asghar, 25.
Mohammad Hussain, 88.
Mohammad Hussain, Effandi, Dr., 41, 42.
Mohammad Mahboob Hussain, 89.
Mohammad Murtaza, 88.
Mohammad Vali Hasan, 289.
Mohana Reddy, 156.
Mohanlal Krishna Dutt, 98.
Mohan Singh Lodha, 24.
Moin Nawaz Jung, Nawab, 206.
Motilal Mantri, 284.
Moulana Abul Kalam Azad, 159, 174.
Moulavi Fasiuddin, 88.
Moulavi Jaun Mohammad, 89.
Mounttbatten, Lord, 271, 286.
Mukundarao Pedgaonkar, 283.
Mukunda Reddy, 157.
Munnalal, 240.
Munshi, K.M., 98, 286.
Murlidhara Rao, K.V., 157.
Murtuza Shah, 42.
Mustafa Ali Beg, 39.

N

Nagaiah, 241.
Naidu, C.K., 116.
Naidu, M.G., Dr., 24.
Narahari Rao, Bhoomkar, 157.
Narasaiah, D. 157.
Narasa Reddy, 47.
Narasimha Gupta, 157.
Narasimham, Kallur, 157.
Narasimha Rao, Shahnavis, 78, 79, 98.
Narasimha Reddy, L, 156.
Narasing Rao, M, 88, 50, 83, 84, 85, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 159, 160, 206, 245.
Narayan Appa Patwari, Chittarpur, 25.
Narayana Reddi, Ravi, 51, 52, 149, 150, 194, 245.
Narayanaswamy, Mahatma, 88, 89, 91, 160, 161, 162.
Narayanlal Pitti, Raja, 96.
Narayana Rao, M, 47, 98.
Narender Pershad, Saksena, 90, 266, 267.
Narendra Dutt, 129.
Narendraji, Pandit, 94, 95, 96, 97, 282.
Narsimha Sahu, Nerla, 22.
Nehru, Jawaharlal, Pandit, 67, 111, 112, (Panditji) 173, 195, 214, 215, 216, 217, 271, 275, 280, 281.
ehru, Motilal, 131.

Nizam, 1, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 45, 49, 54, 56, 58, 59, 61, 62, 67, 68, 71, 72, 73, 84, 85, 86, 89, 90, 92, 93, 97, 98, 103, 104, 108, 125, 126, 130, 133, 135, 136, 143, 145, 146, 154, 155, 161, 162, 163, 173, 175, 184, 191, 192, 193, 194, 196, 198, 202, 204, 211, 212, 214, 218, 222, 230, 233, 235, 238, 242, 245, 255, 261, 265, 268, 270, 271, 272, 273, 276, 277, 278, 284, 286, 287, 289, 290.

P

Padmaja Naidu, 22, 240, 242, 275.
Pannalal Pitti, Raja, 144.
Paranjape, Baba Saheb, 58.
Patki, V.N. 157.
Patny, M.R. 245.
Phatak, L.B., 83, 84, 240.
Pickthall, 82, 83.
Pillay, R.V., 21.
Praneshacharya, 127, 282.
Prasanna Kumar, 243.
Prashanta Kumar, 98.
Pratapa Reddy, Suravaram, 46, 80, 88.

Q

Qazi Mohammed Hussain, 108, 114.
Quadar Hussain Khan, Prof., 82, 83.
Quershi, Dr., 114.

R

Radhabai Deshmukh, 285.
Radhakrishna, 93.
Raghava Ranga Rao, 78.
Raghavender, S, 151.
Raghavendra Rao, 41, 42, 268.
Raghavendra Rao Pandit, Sharma, 22, 23, 25, 33, 53, 54, 63, 64, 66, 83, 121.
Raghavendra Rao Shrinivas Rao, 152.
Rahmat Yar Jung, Bahadur, Nawab, 151, 240, 241.
Rai Bisesharnath, 28, 53, 54.
Rai Ratanchand, 33.
Rai Sarat Chandjee, 96.
Rajagopalachari, C, 111, 115, 174, 287.
Rajagopal Mudaliar. 81.
Rajagopala Reddy, Raja, 43.
Rajalingaradhya, Kadimailla, 79.
Raja Reddy, 151, 152, 157.
Rajendraprasad, Babu, 174.
Rajpal Shamsundar, 98.
Ramachandra Dehlavi, Pandit. 88, 89.
Ramachandra Gouda, 157.
Ramachandra Naik, 25, 74, 76, 130.
Ramachandra Rao, 25.
Ramachandra Rao, Laturkar, 98.
Ramachandra Rao, M, 51, 158, 245, 281, 282.
Ramachandrarao, Nandapurkar, 156.
Ramachandra Rao, Vandemataram, 92, 93, 98.
Ramachar, 201, 202, 203, 206, 210, 212, 215.
Ramachari, 128, 129, 242.
Ramachari, Pandit, G., 139, 140, 142, 197, 245.
Ramachari, M, 138.
Ramacharya Joshi, 129.
Ramakoteswara Rao, 51.
Ramakrishna Rao, Burugula, 47, 83, 139, 140, 142, 240, 242, 245, 267 268.
Ramanand Theerth, Swami, 120, 121, 127, 151, 152, 191, 192, 215, 267, 269, 274, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284.
Ramanuja Rao, Devulapalli, 80.
Rama Rao, 239, 245.
Rama Rao Vetharaju, Jadaganti, 46.
Ramareddy, G, 157.
Rama Saheb, Barsurur, 25.
Ramaswamy, 240.
Ramaswamy Iyer, C.P., 258.
Ramaswamy, T, 240.

Rambhau, 241.
Ramkishan, 25.
Ramkishan Dhoot, H, 139, 149, 150.
Ram Murthi, 267, 268.
Ram Singh Puroshotl am Singh, 157.
Ramulu, 117.
Ranade, 160.
Ranga, N.G., 282.
Ranganath, 22.
Ranganatham, Dr. S.E., 112, 114.
Ranga Rao, Pelbaraju, 157.
Ranga Rao, Tekmal, 43.
Ranga Reddy, R.V., 157.
Rao, N. K., 51, 157.
Ratilal, 240.
Ratna Reddy, 157.
Razvi, 206, 289.
Rushbrook Williams, Prof, 248.

S

Sarojini Devi, Naidu 24, 53, 54, 141, 169, 177, 178, 242.
Satyanarayana Sinha, 98.
Satyavati Devi, Rachamalla, 80.
Savarkar, 68, 111, 164.
Savidge, 206, 207.
Sayud-ul-Mulk (Nowab of Chattari), 197, 206, 214, 216, 218, 230, 231, 232, 258.
Seetaramachander Rao, Vediraju, 78.
Sen Gupta, A.C., 115.
Sesharao Waghmare, 98.
Shahabuddin, 239, 240, 241.
Shah Mirza Beg, Major, 19.
Shamlal, 89, 90, 91.
Sham Rao, Tadlimbekar, 157.
Shanker Rao Patil, 92.
Shanker Rao Srinivasa Rao, 157.
Sharma, 70.
Sharma, P.N., 80.
Shaukat Ali, 25, 26, 39, 40.
Shigurkar, K.S., 157.
Shivachandra, 95, 97.
Shoebulla Khan, 85.
Shridhar Naik, 46, 122, 245.
Shrikishan, 23.
Shriram, 240.
Siddiq Dindar, 88.
Sirajul Hasan Tirmizee, 74.
Sitaramakrishna Rao, Pappu, 241.
Sitaramayya, Pattabhi, 169, 173.
Sitaram Sharma, 157.
Sohanlal, 91.
Srecnivas Rao Borikar, 149, 150.
Srinivasa Rao, Hawaldar, 127, 157.
Srinivasa Rao, Kandi, 129.
Srinivasa Rao, Madnurkar, 129.
Srinivasdas, 25.
Srinivas Rao Sharma, 47, 121.
Srinivas Sharma, 78, 79.
Sriramulu, 156.
Stafford Cripps, Sir, 219, 221, 224, 226, 227, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 238, 258.
Subba Rao, Chilla, 81.
Subhash Chandra Bose, 63, 65, 110, 111, 112, 270.
Sudhakar, 163.
Sultan Ahmed, Sir, 171.
Swatantrananda, Swamy, 89.
Syed Abdul Latif, Dr., 81.
Syed Ahmadulla Huseni, 24.
Syed Alam, 245.
Syed Asadulla, 81.
Syed Hussain, Prof., 110.
Syed Mohiuddin Ali Khan, 38.
Syed Shah Habibulla, 38.

T

Taranath Rao, 22, 39, 40.
Thirmijee, 245.
Tilak, 16, 40.
Tirmal Rao, Gangavati, 129.
Trench, Sir, 82, 99, 101.
Trimbak Balabhvau Naik, 157.
Tuljapurkar, 279.

V

Vallabhbhai Patel, Sardar, 53, 159, 168, 169, 170, 174, 177, 178, 271, 287.
Vaman Naik, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 38, 42, 45, 46, 53, 54, 67, 80, 83, 117, 120, 279.
Vasant Rao, Deshmukh, 157.
Vasudeo Rao, 84.
Veda Prakash, 90.
Vedavrata, 92.
Veerabhadra Rao, 47, 98.
Veerabhadra Sharma, 80.
Venkata Bhujanga Rao, 47.
Venkataramacharyulu, D, 47.
Venkata Ramarao, 38, 47.
Venkatarama Reddy, 9, 19.
Venkataranga Rao, P, 47, 48.
Venkata Ranga Reddy, K, 50, 52, 120.
Venkata Rao, P, 112, 157.
Venkata Rao, Swami, 78.
Venkata Reddy, 158.
Venkatesh Joshi, 151.
Venkateswara Gupta, 47.
Vimalabai Melkote, 285.
Vinayak Appaji, 157.
Vinayak Rao, 89, 96, 97, 98, 111.
Vinayak Rao, Koratkar, 140.
Vinayak Rao, Vidyalankar, 88, 89, 92, 94, 95, 245.
Vinayak Kumar, 98.
Virabhadrudu, Prof., 108, 109.
Vishnunath, 22.
Vishwanath Govind, 240.
Vithal Rao, Deshpande, 120.

W

Walter Monckton, Sir, 258, 259, 264, 278.

Y

Yalla Reddy, B, 52, 157, 194.
Yoganand, Swami, 46.

Z

Zahid Hussain, 206, 207.
Zain Yar Jung, 287.
Zakir Hussain, Dr., 173.
Zulqader Jung, Nawab, 16, 18, 19, 89.

INDEX TO PLACE-NAMES.

A

Addikmet, 108.
Adilabad, 25.
Afghanistan, 244.
Afzal Gung, 269.
Ahmadnagar, 93.
Ahmadpur, 92, 94.
Ajanta, 59.
Akola, 74, 130.
Alampur, 49.
Aland, 94.
Aligarh, 24.
Allahabad, 62.
Alwandi, 157.
Amaravati, 98.
Annamalai, 114.
Arrah, 162.
Atraf Balda, 79, 157.
Aurangabad, 22, 24, 25, 38, 56, 61, 64, 86, 108, 118, 122, 123, 161, 170, 239, 240, 241, 242, 283.

B

Bangalore, 169, 277, 278, 287.
Bardoli, 158.
Baroda, 48, 255.
Baroncha, 25.
Barsi, 93, 98.
Basmath, 156.
Beed, 123.
Bellary, 57.
Benaras, 114.
Berar, 24, 54, 56, 58, 59, 60, 130, 227, 229, 230, 232, 278.
Bezwada, see under Vijayawada.
Bhir, 281.
Bhongir (Bhuvanagiri), 52, 156, 157.
Bhopal, 223, 255.
Bidar, 89, 91, 95, 108, 124, 127, 165, 166, 167, 168, 188, 189, 190, 214.
Bihar, 1, 5, 162, 166, 167, 243, 282.
Bijapur, 98.
Bombay, 7, 9, 21, 23, 24, 59, 63, 73, 86, 90, 130, 138, 169, 174, 175, 176, 180, 182, 266, 270, 290.
Buldhana, 98.

C

Calcutta, 7, 15, 163.
Chakur, 94.
Chanda, 25, 93.
Chikadpalli, 266
Chilkapur, 51.
Chincholi, 95.

D

Dacca, 144, 169.
Damargidda, 94.
Delhi, 90, 177, 214, 257.
Devarkonda, 47.
Dharmapur, 241.
Dhulpet (Dhoolpete) 90, 121, 124.

E

Ellora, 59.
Enugurthi, 78.

G

Gowliguda, 283.
Gulbarga, 88, 89, 53, 54, 58, 89, 90, 9 , 94, 95 96, 108, 126, 127, 128, 162, 206, 242.
Gunjoti, 90, 95.

H

Hadgaon, 242.
Halikhed, 89.
Hanumakonda, 43.
Hardwar, 88.
Haripura, 182, 220, 221.
Hingoli, 95.
Hipperga, 120, 280.
Humnabad-Manik Nagar, 90.
Humnabad, 95.
Huzurabad, 44.
Hyderabad, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 21, 23, 24, 28, 29, 30, 36, 38, 39, 40, 44, 47, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 78, 79, 81, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 94, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 112, 120, 121, 122, 124, 126, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 160, 161, 162, 163, 165, 167, 168, 169, 170, 172, 173, 174, 175, 179, 180, 182, 183, 184, 186, 188, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 210, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 226, 227, 228, 230, 231, 232, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 245, 246, 247, 248, 255, 258, 261, 262, 265, 266, 267, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290.

J

Jaipur, 221, 258, 272.
Jalianwalabag, 1.
Jalna, 61, 97, 241.
Jangaon, 38.
Jogipet, 46, 95.

K

Kachiguda, 102.
Kakinada, 53, 54, 56, 57, 63, 180.
Kalam, 92.
Kandi, 52.
Kangdi, 88.
Karimnagar, 22, 38, 49, 157
Kashmir, 201.
Khairpur, 255.
Khammam, 44, 48, 52, 157.
Kodangal, 49.
Koppal, 157.
Kushtagi, 242.

L

Latur, 121, 123.

M

Madhira, 44, 47.
Madikonda, 52.
Madras, 22, 40, 53, 67, 81, 111, 112, 114, 180, 175, 282, 290.
Mahaboobnagar, 18, 20, 39, 49, 78, 108, 158.
Malakapur, 51, 52.
Manmad, 93, 183.
Manvi, 242.
Masulipatam, 227, 229.
Medak, 38.
Mominabad, 120, 241, 281.
Musheerabad, 269.
Muzzafarpur, 167.
Mysore, 79, 130, 170, 201, 204, 205, 221, 255, 272.

N

Nagar Kurnool, 95.
Nagpur, 15, 53, 93, 109, 110, 112, 114, 115, 180.
Nalgonda, 44, 78, 96.
Nanded, 7, 94, 108, 122, 124, 164, 241, 242.

Narayanpeth, 96.
Nawanagar, 254.
New Delhi, 162, 169, 231, 264, 265, 271, 287.
Nizamabad, 50, 93, 95, 96.

O

Orissa, 1, 5.
Osmanabad, 25, 98, 121, 157, 239, 281.

P

Paithan, (Pattan) 22, 64, 84, 240.
Panchgani, 220.
Pandharpur, 98, 241.
Parbhani, 25, 108, 118, 120, 157, 239, 241, 242.
Parkal, 97.
Partur, 120.
Patiala, 255.
Patna, 102, 111.
Poona, 24, 63, 65, 67, 71, 89, 121, 180.
Puri, 3.
Pusad, 93.

R

Raichur, 22, 24, 38, 39, 40, 126, 127, 128, 242.
Rajkot, 161, 162, 163, 221.

S

Secunderabad, 7, 44, 53, 78, 79, 80, 81, 102, 182, 266, 267, 269, 282, 289.
Sevagram, 161.
Shadnagar, 50, 120.
Sholapur, 86, 91, 93, 98, 127, 159.
Simla 5, 85, 87.
Sirmoor, 255.
Suryapet, 44, 45.

T

Tarakheda, 95.
Travancore, 64, 201, 221, 258.
Tuljapur, 22.

U

Udgir, 89, 91, 95.
Umar, 23.
Umarkhed, 98.
Umerga, 90.
Umri, 94, 122, 241.

V

Vemanur, 22.
Vijayawada, 22, 93, 98, 282.

W

Wadi, 40.
Wardha, 110, 161, 166, 171, 174, 177, 178.
Warangal, 22, 25, 44, 47, 51, 52, 78, 79, 80, 97, 157, 242.

