

A LETTER TO THE MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

33, Palace Street, London, S.W.1.
January 30, 1920.

To the Rt. Honourable Earl Curzon of Kedleston.

My Lord,—I herewith submit a copy of my recent publication on the Turkish question:—"The Sword against Islam"—and take the liberty to beg your Lordship the favour of going through it, although I am fully aware how very valuable your time is. I claim to have been in touch with the Muslims of different parts of the world for the last fifteen or twenty years, and have represented their views frankly in this book as on other occasions before.

What is the state of feelings of Muslims of India your Lordship must have heard from the Rt. Honourable Mr. Montagu, whose statesmanlike and sympathetic attitude on the question is appreciated in India, but the British Press does not seem to realise the full significance of it. One paper went as far as to say:—

"Should Turkish sovereignty be extinguished in Europe there will be a great outcry among the Indian Mahomedans, but those who know them best consider that the excitement will end in talk."

Perhaps your Lordship will remember that what is suggested in the above quotation as regards the "fanatic and militant" Muslims was thought of the "mild and cowardly" Bengalees at the time of the partition of Bengal. But it proved that the excitement of the Bengalees instead of ending in talk resulted in the introduction of bombs and anarchy in India. There is no doubt that the excitement of the Muslims will end at least in the introduction of Bolshevism in India. THE FRENCH AND ITALIAN PAPERS HAVE NOT LEFT IT A SECRET THAT IT IS THE BRITISH FOREIGN OFFICE WHICH IS URGING THE EXPULSION OF THE CRESCENT OR ISLAM (BOTH ARE THE SAME AT PRESENT) FROM EUROPE—EVEN FROM MUSLIM THRACE, ADRIANOPE AND CONSTANTINOPE. Thus in the eyes of Muslims Great Britain will become the chief enemy of Islam as it is considered to be the chief enemy of the Bolsheviks, and a mutual community of interests will be created between Islam and Bolshevism.

Your Lordship is in a better position than many other British statesmen to gauge the intensity of the present Muslim feelings, and of the change that has taken place in their attitude towards Great Britain. As Viceroy of India your Lordship must have found Muslims extremely loyal and even subservient to the British officials. They, then, refused to make a common cause with their Hindu brothers. They kept themselves aloof from all political agitation, and even from the Indian National Congress. They started anti-congress movement. They hailed the partition of Bengal. They smashed up the Hindu boycott and Swadeshi movements. They sided with the I.C.S. men in supporting their claims and in opposing simultaneous examination. Their representatives in the Councils were always with the official members so much so that later on they opposed the late Mr. Gokhale's Bill for free and compulsory education, and supported such measures as the Press Act. In short, but a few years ago Muslims in India were en masse with the British and they paid no attention to one or two radical men they possessed.

What is the case now? Politically Muslims and Hindus have joined hands. There has been fraternisation even on the occasion of religious festivals of both communities respectively. Muslims freely attend the National Congress although they have their own political organisation—the All-India Muslim League—which holds its sessions at the same place as the Congress and passes almost identical resolutions. It is Muslims now who are mostly "extremists." It was the Muslims who proposed first to boycott the recent official Peace celebrations in India, and were joined by the Hindus later on. It is Muslim leaders who cheerfully court internment and imprisonment. It is Muslims who hold Khilafat days in every village and hamlet of India. The same Muslims who opposed boycott during your Lordship's Viceroyalty have now themselves appointed a Committee of leading Indians to formulate practical schemes for the boycott of British goods successfully and progressively and to stop co-operation with the British officials. Khilafat Committees have been organised all over India. The effectiveness of the Muslim organisations was tested and on proclaiming a day for strike even the Stock Exchange of Bombay had to be closed.

All this change, which certainly is more than mere talk, has taken place because of the threatening attitude of Great Britain against Turkey. The seed of hatred against the British is being steadily sown in the mind of Muslims, and foundations are being laid for new crusades and holy wars. The British Press is crying aloud that not even a handful of Christians should remain under the Muslim rule. This cry will naturally be re-echoed from the East and from the home of a solid mass of 82 million Muslims that no Muslim should live under Christian rule. The cry of Islamiah irredenta will pass from Mosque to Mosque. For the present Muslims are powerless from a military point of view. This is the more reason why they will seek the help of Bolshevism or any other Power which will help them in rehabilitating the position of Islam in Europe as in Asia. Whatever cloak may be put on it, the fact cannot be concealed from the Muslim eyes that the cry of turning out the Turks bag and baggage from Europe is prompted only by the inherent hatred against the religion which has been openly styled the "antagonistic faith," i.e., Islam. There can be no other reason for this threat of turning out the Turks from such places as have been admitted by Mr. Lloyd George himself to be their homelands—like Thrace (both Western and Eastern), Adrianople, Constantinople, Asia Minor, where admittedly Muslims preponderate. Adrianople and Constantinople both are now not only essentially Islamic towns, but they represent the culture and civilisation of Islam to-day as no other town in the world represents it. Muslim colleges, hospitals, Mosques, libraries, and other buildings and institutions abound in the Darulsaadat (the House of Bliss)—Constantinople—as nowhere else in the world. Unless a deliberate act of vandalism is meant to be carried out of destroying the centre of Islamic civilisation, neither Adrianople nor Constantinople should be touched at all. Under international or any other non-Muslim control they can no more remain the centre. That small portion of Europe which is now left to Islam is the point of contact between the East and West. The tendency of the age should be to harmonise the East and West—the peoples of different races, colours, religions, civilisations and cultures, and not to separate them. For this reason also Europe and Christendom should rise above bigotry and fanaticism and extend a helping hand to the Muslim Turk instead of treating them as outcasts, as they have done so far.

If the natural and rightful owners are ousted from Adrianople or Constantinople, these places are sure to become an apple of discord between the Balkan States as well as bigger Powers, even though for the time being they may be internationalised. Experiment has shown that internationalisation does not contribute much to the prosperity of any place.

In one of his recent speeches, Mr. Lloyd George said that because the Turks closed the Straits in the last war against France and England, therefore, they should no more be allowed to remain in charge. If once in four or five centuries the Turks went against France and England, how many times did they render help, from the same position, both to France and to England, and what guarantee can there be that any other State or States that are given the charge of the Straits may not go against France and England? France and England themselves may not remain friendly for ever. Looked at from any point of view, political or religious, the homelands of the Turks where Muslims admittedly preponderate, should not be disturbed. There is also a moral reason for respecting the homelands of the Turks. Your Lordship paid a compliment to the late Nizam of Hyderabad that he was a man of his words and would not go back upon them even if it cost him any loss. The King, in his message to India at the outbreak of the war, said: "Paramount regard for treaty faith and the pledged word of rulers and peoples is the common heritage of England and India." Mr. Lloyd George pledged his word on behalf of the whole Empire on January 5, 1918, that Great Britain had no aims "to deprive Turkey of its capital, or of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace, which are predominantly Turkish in race. . . . We do not challenge the maintenance of the Turkish Empire in the homelands of the Turkish race with its capital at Constantinople."

Nor were those homelands of the Turks—Thrace, Adrianople, Constantinople, and Asia Minor—challenged under the Armistice terms with Turkey. Why, then, are they challenged now? Is it because now Great Britain finds herself to be in a stronger military position and believes that she can dictate any terms she likes? Intoxicated by its mili-

tary power shall England—shall those British statesmen who have a personal gentlemanly instinct and even a legitimate pride in their honour, fail to redeem British words given out at a time of crisis when the prospects of the war were gloomy and when Muslims had to be placated?

In certain papers it has been said that those were not words of promise but only an offer. What difference can it make whether they were words of promise or of offer if they were not used simply to deceive the Turks or other Muslims? Either they were tokens of an honourable promise and a faithful description of the British war aims, or they were meant to be a most perfidious strategy or opportunism.

I would draw your Lordship's attention to the following words in this connection which are from a memorial presented to the Prime Minister under the joint signatures of responsible Englishmen, some of whom have held responsible civil and military positions in India, like Lord Amptill and Carmichael, Sir Francis Younghusband, Sir Theodore Morrison, Colonel Durand, Sir J. P. Hewett, etc., etc. :—

"This declaration is now widely known in India and there is little probability of its being forgotten. If you are unable to persuade the Powers at the Peace Conference to fulfil the pledges then given, we fear that the Mahomdians will consider it a breach of faith for which they will hold England responsible. No Indian administrator can contemplate this possibility with equanimity. Hitherto we had a reputation for good faith in India which has been one of the most valuable assets in the Empire. We cannot hope to retain it if we fail to keep our word upon a subject like this."

The Muslims should be assured that once the British Prime Minister declared that the war was not to deprive the Turks of Thrace, Constantinople, Asia Minor, once that he admitted these to be the homelands of the Turks and their right to live there undisturbed, and once that the Turks signed an armistice on that understanding and the Indian Muslims helped Great Britain on that assurance in the war against their brethren, now, even if the heavens were to fall and the earth were to move, England would refuse to be a party to any undertaking that would involve the breach of British good faith.

As regards the non-Turkish portions of the Muslim Empire, your Lordship knows that Islam does not recognise any racial and national boundaries. Syria, Mesopotamia, Hedjaz, all are peopled preponderantly by Arabs, who acknowledge the same faith as the Turks, and have the same culture and civilisation. Sharif Husain, although he revolted from the political sovereignty of the Turks, and Muslims of the world, therefore, consider him to be a rebel, he still recognises the Ottoman Sultan as the Khalifa. While Islam does not recognise the division of human brotherhood into nations, it forbids that any Muslim should hold any other Muslim individual or race under subjection against its will. If the Arabs desire to be autonomous, as Indians themselves desire, and if they have any quarrel with their Turkish brothers over that, it will be a duty of other Muslims assigned by the Quran itself to effect a reconciliation between the two, provided that the Khilafat of the Ottoman Sultan is not disturbed, and unless Muslims find out that the Christian Powers encourage a quarrel between the Arabs and the Turks, either with a view to weaken Islam or to bring the Arabs of Syria or Mesopotamia under their own subjection under the cover of mandate or openly. No Muslim is willing to raise the question of the Khilafat at the bidding of Christian States, or because it suits Christians to create schism. The democracy of Islam does not recognise special rights and privileges of any race or people, or claim or dynasty.

In a debate in the House of Lords on April 20, 1915, when your Lordship was also present, Lord Cromer, who knew something of the constitution of Islam, said: "I think we might go so far as to give them (Muslims) some sort of assurance that we recognise that the Caliph should be not only a Muslim, but a Muslim of such position as to be independent of any European pressure of any kind or sort." In the same debate, Lord Crewe, on behalf of the Government, and presumably by your Lordship's consent also, gave the following pledge: "It is not for us, I will not say, to attempt to impose a Caliph on the Muslim world, but even to bring about by forcible means a situation which would in practice compel the choice to fall upon a particular individual." Lately, in certain irresponsible quarters, it has been suggested that the Khilafat should be divorced from the Sultanate as if Islam also recognised any Pope, or any such bifurcation of religions and secular headship. The Holy Prophet of Islam himself united in his person both sorts of leaderships. He was at the same time the religious head of the Muslims and the President of the Muslim Commonwealth. Regarding non-Muslim subjects of the Muslim Khalifa, Islam itself lays down in clearest possible terms that not only their lives and properties but even all their religious institutions should be safeguarded and assured a security. The interests of non-Muslim minorities in every city and province or federated states of the Turkish Empire should be as carefully safeguarded as they have been of the

Jews, etc., in Christian states. But at the same time it will be but just to expect that the interests and lives of Muslim minorities in Greece, Servia and Bulgaria shall also be perfectly safeguarded by means of special treaties. Muslims expect that the Muslim state of Albania, which had its recognised independent status before the war, shall, under a Muslim ruler, be an independent state.

Your Lordship will, on mature consideration, find that the demands of Muslims of India as regards the Empire of their Khalifa are very reasonable, and that their fulfilment will not only preserve the Muslim Empire as a blessing to humanity and a means of peace and the status of Islam among other religions and civilisations, but will also strengthen the position of Great Britain herself.

The Muslim nation has proved many a time before the bulwark of the British Empire in the East. The soldiers of Turkey herself have died shoulder to shoulder with their British comrades. The Russian menace to the British Empire in the East is far from dead yet. Through Turkey England was able to weaken that menace. It was the Turks who directed to themselves the greatest violence of that menace, that avalanche.

The Russian menace, which will before long be augmented by German co-operation, can neither be crushed by the establishment of petty border states nor single-handedly by Great Britain herself.

The little war which England has lately had with Afghanistan must have convinced British statesmen that it is not easy to oppose foreign foes, even when weak and small, with internal unrest.

The Russian menace, and it will be more terrible now when better organised than it was during the Tzarist régime, can only be crushed if it can be crushed at all, by a strong, powerful and independent Turkey, supported by an independent and powerful Persia. Unless these Empires are themselves independent, the people will have no heart to put up a fight against a nation which would promise liberty and independence.

If Great Britain enters into an offensive and defensive permanent alliance with Turkey and Persia, then, and then alone, will she be able not only to have two Powers imbued with national spirit to support her against the German-Russian menace attacking the British Empire at points where the British Navy cannot reach, but she will also ensure the sympathy and co-operation of Islam. Then the small buffer states will also prove an effective breakwater.

On the contrary, if she allows herself to be carried away by the cry of turning out the Crescent and Islam from Europe, and of keeping Christians free from the rule of the "infidels" (monotheistic Muslims are still considered by the Archbishop of Canterbury to be heathens because they refuse to worship a man), she will have to fight the battles not only against the German-Russian combination, but also a Bolshevik-Islamic combination.

Your Lordship, as a student of history, knows that Islam can put up stiff fights even if indifferently armed. In self-defence Islam arouses a victorious, an all-conquering spirit. It is not only for open fight and sacrifices that Islam imbues a vigorous spirit, what the "Men of the Mountain," or *Hashisheen*, did, has shown that Islamic Constitution can be manipulated even by workers in secret to be a terror to mighty Powers. To Muslims, death in the cause of Islam guarantees eternal life. Strongest Press acts and meeting acts, etc., will be of no avail against the Constitution of Islam and the *Fatwas* of Ulema, unless all Muslim theologians are hanged, all the Mosques are closed, all the sermons from the pulpit prohibited, the pilgrimage to the Holy Cities forbidden and each copy of the Quran destroyed.

It might be a very pious Christian sentiment to free the sacred soil of Europe from the "heathen" Muslim Turk, but will it be worth the price it will cost in human blood, in human misery, is a question to be taken into consideration. It might be easy from a military point of view to expel the Turks from Europe, or even to annihilate them, but no power on the face of this earth can annihilate Islam, and as long as Islam lives the destruction of the most valiant sons of Islam shall yet be avenged. The teaching of Islam is: "In retaliation is your life," and retaliation there shall be. Islam will not forget that Muslim toleration in Spain, in Malta, in Sicily, and now in Eastern Europe has proved a bane for the Muslims themselves. If Muslim theologians had not stopped the hands of Salim I, then to-day Europe would have found no Christians in the Balkans to free. But Muslims even in those days, which are called days of barbarism, were far more tolerant than those statesmen of to-day who are piously advocating the expulsion of the Crescent from Europe.

Now that the last valiant nation that fought to uplift the banner of Islam in Europe and Asia has been defeated, the Muslim nation must seek an alliance with some other power to rehabilitate the status of Islam. The question which is at present passing in the minds of thinking Muslims is whether that power shall be the new and rising power of Bolshevism or the old and tried power of Great Britain. Naturally, Muslims are for the present more inclined towards the latter, but

if Great Britain herself adopts the position of the chief enemy of Islam, Muslims will have no alternative left. There are a few Muslims who will no more be reconciled to Great Britain because they think that Great Britain has already gone too far in the enmity of Islam. But, with a favourable policy towards Turkey, there is no doubt that the masses will be for Great Britain.

And what benefit does England expect to get by destroying Turkey? It is true that British statesmen of learning like your Lordship have naturally a regard for the old Greek culture and civilisation, and may be inclined to bestow Muslim Thrace, and even sacred Adrianople, upon the Greeks as a token of this appreciation of the old Hellenic civilisation and also with a view to have a strong friend in the Balkans. But I am convinced that a statesman of your Lordship's acumen, knowledge, and experience knows how little modern Greeks have of the old Hellenes. Besides this, is there any nation which ever appreciated more and did greater service to the old Hellenic culture than the Muslim nation? All that was good in Greek culture Europe realised through Mussulmans. Why, then, should Europe be ungrateful to Mussulmans and be ready to do them the greatest injustice that could ever be done to any nation, i.e., to wrench from the Muslim nation the seats of its culture and civilisation and to treat its people like cattle and to give them over to the rule of their enemies against their will? The seat of Islamic civilisation to-day is in Constantinople, not in Hejaz. As to having a strong friend in the Balkans, can Great Britain really depend upon the Greeks? What has even the late war demonstrated? And will not strengthening the Greeks cause an envy in the minds of other Balkan States and increase their mutual ill-will?

Turkey and Turkey alone can be the best policemen for the Balkans.

Even in the Dardanelles the Turks have power, and will continue to be the best guardians, otherwise the Russian Navy, and particularly Russian submarines, will cause much trouble to Great Britain in the Mediterranean. If the Dardanelles are internationalised the chances of international trouble will increase. A slight misunderstanding between Russia and Greece, or Italy and Bulgaria and Greece, will cause international anxiety. One natural effect of opening up the Dardanelles will be to encourage all the States in the Black Sea littoral to possess big navies, and Russia will no doubt try to become a big naval Power, so that if internationalisation of the Straits does not only remain a farce, but a really open gate for the navies of all Powers, Russia will be able to exert a world influence by having a strong navy in the Black Sea. This will increase the world danger as well as the world's armament. A suggestion is thrown out in the Press that Great Britain wants to keep Constantinople handy to offer as a bribe to Russia when she covets India again. There is a Persian saying which means that to those who have a hunger for conquest if you give the whole of this world they will clamour for the other. Russia will no doubt accept the bribe with thanks, but will most probably use this further strengthened position to attack the British Empire in the East with greater vigour.

It is quite true that the Turks joined in the late war with the enemies of France and England, although they had no grievance against France in any case, and that, therefore, it is incumbent upon the British and French statesmen to base the future settlement with an eye upon a possible repetition of the same eventuality, and also to give due punishment to the Turks for having fought against the Entente.

Everybody can see that certain combinations in the late war were very unnatural indeed. That two hereditary enemies like Russia and Great Britain, or the Turks and the Bulgars, should have joined hands in nothing but an unnatural phenomenon. No less unnatural is that Turkey should go to war against France and England. But it would be a grave mistake if an unnatural phenomenon should be taken to be normal and the permanent settlement should be based upon it.

As to punishing the Turks, they have been more than punished already. What they have suffered during the war is indescribable. And what they have suffered since the so-called armistice is nothing short of barbarious torture, especially at the hands of their mean, spiteful enemy, Greece, which has behaved as if she was the sole conqueror of Turkey, although she has taken no real or effective part in conquering any portion of Turkey. Even such portions of the Turkish Empire that had not suffered any disorder, as Smyrna, have been terribly ravaged without the slightest excuse or justification. Thousands of Muslim men, women and children have been butchered in cold blood and hundreds of thousands have had to fly for their lives. Hundreds of thousands of refugees are now in Constantinople, breadless and homeless. The only shelter they possess is of the Mosques. *While Christian people have organised missions and sent hundreds of thousands of pounds to relieve the sufferings of their co-religionists, Muslim men, women and children have been left to die of starvation and want of clothing without any effort to relieve them. I asked your Lordship's permission to be allowed to go to Constantinople and other parts of the Muslim Empire with a mission, but in reply I was told that*

the only relief that could be offered to the Muslims was through the agency of a Christian clergyman, and that a sum of £800 (!!!) was sent through him by a Red Crescent organisation. What is the state of affairs in Constantinople? Even Greek men-of-war are there training their guns upon the palace of the Khalifa. The Entente Powers have thought it fit to occupy the Turkish capital and to take Greek soldiers also with them there, although they did not send any army to any capital of their other three enemies—not even to Berlin. Insults have been added to injury. Every humiliation has been offered and is being offered to the people and the Government. Respectable men, even princes, have been unceremoniously caught hold of and deported to foreign lands. Peace is being delayed, and that may eventually lead to disorders and rebellions, because all the State machinery is being disorganised by this chronic state, which is neither war nor peace. But for the fact that Islamic peoples are always better disciplined and self-controlled, sober and god-fearing, anarchy, if not Bolshevism, would have long found its way in the sorely tried people of Turkey. In short, there is no doubt that the punishment which has already been inflicted upon the Turks, their State and Government (both past and present) ought to satisfy even the most revengeful and blood-thirsty mind.

God Almighty knows how the hearts of Muslims bleed for their brothers in Turkey. They suffer it calmly because they take it to be a result of the war that has ended in defeat. But it will be too much to expect that they will be passive lookers-on for ever if this torture is indefinitely continued, or if to the humiliation of the Turks a humiliation of Islam is also added. Its sacred cities, taken over by one or a group of Christian Powers, its adherents given over to the mercy of non-Muslims, its Khalifa relegated to the position of a petty ruler. The Muslims of India who have always realised, and not only realised, but have faithfully carried out their citizen-duty, have urged upon the British statesmen times out of number the necessity of an alliance between Turkey and Great Britain on mutual equality and independence. They have urged the same for Persia. With such an alliance they could remain true to their August Faith and their secular Empire. This loyalty to the State has been tried by the ordeal of fire. They have not wavered in this trial.

But when there is a duty for the citizens there is also a duty for the State. The State should also give due regard to the views, interests and sentiments of its citizens. Will Great Britain fail in its duty towards its citizens? The Hindus and Muslims are united on the point that the integrity and independence of Turkey should be maintained. Do the British delegates, when they go to the Conference, realise the fact that they are not only the representatives of 40 million peoples of Great Britain, but also of 300 million peoples of India? The 300 million people are not technically Christians—I say technically because I believe that Muslims are good Christians—yet they are the citizens of the same Empire and they have borne all the burdens of citizenship. As far as Turkey is concerned, it was not only through the Indian Army that victory was gained, but even to-day it is the Indian Army which is mainly garrisoning the occupied portions of the Turkish Empire.

There are three points which the British delegates to the Peace Conference, when it meets to settle peace with Turkey, would do well not to allow to be obscured in their mind. (i) That all Indians are fully and unshakably convinced that Great Britain has a dominating voice in the settlement of peace with Turkey, and that, unfortunately, it is the British statesmen who are showing the greatest hostility to Turkey. The French and Italian Press both have made it clear that their people and Governments are not in favour of expelling the banner of Islam from Europe, and there is not the least doubt in the mind of any single Indian that if Mr. Lloyd George were to keep firm to his words uttered on January 5, 1918, neither France nor Italy nor America would raise any objection. They also know that it is the oil-fields of Mesopotamia, and the memory of the crusades that have been the chief incentives for the invention of "mandates." If Great Britain were to keep honourably and straightforwardly to her words that the war was fought to guarantee the independence of all the weak and strong nations, and let there be a fully self-governing federation of Arab States, the Arabs would have no objection to making a permanent alliance with their parent Empire of Turkey and to acknowledge the supremacy of their Khalifa. If Great Britain would not covet Mesopotamia and Palestine, neither France nor Italy would demand any portions of the Ottoman Empire.

The second point is that it will be impossible to expect peace in the East, and particularly in India, if the Turkish Empire is dismembered, with a view to humiliate Islam or with a view to increase pressure upon India, so as to keep it under a sort of perpetual domination. Why the Hindus have joined the Mussulmans is because they see that the present policy of British statesmen aims at perpetual domination over India by trying to destroy or weaken all such independent states which were likely to have any sympathy with the legitimate and natural aspiration of the people of India. The one result of the military victory of Great Britain in the

recent war was noticed not long ago at Gujranwala and Amritsar, etc.

The third point for the British Peace delegates to keep in mind is that now the question of Turkey is no more a purely Turkish question concerning only 20 million people or only a secular sovereign whose armies have been overwhelmed in the war. They should never forget that the question of Turkey is the question of Islam, that the Sultan of Turkey is also the Khalifa of the Muslims world, that Islam has not been defeated. Even if through intimidation, bribery or flattery Turkey is made to sign any humiliating peace the Muslim world will not recognise it, and will consider means to counteract it. It is true that the honour of Islam has been for centuries in the hands of the Turks and that they have sacrificed their lives freely to keep that honour, although assailed on all sides by Christian States and Powers. It is true that they are endeavouring even now to maintain that honour, and, in Anatolia, even women are preparing to fight to the end for the same honour of Islam. But the Muslim world appreciates the difficulties of the Ottoman Government at Constantinople, and although fully expecting that no Muslim worth the name will be found to sign a humiliating peace, and that the Muslims of Thrace, Adrianople and Constantinople will not allow the Muslim Government to be moved until all are dead, yet if a humiliating peace is forced upon the Ottoman Government the indig-

nation of Islam will be against those who force not against those who are helpless. My Lord, it is undeniably within the reach of practical politics to strengthen the British Empire by making India a self-respecting, contented unit of the British Commonwealth, and to obtain all that is best in the 300 million people for the enhancement of the glory and strength of the British Empire by respecting the views, aspirations and sentiments of the people of India, whether in regard to the internal affairs of the country, or to those external affairs in which its citizens are vitally interested. India will not allow herself to be ignored either by Great Britain or by other Powers of the world. If she is fit to be a member of the proposed League of Nations her voice must be heard by all the Powers in such matters as affect her citizens in any way. When peace with Germany was discussed and signed she had a few representatives, even though they were not chosen by her people. When peace with Turkey is discussed she will claim a right not only of nominal representation, but of a powerful and real representation of her own sons and an *effective* voice to help her Minister for Foreign Affairs in asserting the voice of Great Britain, and to see that racial and religious prejudices do not overpower other delegates so as to lose sight of her interests.

Your Lordship's,

Most respectfully,

SHAIKH M. H. KIDWAI OF GADIA.

TDV ISAM
Kütüphanesi Arşivi
No R7B-443-4

Letter of an Indian
Schiekh