

Indian Opinion

No. 35—VOL. XX. FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 1ST, 1922. Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper
Price Fourpence

NOTES AND NEWS

It is reported that General Smuts is due to arrive in Durban from Greytown at 3 o'clock next Wednesday afternoon, and immediately afterwards he will attend a meeting of the Natal Executive of the South African Party, at which the perturbation of Durban concerning the recent Provincial legislation affecting the Asiatics will be the principal subject of discussion. We need hardly say that the Indian community will stand with Durban in according a hearty welcome to the Prime Minister.

A Nairobi message states that a farewell dinner was given to the ex-Governor Sir Edward Northey at which were present Lord Delamere for the Reform Party, Mr. Grogan for the Convention and the President of the Associated Chambers of Commerce and others. In the course of his reply, Sir Edward Northey, who was visibly affected by the warmth of his reception, is reported to have said, he had no intention to venture on controversial or political questions, which would embarrass the action of his successor, but he maintained his consistent views regarding the currency and the Indian questions, and deeply regretted his departure on the eve of placing the colonial finances in order through the Geddes Committee.

A Reuter's message from London dated August 21, states:—

His Majesty has approved of the appointment of two Indians as Puisne Judge in the Calcutta High Court and Advocate-General for the Presidency of Bengal respectively, in succession to Britishers, who have hitherto occupied these high posts. These appointments are apparently in pursuance of the policy announced some months ago by the ex-Secretary of India the Hon. E. Montagu, of gradually substituting the whites by Indians in important positions.

The only comment that we could offer on the above is that the days have now long passed to win India by mere crumbs. What India wants is the removal of the grave wrongs done to her and a sincere repentance on the part of those responsible for those wrongs. Anything else but that, to our mind, will be vain attempts.

An Anti-Asiatic correspondent of the *Natal Advertiser* complains of there being 15 Indian stores in Pinetown which he considers a danger and suggests that various village committees should form a deputation to interview General Smuts during his visit to Natal to stop allowing more of these trading licences being granted.

The *Hindu* (Madras) writes:—

"We regret to announce that, owing to a severe heart-attack, Mrs. Sarojini Naidu has been ordered by her doctor to take complete rest for at least six weeks, and has, therefore, been compelled to give up all idea of touring India with the Civil Disobedience Inquiry Committee. At a moment like the present, when so few great Nationalists are at liberty, the serious illness of so popular a leader is a national loss; but Mrs.

Naidu's need of rest, after so much hard work, is nothing wonderful. We hope that she will soon be well again." Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, India's great Poetess, has played no small part in the National life of India, and her absence, at the present moment when the bulk of the great leaders of India have been imprisoned, must no doubt be keenly felt. We earnestly hope that Mrs. Naidu has by now completely recovered and has regained the strength that she formerly possessed.

A Hyderabad, (Sind) message states:—

Karachi Municipality has unanimously resolved that all uniforms to their servants shall in future be made of cloth manufactured in India, preferably *khaddar*. They have also appointed committees to consider the question of removing brothels from the town quarter and taking over the Karachi Tramways. Larkana, Sukkur and Hyderabad Sind Municipalities have also resolved to provide *khaddi* uniforms to their servants.

According to a message from the *Advertiser* London correspondent Mr. J. H. Thomson, the Labour leader in the course of an address to railwaymen has given good advice to strikers which should be taken to heart in every country. He is reported thus:—

During the war, and shortly afterwards, there had grown up in this country among the workers an idea that the only way to settle a dispute was to have a strike, no matter how trivial the nature of the dispute. The growing tendency was to have a "down tools" policy every week-day and twice on Sundays. "I say, never give up the power of the strike weapon, but equally do not make the foolish mistake of assuming that strikes are the only means of settling disputes." Mr. Thomas added: "Let the strike be the last weapon. Resort to every means before a strike." He warned them that unless they rendered a good day's work their policy would lead to absolute disaster. They must be mindful of their obligations to the public. They could put on railway fares which would prohibit people from travelling, and make impossible the sending of goods by train, resulting in large masses of railwaymen becoming unemployed.

INDIANS AND THEIR HEADGEAR

INDIANS have been, and are still being, molested on various occasions with regard to their headgear. Some of the Courts of the Union, on certain occasions, tried to force Indians to uncover their head when entering. But, later, it was recognised that it was a religious custom among Indians to keep their head covered, and they were allowed to do so. As it is a mark of respect among Europeans to uncover their head, among Indians, it is a mark of respect to cover their head. Mahomedans and Parsees are supposed to have their headgear on when they eat, drink or speak and even when they perform their ordinary prayers, whilst among Hindus, apart from

respect it is considered unbecoming to go out to any one with their head uncovered. It is done only on occasions when some death has occurred. When an Indian has his headgear on, no disrespect is meant by him, but on the contrary, it is a sign of respect on his part. We have dealt with this subject in view of an incident that happened recently in the Johannesburg Magistrate Court when two Indian spectators were ordered by Mr. W. M. B. Will to remove their headgear or remove themselves. A warning that, should they keep their headgear on again "they might be sent to the Fort!" One of the Indians, in consequence, it is reported, uncovered his head while the other left the Court. We do not know whether they had their National headgear or a foreign one. But in either case the action of the Indian who left the Court was a dignified one; not the one who removed his cap and stayed in. If the latter had no principle in keeping his cap on he should have removed it without being ordered to do so. It is only when we have learnt to fear God and, not man, do not to deceive our conscience even if we have to risk our life that we can claim to be considered a civilized and self-respecting community. And it is only then, and not before then, that we shall be able to obtain and be entitled to enjoy the rights we are demanding in this country.

PHANTOM EQUALITY

Mr. C. Rajagopalachari the present editor of *Young India* has written the following article in the issue of July 13:—

Much dissatisfaction has been expressed at Mr. Balfour's speeches in Australia wherein he admitted the principle of exclusion of future Indian immigration as correct. There is no doubt that this exclusion is not consistent with the idea of true equality on which alone can be founded a commonwealth of nations. When the time comes for India to choose, she would certainly choose to remain in the Empire, but three conditions are essential:—

Full freedom of action in internal affairs such as the White Dominions enjoy; security against enforced participation in aggressive action against those foreign nations with whom important communities in India have deep and abiding sympathy and religious ties; equal rights and status, in substance as in form, with the other dominions of the Empire. These three words express these three necessary conditions; Swaraj, Khalafat and Equality. These are vital conditions to be secured if India should be a willing partner in the Empire.

About the first condition, full rights of Self-Government, there is no question raised. It is the admitted goal of development. The second condition will raise a storm of opposition. It is a claim to interfere in foreign affairs, which has hitherto been the business of only the British Parliament. In principle, there is nothing strange in the claim of any member of a Commonwealth of free and equal nations, to partake in the foreign affairs of the Commonwealth. A claim that for some time the democracy of England, Scotland and Wales should alone be the arbiter of Imperial Peace and War, and that the participation of the rest of the Empire in such matters should only be an indirect influence and nothing more, is a position that conflicts with the idea of a Commonwealth as distinguished from the old concept of Empire. But the fact remains that according to standards now prevailing, the claim of India to interfere in foreign affairs goes much beyond the present claims of other dominions. It is, however, for that reason alone, not to be condemned as an important

claim. Indeed though she may not yet have attained full Home Rule rights in internal affairs, she dare not wait as regards this question of foreign affairs. Other dominions are not situated in the difficult or peculiar position in which she is placed. The people of Australia, New Zealand, Africa or Canada have no Khalafat problem to solve. Their nationals are not composed in a large part of Mussulmans whose religious feelings preclude them from destroying or injuring the authority of the Turkish Empire. Again the internal as well as the external safety and peace of India depends on good-will and friendly relationship with the Mussulman states of Asia in a manner for which there is perhaps no parallel in the circumstances of other dominions, except perhaps Canada in relation to the United States of America. India's peculiar situation necessitates, as regards foreign affairs a higher claim on her part than might, at first sight, appear reasonable. It is inconceivable at least hereafter, that India should ask her Mussulman soldiers to attack Turkey and help in the disintegration of the Khalifa's authority; or for the sake of unknown and unknowable causes be involved in a war resulting in lasting antagonism and increased animosity between India and her neighbours in Asia.

The third condition is Equality among the nations of the Commonwealth. This equality is sought to be attained by the false method of reciprocity. Reciprocity, here, means nothing but retaliation. An equality to be attained by blow for blow is hardly a foundation for imperial consolidation and strength. A Commonwealth of nations should be bound by ties of friendship and mutual help, not remain together on an equilibrium secured by retaliation. The attempt would be to bind not by attraction, but by repulsion, a process foredoomed to failure. Equal civic rights for those already domiciled is the minimum. But for all the rest, if India is asked to be satisfied with reciprocity, it is small consolation. Retaliation, like all punishment, so long as it acts as a deterrent, may produce good. But the exclusion of Indians from the White Colonies is not hoped to be prevented by a threat of reciprocity. It is understood to be a settled fact, and India is asked to find comfort in mere retaliation. If on account of the fear of retaliation, there is no chance or reasonable expectation of India being treated like other white nations, there is no satisfaction to India in mere retaliation. India does not care to exclude any one. The right to exclude others is but an imaginary compensation for her own exclusion.

What is the Commonwealth worth to India, if her children are ever in fact to be excluded from the Dominions to which all others, either on or outside the Empire, are in practice welcome? How can the Commonwealth claim to hold India on such conditions?

It is true, as pointed out by some apologists, that Mr. Gandhi in 1914, in settling the South African struggle, accepted as a settled fact the Immigrants' Regulation Act of 1913 which practically stopped further Indian immigration, and therefore asked the white people of South Africa the more readily to grant full civic rights to the existing Indian population. To say, however, that, because a prohibition regulation which had been passed against India was accepted as a fact in arranging the settlement of a struggle conducted on behalf of the domiciled Indian population of South Africa in 1914, therefore Mr. Gandhi must be taken to have definitely given up on behalf of India, the right of future immigration, is a gross exaggeration of facts. Mr. Gandhi did not and could not then act as representative, either official or unofficial, of India. He acted as the leader of the Indian population of South Africa, and had authority by reason of his position as the scope of the then struggle to speak on behalf of the Indians already settled in Africa but not as regards the future immigration which is the right and concern of India, not of those already in the Colony. It is even likely that the domiciled Indians would, if they were selfish,

be as much opposed to further immigration of Indians as the white settlers themselves. But this cannot conclude the rights of India as a member of the Commonwealth to claim equal right with other members and preclude her from equality for all time.

The admission, said to be implied in Mr. Gandhi's letter to General Smuts in June 1914, cannot be ground for ignoring the subsequent march of events and ideas as regards the so-called Commonwealth. To narrow down the later ideals of a world-wide federation of equal nations, bound together by a tie stronger than mere treaty, but yet not subjected to our Imperial mastery, to the compromises and the limitations that were thought to be inevitable in the pre-war period, would be as illogical as unstatesmanly.

The Imperial Conferences of 1918 and 1921 accept the exclusion of India from future immigration as a corollary of the freedom of every Dominion in the Commonwealth to enjoy complete control over the composition of its population. This is an instance of successful definition, but a wrong is not righted by finding a suitable formula which, by skilful choice of words, can include right things as well as wrong things. It may be successful classification but not equality. So long as it is well understood that this right to control the composition of the population is exercised only to exclude India and none else, this formula cannot satisfy the heart.

There can be solution only if there be desire for brotherhood with the people of India, not if the desire is but to hold India. Formulae can be found to cover both equality and domination, but truths and not words are the bread of nations.

NATAL ANTI-INDIAN LEGISLATION

Says the *Tribune*, (Lahore):—

The action of the Union Government in regard to the three anti-Asiatic ordinances passed by the Natal Provincial Council can only be welcomed on the ground that something is better than nothing. Of the three ordinances only one, which debarred Asiatics from the municipal vote, is definitely and unreservedly vetoed. The second, which provided for the establishment of local boards in rural areas for the granting of trading licences, is vetoed only because the decisions of the board were to be final, in other words, because "Indians would have no right of appeal against the decisions of the boards, the members of which might be trade-rivals." This means in plain English that the Union Government would be prepared to allow the ordinance only if the right of appeal were conceded. But would that make any difference to the Indians themselves? To whom would the appeal be made? Would it be made to bodies that are themselves entirely free from racial prejudice? As regards the phrase "might be" in the sentence quoted, it is only a euphemism for "are sure to be"; for it is a matter of common knowledge that the sole object of the ordinance is to prevent Indians from having trading licences. The third, dealing with the sale of municipal land, is actually allowed. Undoubtedly the allowance is subject to the condition that "if Indians are not allowed to purchase certain land they are entitled to suitable land elsewhere in the townships." But the condition is unacceptable to Indians because, in the first place, there is no conceivable reason why Indians as Indians should be debarred from purchasing any land, and secondly because that phrase "suitable land" can only mean, as in Kenya, land which is not suitable. We do hope the Union Government, which is now in direct touch with the Government of India, will have the firmness and the courage to give up this policy of tinkering and to go to the root of the whole matter.

The M. K. Gandhi Library

The fourth quarterly meeting of the General Advisory Committee of the above Library, will take place on Thursday the 7th day of September 1922 at 6-30 p. m. in the Parsee Rustomjee Hall, 140 Queen Street, Durban, whom members and all Indians are cordially invited to be present.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY

The First Anniversary of the establishment of the M. K. Gandhi Library will be celebrated on Sunday the 10th day of September 1922 at 3 p. m. in the Parsee Rustomjee Hall, 140 Queen Street, Durban, to which all Indians and others are cordially invited. The First Annual General Meeting will be held at the same time and place.

ભીંડીયા ધ-દીઆ સ્વીમ નેશનિયન ક્લબ

સ્વીમિંગ પુલ

સ્વી. "કારાગેસા." સ્વિમિંગ ટા. ય થીના બરખાલે ઉપરો.

સ્વી. "કારાપારા." સ્વિમિંગ ટા. ડી થીના બરખાલે ઉપરો.

વધુ ખુબારો

સેમલ ક્લિમિંગ, ડુબાઇ મલેન સ્વીમિંગ, ડરબન.

એ સ્વિમિંગ મળવાથી બરખાલે મળે મલો.

મલવાડી ક્લબ

પ્રકાર	પ્રીસ્તી	કોડ	મુલ્યમલેન	પરમી	સુવેલિય	કુલ
પર	૧૯૨૨	૧૯૭૮	૧૦૪૨	૩૨૨૨	ક. મી.	૮૫
	૨૦૨૨	૨૦૨૨	૨૦૨૨			
કુલ	૧	૧૦	૮	૨૦	૧-૧૬	૪-૩૪
કની	૨	૧૨	૮	૨૨	૧-૧૫	૪-૩૩
સ્વી	૩	૧૩	૧૦	૨૨	૧-૧૪	૪-૩૩
સોમ	૪	૧૩	૧૧	૩૦	૧-૧૩	૪-૩૬
મલવા	૫	૧૪	૧૨	૧	૧-૧૧	૪-૩૬
મુલ	૬	૧૫	૧૩	૨	૧-૧૦	૪-૩૬
કુલ	૭	૧૬	૧૪	૩	૧-૯	૪-૩૬