

Indian Opinion

No. 36—VOL. XX. FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 8TH, 1922.

Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper
Price FOURPENCE

NOTES AND NEWS

A REUTER'S message from Simla dated August 31st, states:—The Government of India, in announcing its decision on the report of the Committee appointed to inquire into the train tragedy last November, when 70 Moplah prisoners were asphyxiated in a railway van, ordered the prosecution of Police Sergt. Andrews for culpable negligence, in that he chose an unsuitable van for the transport of the prisoners, and did not heed the prisoners' cries for water and air. The Government expressed its sympathy with the families of the dead Moplahs, but believes that the disaster was to a large extent due to circumstances which could not be controlled.

The Moplah train tragedy in which 70 Moplahs being packed in a closed van were suffocated to death is an incident which no Indian can ever forget nor forgive. It will always be remembered and be talked of from generation to generation as one of the cruelties Indians were subjected to under the British Rule. The announcement made on the subject by the Government of India, as reported above, instead of acting as a healing balm has, to our mind, come only to deepen the sore. It has expressed sympathy with the families of the dead Moplahs which amounts to this: "We are very sorry but it could not be helped!" The parties responsible for this tragic happening are really guilty of the worst type of murder. But the Government of India have ordered the prosecution of one Police Sergt. Andrews for "culpable negligence." We have nothing against the Police Sergeant. Whether he is punished or not punished the seventy lives that have gone will never come to life again. But, can the Non-co-operators in India be blamed for striving to mend or end a system of Government which can make such happenings possible and allow them to pass off lightly?

A Reuter's message from Lahore states:—

There has been a serious recrudescence of trouble with the Sikh Akali (otherwise fanatics), several of whom have been attempting to seize private property attached to the Sikh shrine near Amritsar. The head priest complained to the authorities, who arrested them, where upon other Akali in a defiant manner repeated the offence, until 200 arrests were made, including a number of local notables. The authorities are now searching the trains, detaining Akalis, a large number of whom left for Amritsar when the news of the trouble was circulated in the Punjab.

Madras, Sept. 1.—With reference to the disturbances in the Godavery district, it is now reported that 500 rebels attacked the police stations at various places around Tuni, and carried off all arms and ammunition. Police in motor cars are being hurried to the scene, which is situated in a remote district.—Reuter.

Amritsar, Sept. 2.—Police cordons have been drawn round the Sikh shrines near here, to prevent the approach of bands of Akalis, who (as reported above) were attempting to seize private property

attached to the shrines. A number of fanatics were slightly injured in the course of the disturbances, and the situation is now under control. The Government announces that it intends to frame legislation for the better management of the Sikh shrines, but in the meantime it will not tolerate any encroachment on private property in charge of the priest of the shrine.—Reuter.

A Reuter's message from Ottawa dated Sept. 3 states:—

During the course of a speech at a dinner given in his honour by the Government, Mr. Sastri urged that Canada, having once been in a similar position, should sympathise with the Indian's position to-day. He described Gandhi as a "philosopher-anarchist," with an impossible idea of the proper method of government. The Premier, Mr. Mackenzie King, admitted that Canada had once been threatened with trouble, but not against British institutions or ideals.

We take the following from the *Natal Mercury*:—

Although the greatest interest in the event was shown by newcomers to Durban, there was quite a large number of interested spectators along the Umgeni Road yesterday (Monday) afternoon to witness the procession of Indians from the town and suburbs to the river at Umgeni, where the Mahomedan festival of Muhurrum took place. At a casual glance the ceremony appeared to be endowed with all its usual splendour, but a reflection of the general business quiet could be seen in the substitution of print for silk, so that the old-time richness of colour was absent. The pagodas were obviously not nearly so expensive as in former years, and in fact an air of cheapness pervaded the whole ceremony. Some painted faces were seen, and there was plenty of noise from the tom-toms, but there is no doubt that the ceremony has been shorn of much of its former picturesqueness. In the afternoon the ceremony of "drowning the gods" took place in the river.

MR. PARSEE RUSTOMJEE'S GIFT

MR. Parsee Rustomjee could not have made a better gift to Durban Indians than he has done in the shape of a beautiful Library, known as the M. K. Gandhi Library, situated at 140, Queen Street in the Parsee Rustomjee Hall. This Library is free to all, no subscription or fees of any kind being required to be paid. It contains a good number of books already, in the English and other vernacular languages by the best authors, and newspapers and magazines are being specially subscribed for for the benefit of the public. The number of these are gradually being increased. On Sunday next an year will have been passed since the establishment of the Library. During a casual chat with a highly qualified Indian gentleman, whose views on matters communal have often been very useful and are not at any time worth

ignoring, when asked what he thought of this beautiful gift on the part of Mr. Rustomjee replied, that he was against the principle. He was of the opinion that Indians were not sufficiently advanced as to appreciate such a gift, and spoke very pessimistically about their advancement. Though, we must admit, there has been a lack of appreciation on the part of Durban Indians for the gift that is so generously placed before them, we can, by no means, take a pessimistic view as our friend, mentioned above, has done. If pessimists only became optimists and did a little work with faith, a great deal could be achieved towards the advancement of our brethren in this country. If all would be pessimists the world would very soon come to an end.

These are days when Indians in every part of the world have seriously to think. At a time when thousands of their brethren in India are suffering for the sake of their country and countrymen, Indians outside should not indulge in joy-making and luxuries. As for Indians in South Africa, they have a double duty to perform; one towards their Mother-country and another towards themselves. It should not be forgotten that there are due more to India than to our movement in this country for the vetoing of the two Anti-Indian Ordinances recently passed by the Provincial Council.

While India has even in her time of woe done all that was possible to save us from our difficulties, it is not a matter of little sorrow that we have not been half as alive to the present National movement in India. If we have done anything for India it has been mighty little. The reason why we are not alive to our own position or to the position of our Motherland is either thoughtlessness or ignorance. We are so engrossed in sports and other enjoyments that we have no time to think of what is going on around us. And the time is not far off, when we may suddenly find ourselves surrounded with dangers from which we will find no way out. It is therefore necessary that we should get rid of this thoughtlessness. And if thoughtlessness is gone there can be no ignorance. Moreover, Durban Indians can have no reason to complain of ignorance with a beautiful Library placed freely at their disposal for which they owe not a little gratitude to the donor.

HAS A BEGINNING BEEN MADE?

Mr. Henry S. La Polak has contributed the following article for the June number of the *Indian Review*—

It is now nearly a year since the Imperial Conference of 1921 separated, after having, with the exception of the Union of South Africa in respect of a considerable part of its area, passed a resolution urging the desirability of conferring equal citizenship upon His Majesty's Indian subjects domiciled in the overseas territories of the British Empire. No one acquainted with conditions in the Self-Governing Dominions and the powerful prejudices and racial superstitions prevalent therein, would, five years ago, have supposed that even the nominal recognition of the equality of citizenship for Indians could have taken place for decades to come. It was believed that racial privilege was too powerfully entrenched and that, if the recognition of the principle were to come at all, it would be first of all in those parts of the Empire which did not enjoy responsible government but were administered from Downing Street. Indeed, there were some who even doubted whether His Majesty's Government needed at all to be brought into the matter in view of the sympathetic attitude maintained by the British Cabinet towards the question of Indian advancement and wellbeing in the Self-Governing Dominions, British Ministers assuring the

Indian complainant of the righteousness of the cause and expressing regret that they themselves could do no more than expostulate mildly and academically with the Dominion Governments. These, however, resented anything savouring of interference by outsiders in matters which, though affecting the welfare of unrepresented nationals of another part of the Commonwealth and, therefore, properly coming within the sphere of the foreign relations of the offending Dominions, they, nevertheless, chose to regard as matters of domestic concern.

Curiously enough, though the statute-books of many of the Crown Colonies, Dependencies and Protectorates, as, for example, in Ceylon, the Malay States, Kenya, Fiji, Mauritius, British Guiana, and Trinidad, are replete with ordinances and regulations having the force of law denying to Indians rights of equal citizenship with white British subjects, it was not until the case of Kenya became acute, when Lord Milner presided at the Colonial Office, that it was generally realised in India that the worst offender on the score of racial differentiation was Great Britain herself in the overseas territories in which she exercised direct jurisdiction and in respect of which her Cabinet was responsible to the British Parliament. The general mental obscurity on this subject in India was illuminated as in a flash when Lord Milner announced his determinations, apparently in the name of the British Cabinet, to maintain the policy of racial segregation in Kenya, to extend it, if possible, to neighbouring areas, including mandated territory, and to refuse the franchise even to Indians whose qualifications to exercise it could not properly be disputed. In other words, in the name of His Majesty's Government, he proclaimed the doctrine that the tropical Empire was to be administered by a privileged race, with rights of domination over all other peoples of the Empire who did not belong to that race.

Inevitably, India, who had, with increasing success, been claiming to replace the doctrine of racial supremacy by that of racial equality, took up the challenge, and the fierceness of the subsequent controversy on the subject of Kenya bears testimony to the anxiety of India lest what she gained in one field she lost in another. Then came the Imperial Conference of last year, and it is now notorious that the Conference was at one time almost wrecked and India disastrously isolated by the combined opposition of General Smuts and Mr. Churchill. The former, on general principles, was opposed to recognition of the doctrine of equal citizenship for the non-white peoples of the Empire. Moreover, whatever his personal views might have been, he could not, without express authority from the Union Parliament—which he would be unable to obtain save at the risk of splitting the Union from end to end—commit his Dominion to the new doctrine, since the constitutional law of two Provinces of the Union was based upon the positive and explicit denial of the doctrine. The Transvaal Ordinance, or fundamental law, expressly declares that "there shall be no equality between white and coloured either in Church or in State." Mr. Churchill supported General Smuts, not so much because he thought South Africa right, as because, if the new doctrine came to be adopted, it would, if honestly enforced, put an end to the career of the Colonial Office as the central bureau, at the heart of the Empire, for the exploitation of the tropical lands of the Empire in the interests of British manufacturers, capitalists, and other privileged classes. Mr. Joseph Chamberlain was the first to appreciate the value to the British people of schemes for the "development" of the tropical British colonies and dependencies, and the close association, under his successors, between the Colonial Office and the British exploiter, under the masking pretence of the "advancement" of the native populations and their protection (and other forms of exploitation such as the Indian, is notorious. It is, perhaps, the best

"business" department of the State, and such statesmen as Col. Amery and Mr. Churchill are among the foremost exponents of the new Imperialism. Fortunately, however, both General Smuts and Mr. Churchill were outgeneralled and defeated by the Indian delegation, consisting of Mr. Montagu, the Maharaj of Kutch, and Mr. Sastri, backed by the overwhelming eloquence and prestige of the Prime Minister. General Smuts refused to be bound by the resolution so far as considerable parts of the Union are concerned, but Mr. Churchill could not take up a similar attitude in respect of Kenya, as he would have liked, and, indeed, attempted to do, for it would at once have been made to appear that His Majesty's Government regarded the doctrine of equality of citizenship as unsuited to certain parts of the Empire where Great Britain exercised direct jurisdiction, when, undoubtedly, India would have been forced to take up the challenge and a controversy would have been precipitated that might at the end have rent the Empire asunder.

What, however, Mr. Churchill had not been able to effect in principle, he sought to achieve in substance, first, by sending out with the Governor of Kenya a series of proposals which totally ignored, and even denied the doctrine of equality of citizenship, and which he endeavoured to loist upon the Indian community who would thereby have consented to contract themselves out of the scope of the Imperial Conference Resolution; and, secondly, when this sordid move failed, by endeavouring (thanks to Mr. Montagu, unsuccessfully) to commit the British Government, to a policy that would, in effect, have evacuated the resolution of all its virtue, both in the spirit and in the letter. It will thus be seen that the Colonial Office, at any rate under Mr. Churchill, is not to be trusted, unaided, to put into effect the underlying policy of the resolution.

We have seen what it was sought to do in the case of Kenya. The Colonial Office has recently declared its provisional adhesion to the doctrine of race segregation in Uganda, where it had not previously existed. It is becoming known that, under the influence of powerful groups and corporations of white British subjects, the Governments of Fiji and British Guiana are suffering in their objection to the grant of equal citizenship to the local Indians. But these Governments are merely local branches of the Colonial Office, which is already in the grip of similar vested interests with headquarters in London. What has the Government of India done, apart from sending Mr. Sastri on his historic and highly important mission to three of the Dominions, to ensure that effect is given to the Imperial Conference Resolution? Has it yet asked for categorical information regarding the steps taken by the Colonial Office to procure the removal of disabling legislation and differential administrative methods in the territories for whose good government the British Cabinet is responsible to Parliament? Will it not be a significant thing to find, in fact, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and India on one side, and South Africa and Great Britain on the other? It will be a new and quite unexpected ridding of forces, but unless Great Britain hastenes to restore the equilibrium, by implementing with all possible speed the agreement into which she entered with India before the whole world last year, she will only have herself to thank if vested power, privilege, and interest weigh down the balance against India and bring about, not a new Imperial integration known as the British Commonwealth of equal and free peoples, but the dissolution of an Empire of greed and exploitation that has outlived its usefulness and that denies the new spirit of human brotherhood. The Viceroy and the Secretary of State for India must, if India is to survive as an equal partner in the Commonwealth and preserve her self-respect as a world nation, wage a remorseless war with the Colonial Office until the principle enshrined in the Imperial Conference

resolution is applied fully in the spirit as well as the letter.

AUSTRALIA ON MR. SASTRI

The following are cuttings from Australian papers on Mr. Sastri's mission which we reproduce, from *Swarajya* :—

The Imperial Indian emissary, Sastri, was entertained by the members of the Sydney Millions Club last week, and both Indian and Australian ideals and national sentiments were scandalously misrepresented at the gathering, amidst what the *Sun* describes as "wild cheering."

Sastri declared that "he was proud to think that India had stood behind the Empire during the Great War." Naturally as an Imperialist, he did not tell the Millions Club banqueters that more of his fellow-countrymen "died of hunger" under Imperial rule during the war "than were killed on all the battle fronts" of all the armies of Europe during the same period.

Anything remotely resembling the truth concerning Imperial rule in India would of course, have been out of place under the circumstances.

Had the Imperial authorities not been perfectly certain that not a gleam of truth concerning India's real sentiments towards her foreign Imperial rulers would be uttered by Sastri in Australia, that individual would never have been allowed to leave his native country.

The misrepresentation on the Australian side was equally glaring. Mayor McElhone said that "As India and Australia both belong to the Empire, the people of both countries should have the same rights. He knew of no other part of the Empire—except South Africa—which placed an embargo on Indians entering their country."

Australia does not, and never will, "belong" to the Empire in the same sense that India does. Between the status of a citizen of the Australian Commonwealth and an Indian subject of the Empire there is an immeasurable gulf.

The only sense in which the inhabitants of India and the citizens of Australia are entitled to the same rights is that in both countries the power to "prohibit undesirable aliens" ought to be fully exercised as a matter of local self-preservation. There would be no Imperial rule in India if the people of that country had that right, and there would have been no "wild cheering" from the Millions Club banqueters if Sastri had put that view of the case bluntly and plainly.

In Australia we claim, and always will claim, and assert, the right to exclude undesirables, whether they be the subjects of the British or any other Empire, kingdom, or principality. The utterances of Mayor McElhone on the occasion referred to were absolute treason and blasphemy against our White Australian religion of race purity. Such sentiments no more represent Australia than Sastri represents India.

The Sydney *Sun* which adorns its title page with the legend, "Above all for Australia," printed in full the anti-Australian utterances referred to without a word of editorial comment or criticism. The shadow of Northcliffe seems to have a blighting effect wherever it falls.

"There is one reason, and one reason only, why Imperial missionaries are sent out to Australia as propagandists and why Millions Club members cheer their utterances. The one aim and object of imperialism is the complete degradation of labour. Cheap labour is the idol before whose shrine every Imperialist prostrates himself, and India is the greatest reservoir of cheap labour in the world."

When labour is degraded to the lowest possible level of human subsistence, what imperialism has accomplished in India, and to a large extent in South Africa, it seeks to accomplish in Australia. The

plague of Imperialism is a menace to freedom everywhere, and the curse and canker of the whole human race.

LOADING TO TYRANNY

There is another aspect of Sastri's visit that is worthy of just a word.

He is the representative of a conquered people, and he hobnobs with the conquerors. He accepts a title from them; he is proud to be in their service; he is very anxious to ingratiate himself with those who oppress his fellow-countrymen.

Is such a man deserving of our respect?

It seems to me that his acceptance of alien domination, under the pretext of coaxing concessions from the dominant power, is opposed to one of the highest impulses of human nature.

If Australia were in the grip of invaders who deemed us vastly inferior to them, and treated us accordingly—sweated us, starved us, jailed us, shot us down, made us abase ourselves before them, contemptuously denied us educational opportunities and civil rights, what would we think of an Australian who was friendly with the conquerors, accepted favors from them, and lauded their alien civilisation as something almost divine?

Such an Australian would be execrated by us all. We would regard him as one who was false to his kith and kin; as an abject and despicable toady to those who were holding down his race by armed force.

Similarly, if I were an Indian, the fact that Sastri is cheered by British Imperialists, and feted by jingoes who uphold the Amritsar massacre, and the violent repression of every manifestation of Indian discontent, would be enough to damn him irretrievably in my eyes.

Things as they are in the land of his birth, it would be more honorable for Sastri to be one of his majesty's prisoners than one of his majesty's privy councillors.

And no Australian who is able to see and understand things from the view point of his neighbours can have any feeling but aversion for an Indian who permits himself to be patronised by Billy Hughes and the Millions Club.—*Australian Worker*.

THE EMPIRE'S MORAL LINK!

It is obvious from the method of the pleading that Mr. Sastri has a fundamentally different view of the British Empire than is accepted in Australia. "We think," he says, "that citizenship of the Empire carries with it the right of a man to move about freely in the Empire and settle where he pleases, and practise the profession for which he may be qualified, developing his faculties or capabilities to the utmost possible extent under the laws of the Dominion in which he may settled." The implication contained in that statement is of the Empire as a federation of countries under one general and common constitution. The Empire is, of course, nothing of the sort. It is a community of free and independent nations bound together by a link that is moral, and not material. Each nation within the Empire has a right to make its own laws, and these cannot be interfered with even when they appear to operate against the other partners in the Empire. Thus Australia has never been questioned the right which it exercises of placing a Customs tariff, or even an embargo, upon goods manufactured in any part of the world, including England itself. This very principle was fully discussed at the Imperial Conference held in England last year, when the conclusion reached was that each Dominion should have the full right to regulate the character of its population. Mr. Sastri is therefore speaking from a mistaken point of view when he argues that it is a part of Imperial policy and in the case of Imperial solidarity that the request of his mission to Australia should be granted. The question of whether or not Indian natives resident in Australia should be admitted to the privileges of full citizenship

is entirely a matter of Australian policy, and has nothing whatever to do with the solidarity of the Empire.—*The Age*.

PANDIT MOTILAL NEHRU IN MADRAS

Pandit Motilal Nehru made an interesting speech during his visit to Madras before an audience of forty thousand people. After thanking them for the honour done to him and the friends that accompanied him he went on to say:—

IS NON-CO-OPERATION DEAD?

My friend Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar has told you that this magnificent demonstration, this grand spectacle which we see before us to-night in this great assembly gives a direct lie to the assertion made in certain quarters that Non-co-operation is dead. I am one of those who believe that Non-co-operation is not only not dead but that it can die only when it has achieved its purpose and then only it will give place to co-operation with our own Swarajya Government. But there are men of standing, of political wisdom and acumen who say Non-co-operation is dead. And they are honourable men. (Laughter and cheers). How then are we placed now in this difficulty? Here are my friend Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar and my humble self protesting before you, trying to convert the converted who by their mere presence on this Beach have more loudly proclaimed than any words of mine or my friends can do, that Non-co-operation is very much alive and on the other hand we have these, honourable, men who say it is dead. Now surely they must both be right and I have no doubt in my mind that both are right. But how? Now this is a paradox. At least it looks like one but to me the position is clear enough. Non-co-operation is dead. But where? It is dead in the Council Chamber. (Hear, hear and cheers.) It is buried under the banquetting table of the Viceregal Lodge (laughter) and the various other Banquetting Halls. It is very much alive in the millions of Indian homes. (Hear, hear). In the tens of millions of Indian hearts. (Hear, hear). So you will be pleased to see that both are right. (Laughter). And yet Non-co-operation lives and shall live until it merges itself into Swaraj.

IS IT AUTOSUGGESTION?

Then again it is said that Mahatmaj's arrest has proved such a great set-back that Non-co-operation is as good as dead if not actually dead. You have heard what Earl Winterton said in the House of Commons the other day. He said that normal conditions have now established themselves after the arrest of Mahatma Gandhi and by normal conditions he meant that opposition to Government had died out. Then he said that the bubble of supernatural powers and other attributes of Mahatma Gandhi was burst by his arrest. Gentlemen, what do we see before us to-night? Is this a mere bubble? It must be a very very solid and substantial bubble which holds so many thousands of people here to-night. And is there any doubt whatever that the followers of a movement who are honoured by people in such large numbers as are present here to-day—is it conceivable that that movement is on the wane? I say that Earl Winterton only proposed adopting that new system of treatment which is called Autosuggestion. (Laughter.) By that treatment you try to convince a patient that he is getting well although he is dying and he gets well. He is here trying the other way about. He is trying to convince himself and uses it as a plan for his country and countrymen who do not know and care less to know the real facts about India. Well, let him, if he chooses, live in a fool's paradise. (Laughter). We have no objection to that. (Laughter). Then we have the Viceroy telling one of the Deputations from the commercial people, I think it was, who referred to the opposition to Government and

the want of sympathy to the administration in their address. He said to them: 'Gentlemen. In spite of what you say I am assured by my subordinates—by the Provincial Government I suppose, he meant—and their subordinates that there is now more confidence in the Government of India, in the hearts of the people and it is gradually progressing.' I say let His Excellency live under that hallucination. If he cares to see with his own eyes and hear with his own ears what is happening in the country he will soon be disillusioned.

THE WORK BEFORE US

But what of that to us? What does it matter to us what His Excellency thinks or what the Right Honourable Gentlemen in the House of Commons think? We have got to see for ourselves what we are, what we are doing and what remains for us to be done. The answer to all these three questions is to be found in the teaching of Mahatma Gandhi. My friend and esteemed colleague, the Hakim Sahib, has given you in a very brief and very expressive resume of the situation, the real facts which face us to-day. They will shortly be laid before you by the gentleman who has undertaken to translate them. But the whole programme, the whole teaching of Mahatma Gandhi may be summed up so far as it regards the obtaining of Swaraj in three most essential principles. The first and the foremost is the unity of all classes.

UNITY

In that, I include Hindu-Muslim unity, Brahmin—non-Brahmin unity, Christian—Parsi—Jew unity, in fact everything which makes for disruption and disunion among races. Now if you are able to remove that one cause of our being kept out of Swaraj there is not the least doubt that without more delay Swaraj will be yours. If you can have to day Hindus, Muslims, Brahmins, Non-Brahmins, Christian, Parsi, Jews and all other communities of India united and with one voice declare your firm determination to obtain Swaraj there is not any Government in the world, there is not any power in the world which can keep you out of it for a day. That one item assumes special importance in this presidency where the question of untouchability and the question of Brahmin vs. Non-brahmin are very acute. Now, Gentlemen, I do not pretend to be a religious Divine and I do not ask you to enter into any religious discussion either between yourselves or with me. We are here as an Indian Nation and all I wish you to consider is the social and political aspects of the question. To enter into a discussion as to whether a certain class of Hindus is entitled to enter into the temples of a certain other class is beside the point to-day and not within my province but I ask you whether anyone of you can seriously entertain the idea that Swaraj could be obtained without complete harmony, without complete Union between these various communities. If you agree with me then I ask you, "Are you or are you not going to remove the root cause?" If you are not going to settle this Brahmin vs. Non-Brahmin question amicably amongst yourselves, if you are not going to find some way out of the stigma of untouchability, is it any good for you to say and to declare to the world that you really want Swaraj. (Hear, hear). Are you aware that outside India there is no other nation in the world who will pay the slightest heed to your claim for Swaraj unless and until you have done away with untouchability and the distinction socially and politically between Brahman and Non-Brahman. It is a thing which is not conceivable and I do hope and trust that this principle has dawned upon every true well-wisher of the country and every person who truly desires Swaraj. Remember the threat of Mr. Montagu which he gave from his place in the House of Commons only the other day, one of his last performances in office. In the debate relating to India when the question whether a further instalment of reforms was to be granted to India or not, Mr. Montagu in refusing that instalment gave a threatening warning.

He asked us to beware how we pressed such a demand upon the most determined people in the world. This is how he described himself and his countrymen. Now, gentlemen, unless you are prepared to prove, to demonstrate to the world that determination is not the sole heritage of Englishman, (Hear, hear) unless you are prepared to demonstrate to the world that you are equally determined to get your Swaraj (Hear, hear) you have no hope of success and I believe in your determination to get Swaraj only when you have done away with the two great obstacles in its way. It is up to you to show to the world that you are really organised that you will not stop until you have gained your object, namely, Swaraj, and until these things are discharged it is impossible for them to take you seriously. I say, therefore, that the first and foremost item in the programme is this unity between the different communities in India and that a complete unity. The other things will follow in its wake.

KHADDAR

There is the problem of Khaddar. I have tried in various speeches to meet the arguments of those who had not attached sufficient importance to Khaddar and it is unnecessary for me to go into that question to-night, but is there any man who will differ from me on the economic aspect of the question? Is there any man who cannot say that the wearing of Khaddar, not on occasions of meetings, not merely to show that you possess a scrap of Khaddar, but the adoption of khaddar as your regular dress, does not make him feel a different man? I can tell you from my own experience that it does make me feel quite a different man from what I was. It makes you feel that you have identified yourself with a certain movement, that you have pledged yourself to get something, to attain some object, and that you are not going to stop till you have obtained that object. It is most important to obtain that mentality that is necessary to all your undertakings towards Swaraj.

CONGRESS MEMBERSHIP

Then the third item is the membership of the Congress. Now if you will register yourselves as members of the Congress in your thousands, in your millions, what do you show? You show what the National Will is. So far due importance has not been attached to the membership of the Congress but I say that it is as important as any other item of the Programme. The larger the number of the Congress members, the greater the volume of that soul-force of which we are speaking behind us, and the greater the chances of our success.

TILAK FUND

Last but not least is the question of Funds. You know they are the sinews of war, whether it be carried on by physical weapons or by spiritual weapons. We have to maintain a body of workers and we have to maintain a number of institutions and we have to carry on the fight generally. Nothing can be done without funds. These, gentlemen, are the principal teachings of Mahatma Gandhi and I say that if you seriously think of attaining Swaraj it is for you to strive, to put in your best endeavour and your strongest effort to promote all these three items. These are essential to any progress that you can hope to make.

MAHATMAJI'S SUPERNATURAL POWERS

Now gentlemen there is no doubt that Mahatma Gandhi is at the present moment in jail. As Earl Winterton has said, Mahatma Gandhi's arrest and his incarceration have divested him of his supernatural powers. Now I happen to have put the same question to Mahatmajee before he was arrested. I said to him, "Mahatmajee, it is said you are inviting your arrest in issue after issue of *Young India*. You are in fact courting your arrest. You are at every turn breaking the Sedition Section but what the Government is aiming at is to arrest you. They know very well that

your teaching is now taking firm root and that your arrest will not result in any non-violence. They will argue from the very fact of that Non-violence that the people have lost faith in you and that your supernatural powers are gone." Mahatmajee replied: "If for no other reason in the world, that is strong enough reason for my going to jail, if there are any people who think that I am endowed with supernatural powers, the sooner they are disillusioned the better." So that it was not a bubble left for Earl Winterton to prick. (Laughter). It has been pricked by Mahatmajee himself so far as his own supernatural attributes are concerned.

WILL YOU PASS THE TEST?

But that he has a great soul, that he is the great founder and guiding genius of this movement, that his presence is essential there is no doubt whatever, but his presence does not necessarily mean his being with you on every occasion. He is in prison. But why? He has been all over India not only once but twice, perhaps thrice. He has planted the seed. It is now ripe and he is seeing how it takes root. He whom you claimed with loud 'Jais' is now putting you to the test. Did you really mean it or was it simply an empty sound carrying no meaning? You are on your great trial. If you pass this great test you may be sure that Mahatmajee will be amongst you again to lead you, by easy stages to the remaining stages of the journey to Swaraj. But if you do not pass your test I am afraid you will have to wait for the expiry of his full term of imprisonment.

CONCLUSION

What what do I see before me. Are there signs, are there any indications of the great Mahatmajee having to languish in jail all these six years? I must emphatically deny that there are any such signs. I am perfectly certain that on the constructive programme which has been laid before the country and on such suggestions as may be forthcoming after this enquiry the country will have for its guidance certain definite and clear principles and lines of action which it is to pursue, and following these lines I am perfectly confident that the walls of the prison in which Mahatmajee is confined shall melt away and he will again be at your head to lead you to victory. (Loud and prolonged cheers).

THE PREVENTION OF WAR

By BERTRAND RUSSELL, F. R. S.

Every reasonable being, whether Pacifist, Communist, or Imperialist, must admit the following propositions:-

(1) Future wars will be far worse than the late war, particularly as regards their effect upon the civilian population.

(2) So long as wars continue, each will be far worse than any of its predecessors, until men cease to be sufficiently educated to make new inventions.

(3) To this process, there are only two possible issues, one being the end of war, the other being the extinction of civilisation and, with it, of the scientific knowledge that makes large scale homicide possible.

Those who are impressed by the gravity of this situation have, it seems to me, two different duties to perform, one concerning their personal conduct, the other concerning their influence on public opinion. I do not think the end of war will be brought about by the world in general adopting the pacifist theory, but I also do not think it will be brought about unless there are pacifists to study the problem and influence opinion.

Men who are convinced that the prevention of war is the most pressing problem facing civilisation should, it seems to me, publicly and solemnly pledge themselves to take no part in war, no matter what the issue may be. It is not implied logically that all war, always, is on the balance harmful. What is implied is (a) that most wars are harmful; (b) that the outbreak

of war produces an excitement which clouds people's judgment as to whether this particular war is harmful; (c) that no one can know that a war which is in progress will not be harmful on the whole; (d) that therefore it is better to make a rule of abstaining from war, to guard against war hysteria.

PRIVATE MURDER AND STATE MURDER

The case is exactly the same as that of private murder. There are people (I name no names) whose death would be good for the world; but it would never do if we all went about killing anybody we thought would be better dead. And it is just as bad when States use their private judgment in the matter of war, in which they are always interested parties. War hysteria is very hard to resist unless we have fortified ourselves against it in time of peace. And different issues deceive different people. Many who saw through the "last-war" fallacy in 1914 succumb to it when the Marxian class-war is in question. Therefore, there is need of a nucleus of men pledged against all war.

There should, however, be no coercion of faith exacted with the pledge, since different people have different reasons, and what matters is the act of resisting war, no matter what may be the reasoning leading to this act.

Assuming such a body to exist, its members should, as far as they have leisure, devote themselves to studying the causes of war and the means available for diminishing the frequency and intensity of wars. (It must be remembered that the question is quantitative, and that wars which are small or short are not so harmful as those which are great or long.) There will, of course, be divergent opinions among Pacifists as to the ways of preventing war; this, however, is not undesirable.

I think there is one thing that is important to remember, namely, that theoretical pacifism is not likely itself to be a strong political force, and that the arguments by which a great public can be reached must be common-sense arguments. A great war results always from a victory of passion over self-interest. I do not think that arguments of self-interest alone will prevent war, because when people's passions are roused they judge falsely as to their interests. But I think arguments of self-interest have a part to play: if the public could be persuaded that nations which go to war are fools (a proposition not hard to demonstrate) the warmongers would have a harder task.

War springs mainly from the passions of hatred, envy, and greed. Greed as a motive for war can be eliminated by the arguments which Normal Angell has made familiar, which the outcome of the great war has abundantly verified. Hatred and envy, however, require to be treated by different methods. Undoubtedly they are encouraged by our present economic system, and might be diminished by different systems. But to pursue this line of argument would require a volume.

SCIENCE AND FEROCITY

Mankind have acquired, through science, a control over the forces of nature, which they use chiefly in order to kill each other. It may be said, with little exaggeration, that just as marriage is an institution for legalising and regulating the sex impulse, so the State is an institution for legalising and regulating the impulse to homicide. (About three-quarters of our revenue is devoted to paying for past and future wars.) If we are to survive, we must improve morally, and devote our scientific knowledge to other purposes than destruction. A race of men devoted to scientific ferocity must perish.

We must cease to be scientific, or cease to be ferocious. Which is it to be? The future of the world depends upon the answer: (No more war)

—Swami.