

Indian Opinion

No. 34—Vol. XXIX.

Friday, August 21st, 1931.

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

NOTES AND NEWS

HIS Excellency the Governor-General, the Earl of Clarendon, and Her Excellency the Countess of Clarendon were given a very warm welcome by the citizens of Johannesburg on their first official visit to that city last Monday. Mr. Jussab Ebrahim, on behalf of the Transvaal Indian Congress, presented an address tendering "humble allegiance and an expression of loyalty and good wishes," and submitting the hope that His Excellency would exert his powerful influence towards an equitable solution of the difficulties facing the Union's Indian community. Mr. Ebrahim then garlanded Lord Clarendon, who, in reply to the address, said:

"I would like to assure the Indian community that, while I have the privilege of remaining in South Africa, it will be my earnest endeavour to do all I can to promote the happiness and prosperity of all. I must also thank them for having honoured me with an old Indian custom, in that they have presented me with this garland of flowers which I have round my neck. It brings back to my mind many happy months spent in the great country from which they come."

A Reuter's message from Sydney states:—

About 50 girls, when Confirmed at Our Lady of Victoria Church, Bowen Hills, Queensland, by the Archbishop of Brisbane (Dr. J. Dunhig) took the pledge against smoking. Brisbane is the first diocese in Australia which has inaugurated this pledge required of its womanhood, and the principle has received praise abroad. The Archbishop in addressing the young women candidates for Confirmation referred to the great necessity to-day for a safeguard to womanly virtue, and he said that he regarded this pledge as one safeguard, owing to the temptations to which the habit of smoking might lead. "As far as girls are concerned," said his Grace, "smoking was unknown a generation ago, and it opens to-day an avenue of danger. There are two sides to the question, too, for smoking is detrimental to a woman's nerves and to her health in general." The girls were asked to take a pledge "for the honour of God and for the honour of womanhood," to refrain from smoking for life and to do all in their power to prevent other girls from taking the habit.

We take note of the above with the hope that it may serve as a warning to those who think everything in the Westeners to be good and worth copying. This is, at least, one item in the Western civilisation which we would not like our Indian women to copy.

We call the following from the *Rand Daily Mail*:

Under the chairmanship of Colonel H. Montz, an executive committee has been elected in Pretoria for the formation of a Council of Europeans with the object of "ensuring the lasting domination of the white man in South Africa in a spirit of just guardianship over the

native." Members of the executive include Mr. P. G. W. Grobler (Minister of Lands), Colonel M. S. du Toit, M.P., Dr. G. Preller, and Mr. H. R. Abercrombie.

While wishing to allow the native every freedom and to give him every assistance to develop along his own lines, the council will aim at fighting "undesirable negrophilism" by means of publicity and propaganda.

They propose devoting attention to the education of the white youth, "with a view to opening their eyes to the social relationships their forefathers have maintained for centuries, and to safeguard them against unwittingly succumbing to negrophilistic influences in school, church, or society.

The council supports segregation as a means of maintaining the equilibrium between white and black. It aims at securing preference for European labour, but also at safeguarding certain South African industries for the native against imported labour. It hopes to take measures to prevent the unskilled white labourer from being degraded to the status of the native and being brought into unfair competition with him.

THIS is, we think, the limit of cant and hypocrisy. That the object of the above body is to ensure the lasting domination of the white man in South Africa is quite understandable. But how they can talk of just guardianship over the Native and with the same breath aim at fighting "undesirable negrophilism" is beyond our comprehension. What seems to them "undesirable negrophilism" is nothing else but the desire to see justice done to natives who are the real sons of the soil. Where is their just guardianship when they are out to crush that desire? If their just guardianship over the natives were tested before an impartial tribunal we are sure they would stand convicted and would be liable to severe punishment under the common law of guardianship.

THE following letter from Rabindranath Tagore to one who was intending to go out as a missionary to India will be read with interest:—

"I have read your letter with pleasure. I have only one thing to say; it is this: Do not be always trying to preach your doctrine, but give yourself in love. Your Western mind is too much obsessed with the idea of conquest and possession; your inveterate habit of proselytism is another form of it. Christ never preached himself or any dogma or doctrine; he preached the love of God. The object of a Christian should be to be like Christ—never like a coolie recruiter trying to bring coolies to his master's tea garden. Preaching your doctrine is no sacrifice at all—it is indulging in a luxury far more dangerous than all the luxuries of material living. It breeds an illusion in your mind that you are doing your duty—that you are wiser and better than your fellow-beings. But the real preaching is in being perfect, which is through meekness and

love of self-dedication. If you have strong in you your pride of race, pride of sect, and pride of personal superiority, then it is no use to try to do good to others. They will reject your gift, or even if they do accept it they will not be morally benefitted by it—instances of which can be seen in India every day. On the spiritual plane you cannot do good until you are good. You cannot preach the Christianity of the Christian sect until you be like Christ—and then you do not preach Christianity, but the love of God, which Christ did.”

Mr. Peter Freeman, Member of Parliament and Chairman, Commonwealth of India League, recently in an interview, said:—The opponents of India's aspiration were using every subtle means to frustrate the effects of the Round Table Conference. Every trifling disturbance is exaggerated a hundred-fold to convey the impression that the peaceful India is seething with a mass of rebels. Mr. Freeman says she certainly will justifiably be discontented until the grievances are remedied. It is highly creditable to all concerned that the Irwin-Gandhi Agreement is being so loyally maintained and especially it is a tribute to Mahatma Gandhi's influence that he has been able to secure such widespread adherence throughout India under provocative circumstances. "If Indians are able to maintain such patience, however sorely tried, they will not find England lacking when the moment comes for a final decision to be taken and the responsibility of future Government transferred to an elected Indian Parliament."

THE *Manchester Guardian*, in the course of a leading article on the notorious Miss Mayo's 'Volume Two,' writes:—

There are, of course, those who would use Miss Mayo's book to demonstrate India's unfitness for self-government, but little weight need be attached to their arguments. Logically, to give control to Legislatures responsible to India's custom-ridden voters might seem fatal to the cause of reform. But in practice the men who will stand for and secure election are likely to be modernists, easily influenced by the world's criticism and not too differential to the views of their constituents except in the matter of taxation. As to the assertion that ages of child marriage have produced in India a degenerate race, we may leave this question to the further investigation of scientists, who may also have something to tell us in England about the effects on our stock of the early excesses of industrialism, of city slums and city life, and of a war which destroyed the fine flower of a whole generation.

We have received for publication a full report of the fourth anniversary celebration of the Indian Social Service Committee held last Wednesday evening at the Tamil Institute, Durban, under the presidency of His Worship the Mayor, Mr. A. Lamont. We are obliged to hold over the report for our next week's issue.

A meeting of the Sultan Football Club, Springs, (Transvaal) was held at the residence of Mr. E. H. Bayat on August 6. The following officials were elected:—

Chairman: Mr. E. H. Bayat, Vice-Chairman: Mr. Moosa Akoodie, Secretary: Mr. A. M. S. Choughulay, Captain: Mr. D. M. Khan, Vice-Captain: Mr. Ismail Pabadi, members of the club: Ebrahim Pabadi, Ismail Hajat, Shamsheodeen, Essop Asvat, Ebrahim Khan, Ebrahim Seadat, Ahmed Laher, Ahmed Kosadia, Ismail Laher, A. Belakdy.

UNGENEROUS TOWN COUNCIL

WHEN the Durban Town Council gave two acres of land for the Sastri College on lease we protested that the Town Council's action was ungenerous. We have occasion once again to reiterate that view. As would appear from a report published elsewhere in this issue, the Sastri College authorities applied for further land adjoining the College, in extent, a little more than an acre but later amended their application and applied for the grant of 6½ acres, as originally asked for by Mr. Sastri, to be made over to them, on the same terms and conditions as apply to land granted by the Council to the Government for educational purposes, thus cancelling the lease of two acres now occupied by the College, which would be merged into the total area. The Council-in-Committee who met to consider the application, state that after considering the matter very carefully they are not prepared to recommend the Council to grant the Sastri College authorities the whole of the area applied for, but recommend the sale in leasehold of a little more than an acre as originally applied for.

We Indians have often been rebuked for not doing anything on our own to help our own people. Europeans, whom we look upon as sympathisers in our cause, have often pointed out to us, and we have felt it ourselves, too, that if we, as a community, would do something substantial, independently, for our uplift, we would be sure to get help from the authorities. With this faith Mr. Sastri worked very strenuously among our people and exhorted them to do their bit in the interests of their children's education. The present magnificent College building worth nearly £20,000, is the fruit of the generous response given by the Indian community to Mr. Sastri's exhortation. It is by no means a mean gesture on the part of the Indian community. But what encouragement do we get from the Durban Town Council? We are given only two acres of land and that too on lease. Mr. Sastri's eloquence could stir large audiences, it moved the sluggish Indian community of Natal to contribute £20,000—the biggest sacrifice it is known to have made in the history of South Africa, it can move the Empire, but it fell flat before the Durban Town Council. Mr.

Sastri fell short of falling on bended knees before the Council for more land but it was of no avail. It was just about that time that the Town Council made a free gift of fifty acres of land to the present Howard College, and Mr. Sastri could well see that the Council could be generous when it wanted to be, but in the case of the Indian community it simply did not want to be generous. Being gifted with a tremendous amount of patience Mr. Sastri swallowed the bitter pill hoping for a better future. But the future, as we now see, has proved to be as gloomy as the past.

In mentioning the Council's gift to the Howard College let it not be misunderstood that we begrudge that great and useful institution the gift it has acquired. Far from it. We think it fully deserved the gift and the Durban Town Council is to be congratulated for having risen to the occasion. We make mention of the fact only by way of comparison. Six or seven acres of land situated in, what is so customary to call, an Indian locality and for an educational institution costing nearly £20,000 could not be considered by any sane person an extravagant request. To the Durban Town Council, however, it seems to have appeared so, and has, therefore, not conceded to the request. Would that better counsel may yet prevail upon the Durban Town Council and that it may be inspired to grant the very reasonable request of the Sastri College authorities,

Land For Sastri College

Corporation Very Ungenerous

The Council-in-Committee of the Durban Town Council at its meeting of July 31, and August 14, dealt among other matters with the application for land for Sastri College. The report reads as follows:—

In September, 1927, the Agent of the Government of India, the Rt. Hon. V. S. Sastri, applied to the Council for an area approximately 6½ acres in extent, bound by Warwick Avenue, Mansfield Road, Centenary Road and the Indian Sports Ground, on which to erect an Indian Training College. After due consideration the Council sold in leasehold to the College authorities a site 2 acres in extent, facing Warwick Avenue (Winterton Walk) and adjacent to the Indian Sports Grounds.

In 1930, the Sastri College authorities made application for the land lying between the College and Centenary Road, the area of which is approximately 1 acre 2 roods 9 perches.

At a later stage the Sastri College authorities amended their application and applied for the grant of the whole of the area (6½ acres) originally asked for by Mr. Sastri to be made over to them on the same terms and conditions as apply to land granted by the Council to the Government for educational purposes, with the consequent cancellation of the

lease of two acres now occupied by the College which would be merged into the total area.

The Provincial Administration also made application for the freehold title of all the land applied for by the Sastri College, i.e. the existing site as leased to the Agent of the Government of India, plus the further four acres approximately required by the College authorities.

After giving the matter the most careful consideration the Council-in-Committee report that they are not prepared to recommend the Council to grant the application of the Sastri College authorities for the whole of the area which adjoined their present lease, having regard to the needs of other bodies whose applications are before the Council.

In the circumstances the Council-in-Committee recommend:

(a) That in terms of Section 160 (a) of Ordinance 19 of 1924 the consent of the Administrator be obtained to the sale in leasehold by private bargain of a site described as Lot ITC/1, Block B, in extent 1 acre 2 roods 9 perches, situate between the Sastri College and Centenary Road, to the Sastri College authorities, on the same terms and conditions as apply to their existing lease of Lot ITC, and at a rental proportionate to such existing lease.

(b) That the Mayor be authorised to sign such documents as are necessary herein, and the Corporate Seal be affixed thereto.

Important Supreme Court Judgment

Ladysmith Licensing Appeal Upheld

In the case of Ismail Amod Karwa v. Licensing Officer, Ladysmith, before Mr. Justice Matthews and Mr. Justice Hathorn in the Supreme Court of Natal:

Applicant, a storekeeper, of Ladysmith, had been the holder of two general dealer's licences and a patent medicine licence for the year 1930; in respect of premises situated at 132 and 134 Murchison Street, Ladysmith. In September, 1930, his estate had been assigned and, acting on the instructions of his assignee, he continued to carry on the business as aforesaid. He duly made application for the renewal of his licences for the year 1931, the assignee intimating that he had no objection.

The Licensing Officer, however, refused the application, holding that the right to the licences, as an adjunct to the applicant's business, passed to the assignee when the deed of assignment was granted. Further, the fact that the applicant's estate had been assigned showed that there was no necessity for the renewal and also that the procedure to be followed by the applicant to obtain licences for the current year would be that applicable to new licences. Applicant had appealed to the Town Council which had, however, upheld the Licensing Officer's decision, and he now appealed to this Court, on the grounds (1) that the Licensing Officer had erred in holding that the licences had passed to his assignee on his assignment; (2) that the Licensing Officer, having wrongly held that the licence passed to the assignee, precluded himself from dealing with the application on the basis which he ought to have dealt with it; (3) that it was incompetent for the Licensing Officer to consider the question of necessity or otherwise for a licence in respect of which a renewal was sought; (4) that the fact that applicant had assigned his estate for the benefit of his creditors did not show that there was no necessity for the licence; (5) before deciding as to necessity, the Licensing Officer should have given applicant an opportunity of leading evidence in relation thereto; (6) there was no evidence before

the Licensing Officer upon which he could exercise his discretion adversely to applicant upon the grounds stated, or at all.

Mr. H. G. Mackeurtan, K.C., with him Mr. A. Milne (instructed by Mr. A. Christopher) appeared for applicant, and Mr. F. N. Groome for respondent.

The matter came before the Court last term when, after hearing argument, the Court reserved judgment, which was given on Monday Aug. 10.

Mr. Justice Matthews, after reciting the facts, stated that, although several grounds of appeal had been tabled, they resolved themselves into the following two: (1) Did or did not the notice of assignment divest the application of the licence? If it did, no application for a renewal as distinguished from the grant of a new licence could be made by him; (2) if the applicant was not so divested of the licence, was there or was there not a refusal on the part of the Licensing Officer to exercise the discretion vested in him by Statute, in that, by misinterpreting the law, he failed to appreciate the nature of that discretion, and, further, in that he came to the conclusion that there was no necessity for the licence without hearing evidence at all on the matter or without giving applicant an opportunity of being heard, and that, solely on the fact of the assignment of applicant's estate.

After reviewing the authorities and the relevant sections of the Insolvency Act, his Lordship was of opinion that the Licensing Officer had erred on a matter of law in taking the view that the right to the licences was divested from the applicant and passed to the assignee under the deed of assignment. That being so, there had been a refusal of the renewal of a certificate of approval for a licence and the Licensing Officer could not treat the matter as an application for a certificate for a new licence.

In considering the second question, the Licensing Officer's reasons showed that he came to the conclusion that there was no necessity for the renewal of the certificate owing to the fact that applicant had assigned his estate. It was, however, obvious that though applicant's financial difficulties were such that he had to assign his estate, this was not conclusive as to there being no necessity for a general dealer's licence in respect of the premises. A refusal to renew, for a reason which did not follow from the facts given in support of the reason, was in itself an absolute negation of the exercise of a discretion in a proper manner. Further, the refusal had been made without informing applicant that he had to meet this point, which had been taken by the Licensing Officer *ex mero motu* and, subject to the consideration of the effect of the decisions of this Court on the particular legislation applicable to this Province, that alone would be a ground for setting aside the Licensing Officer's decision.

Having regard to the circumstances, his Lordship thought that this was a case where the Court should not remit the application for rehearing, but should exercise the powers conferred upon it by the Act of 1909 and, having set aside the licensing authority's decision, order that the certificate of renewal be awarded to applicant, who would be entitled to the costs of this appeal.

Mr. Justice Hathorn delivered a concurring judgment, in which his Lordship said that he agreed with the order proposed by Mr. Justice Matthews, but for somewhat different reasons.

The first question to be determined was the jurisdiction conferred upon the Appeal Court by Section 6 of Act 22 of 1909 (Natal), and was one of considerable difficulty, because of the different views which that Court had itself taken at various times. His Lordship's view was that the "appeal" mentioned in Section 6 was an appeal in the ordinary sense "as understood in our courts of law," to use the phrase of Mr. Justice Stratford, in the case of *Ahmed Mahomed v. Balfour Village Council* (1929,

T.P.D. 235).

There had been a series of cases in the Natal courts, culminating in the case of *Bhayla v. Licensing Officer, Estcourt*, in which, by a gradual process, the jurisdiction of the Appeal Court had been limited to such an extent that by 1926 the Court would only interfere upon the narrow grounds upon which any superior Court would review inherently the exercise by an official of a discretion under a Statute.

His Lordship agreed with Mr. Justice Matthews, for the reasons stated by him, that the Licensing Officer was wrong in thinking that the licences were diverted from the appellant and passed to the assignee, and in finding as a fact that there was no necessity for the licence, merely because appellant had assigned his estate. These would be proper grounds for allowing an appeal in the ordinary sense and his Lordship adopted them as the ground upon which to conclude that the present appeal should be allowed.—*Natal Mercury*.

SELF-PITY OR SELF-HELP?

(By L. W. RITCH)

There is said to be a tide in the affairs of man which, when taken at the flood leads on to fortune. The wise opportunist takes advantage of such; the fool lets opportunity pass him by. He may have to wait long 'ere it recur. This is as true of sacred as of secular affairs.

Now, opportunities are valueless to such as are incapable of recognising them or to such as are unfitted or unworthy to utilise them. In the main, people are environed by the circumstances they deserve, by the limitations most conducive to their development, by the conditions they have either actively contributed to fashion, or have through indifference or sloth allowed to obtain.

A duty devolves upon every man to refrain from being party or privy to what he knows or should know to be unjust or wrong, and to hide from that duty behind the excuse of personal discomfort, lack of interest in communal affairs, or similar selfish motive, is merely to pile up wrong upon wrong.

What touches my neighbour, touches me. There is no greater heresy than the denial of responsibility for a brother's welfare. The man who has not yet learnt that he is "his brother's keeper" has yet to learn the alphabet of how to "keep" himself. The realisation of the folly of neglecting the duty to stand by righteousness and to resist the insidious temptations to play, selfishly, for safety is ultimately and inevitably borne home to the foolish, and that painfully. Whether or not "the wages of sin are death," certain it is that each reaps what he sows, and no less certain that folly and un wisdom are corrected by experiencing their consequences in oneself.

We are all too prone to indulge in self-pity, to regard ourselves as innocent victims of others' cruelty and wrong-doing. We are given to appropriating to ourselves certain "rights" and to regarding others who interfere with them as the wrong doers. In reality the doctrine of independent or individual rights has no existence apart from the "heresy of separateness." It is part of that very heresy. Antagonism, rivalry, conflict of interests, that is, "self" and "self-ish-ness," are inherent in the very notion of "rights."

No growth can be healthy and lasting that is rooted in selfishness; no canons of conduct that have selfishness for their foundation can hope to guide men safely and surely. Indeed, it is to be observed that "rights" not infrequently change, alter or vary at the call of expediency. "Rights," then, may thus become wholly divorced from "Right" and merely synonymous with interests.

What then is Right or Righteousness in contradistinction to "rights"? Its exact opposite. As the

latter is but an integer in the notion of separate selves in competition with each other, or separate individualities with conflicting interests, so the former implies a common ideal and a common canon of conduct applicable to each and all. It necessitates a complete change of view-point, a reversal of present conduct. It reinstates Duty on the throne of which Duty is the legitimate occupant. Lived, it must mean a complete change of polarity in thought, emotion, action; harmony where now is discord, the disappearance of want with the discarding of "wants;" enlightened co-operation towards a goal however dimly perceived, and the quickening of the spiritual qualities latent in humanity whereby alone that goal can be attained.

Mahatma Gandhi And The Round Table Conference

"You may depend upon it that I would make a dash to London the moment the way is cleared by those in a position to do so," Mahatma Gandhi is reported to have stated cabling to the *News Chronicle* (London) from Bombay. "Let the British public know that I made every effort humanly possible, but the great civilians here either do not want me to go or do so under circumstances that congress cannot tolerate. I have no desire to attend the conference without these civilians' whole-hearted goodwill and blessings." Mahatma Gandhi lengthily reiterates the view that the patient and long-suffering congress has been badly treated, adding if London cannot guarantee protection to a party to the Delhi settlement which has not arms to back itself, London is most unlikely to produce a scheme acceptable to India.

The *Natal Advertiser* Calcutta correspondent cables that the reasons congress refused to attend the Round Table Conference are revealed in the publication of correspondence between the Government and Mr. Gandhi, in which Mr. Gandhi demanded: (1) A board of arbitration to watch the implementing of the Delhi agreement by both sides, particularly in regard to the collection of land revenue in Gujerat; (2) the local board's inquiry to decide action in the matter of picketing; (3) the collection of land revenue should be dependent on the advice of congress.

On questions 1 and 2 the Government replied: "It would not be possible for the Government to agree to any arrangement which involved the suspension of the ordinary law or included the appointment of external authority to whom the Government would delegate the responsibility for reaching decisions closely affecting administration, nor can it agree to the provision of special procedure benefits, of which the congress could lay claim and from which members of the public would be excluded and which would trench upon the jurisdiction and discretion of the courts of law."

The Government denied that there had been breaches of the Delhi agreement on their part, and stated that cultivators who could not pay had not been coerced to do so. The Government could not agree to a tribunal to consider the Government's actions under the agreement which did not lay down that Congress should be consulted in the matter of the collection of revenue.

The Viceroy finally appealed to Congress to go to conference as the best way of obtaining a real and lasting solution of the present difficulties.

Mahatma Gandhi, in an interview before leaving for Ahmedabad, said Congress would make every effort not to revive civil disobedience until the

round table conference had finished its deliberations but much would depend on the attitude of the Government. A renewal of the fight was certain if the round table conference did not grant the Nationalist demands and this time the struggle would be more intensive and more extensive.

The Bombay correspondent of the *Times* cables that Mr. Gandhi, in a statement, said: "It is a great blow not going to London. My request was incredibly simple. There was a contract between the Government and Congress, and if a breach occurred surely the laws governing contracts must be applicable. But the Government, in its wisdom, rejected Congress' very simple and natural suggestion that matters should be referred to an impartial tribunal. Hence the decision of the Congress Committee.

"It is not intended at present to resume civil disobedience immediately, but also there is no question of reopening the negotiations regarding the Congress round table representation. The non-representation of Congress does not mean the end of the Delhi settlement, which will work honourably until the Government makes the position utterly intolerable, which it is not now."

Mahatma Gandhi, interviewed by Reuter at Ahmedabad, denied reports that the All-India Congress was preparing for war. He said that instructions had been issued throughout India that the Delhi agreement was to be carried out. "I have not the slightest desire to humiliate or embarrass the Government. My only desire is to get justice," Mahatma Gandhi declared.

A later message from Simla states that Mahatma Gandhi has published a lengthy document designated "charge sheet," in which he specifies various alleged breaches of the Irwin-Gandhi pact by the Government. He is also reported to have sent a letter to the Viceroy, Lord Willingdon, asking if the Government of India intends to continue to observe the pact. The Government, it is stated, proposes to publish a reply, dealing with the attitude of Congress towards the pact, and that while intending to adhere to the pact, it is prepared to take up Mahatma Gandhi's challenge and to deal with any recrudescence of civil disobedience.

The Communal Question

"THE Round Table Conference may be packed by people of one view, but our voice is bound to be heard. India cannot come to a decision on the communal issue unless Nationalist Muslims have a due share in it. Ours will be the last word on the subject," observed Dr. M. A. Ansari, in the course of a speech acknowledging the civic honour conferred on him by the Calcutta Corporation.

THE Bengal Nationalist Moslem Conference held recently at Faridpur passed the following resolution:

This Conference considers the packing of the Round Table Conference with Moslems belonging to a particular school of political thought grossly unfair to the Moslem community, and it desires to point out to the Government of India that the exclusion of representatives of the All-India Nationalist Moslem Party from the Round Table Conference would be regarded as an act of manifest injustice and calculated to hamper the solution of the Indian problem.

FOR SALE

Printing Press fully equipped. The only Indian press in Pietermaritzburg. Excellent proposition. Apply: "Press," Box 190, Pietermaritzburg.

India Demands Justice

(BY DR. ANNIE BESANT IN THE
'INDIAN REVIEW')

(Continued from last week)

The question of cotton is another case of flagrant injustice done to the Indians. Protection to Lancashire by the cotton excise destroyed India's cotton trade. At one time India was a country with an enormous foreign trade in calicoes, muslins, silks, and woven fabrics. The English market was supplied with Indian cotton goods. The Lancashire mill industry wanted to grow, and Parliament passed laws putting a heavy duty on Indian cotton goods, and made it penal to import cotton goods from India, punishing those who brought them to England, and those who purchased them. Lancashire's trade was protected; it grew to great wealth, then the policy was changed to Free Trade when England wanted a world market, and India's trade was ruined.

Further, the Indian cotton cultivators were pressed to grow a long-staple cotton, which suits the manufacturers to use in machines in the mills of India, and the cultivators have now to grow the long instead of the short-staple cotton which suited their own hand-loom workers. Injustice and exploitation could go no farther.

Yet I sincerely believe that the union between Britain and India is vital for the welfare of both. Together they can do far more than the total product of both of them working apart. I know that India, if she insisted upon complete independence, would be at the mercy of some other invading nation. She would have Japan, China, Russia, or the tribes of Central Asia overrunning her. And what would Britain do without India? India is the vital link in the British Empire.

Is it wise statesmanship to drive India to desperation, as we are doing at present? Is it wise to toy and vacillate with her future in economics or politics? Is it wise to tell her by our conduct that we help all peoples except Indians who wish for self-determination?

These questions demand an immediate answer; they are a challenge to the goodwill and the good name of the British people. England and India are better together than separate. Make freedom possible for India, the only country in the world where freedom can be won by reform, and not by revolution. India and England can keep the world at peace; they can make a growing friendship between Europe and Asia, with its constant promise of trade expansion and economic prosperity.

With the experience of many years spent working in India I know that at the moment the funds of patience are running low; patience is almost exhausted, and poverty is breeding extremism and distrust of British intentions. When India's patience is exhausted, then nothing that man can devise will keep her within the Empire, which must become a Commonwealth. But I still believe that the vast majority of the British people who know so little of the truth about India wish to "play the game," to give her the same opportunity of Dominion Self-Government as has been granted to the British Dominions. This accumulated public opinion and goodwill is bound to make itself felt against the hard crust of Government, officialdom, and vested interests; and the time will soon come, I hope, when India shall have the same equal opportunity of becoming a Nation.—*Indian Review*.

(Concluded)

British Missionary Societies' Conference

Lord Irwin On India

(From An Esteemed Correspondent)

The following speech was delivered by Lord Irwin at a meeting on India under the auspices of the Conference of British Missionary Societies at the Central Hall, Westminster, on Tuesday, 21st July 1931. The Archbishop of Canterbury was in the chair:—

Anyone who has seen anything at close quarters of what Missions have done and are doing in India would realise the privilege of a meeting like this. While I was Viceroy I was able to see a good deal of their work, and appreciate not only its moral and social results, but the spirit in which it was conducted. Among outcasts and lepers, among criminal tribes of aboriginal dwellers in jungle tracts, in crowded cities and remote places in the hills, I have seen men and women striving devotedly to translate the message of Christ into the practical language of Him who went about doing good. In spite of the tragedy of disunity within the Christian ranks, they are doing work of quite incalculable value to India, and their most powerful sermons are in their lives.

People here have been lately puzzled and distressed by remarks made by Mr. Gandhi on this subject. From my knowledge of Mr. Gandhi I can only say this. It would require very strong proof to convince me that he, who is one of the greatest social reformers India has known, had failed to recognise that the real work of Christian missions was poles asunder from proselytising as commonly understood. I am sure that he knows as we do that it springs only from the irresistible impulse of men who, knowing themselves to possess the treasure beyond the price, long to share it with their fellows, and are impelled by the value they attach to each human soul to spend themselves in lifting those who are down, ministering to the oppressed, and bringing self-respect to those who have lost or never before known its meaning. Truly it is by the spirit of service that these men and women are inspired.

The same spirit has been conspicuously or tacitly at the root of the best work done by men of our race in the political and administrative field. Those great names of the Lawrences, Outram, Nicholson, and many others are the names of men who did their daily work in the sight of God, remembering always that they must render account to Him of their stewardship of power. And it was this Christian background of their lives, dimly apprehended and understood, that secured for them the respect and affection of those over whom they ruled, and whom they served. And it is this spirit in which we must approach our own problems to-day in India.

Indeed I fancy that it is the key to most of the great anxieties by which the world to-day stands oppressed. International co-operation to secure the economic foundations of modern life, disarmament, the relations of races and classes, in politics and in industry; at every point we realise that if only doubt and suspicion could be replaced by real sympathy and trust, we should have moved far to finding the way through our difficulties.

We all know something of the hard facts of the Indian situation that need to be brought into harmony; and he would be a bold man who said

that the doing of this would be a simple business. Quite apart from all other difficulties, the task of adjusting Indian aspirations with what Great Britain will rightly feel to be her responsibilities is, we may feel certain, not going to be easy.

I do not know whether Mr. Gandhi will decide to come to London or not, but I believe that both he and Indian nationalist opinion generally will recognise the necessity of special provisions in the future constitution to suit the special circumstances of India, and will not be unready to welcome the assistance in many directions of Great Britain, when they fully understand that Great Britain by meeting India in free and equal conferences is giving the best earnest of her anxiety to see the fruition of India's constitutional hopes, and that we do not seek in what we here say or do to promote anything but the interests of India.

It is sometimes suggested that these words, 'in the interests of India,' which found place in my agreement with Mr. Gandhi, were badly chosen, and take no account of the right of Great Britain to safeguard her own interests in any settlement that may be reached. We are here faced with an issue of great importance, and it is essential that we should search the foundations of our thought if we are to avoid dangerous confusion.

As I see it, Great Britain has weighty obligations in India, which she cannot ignore, in such matters as defence, financial credit, the protection of minorities of whatever kind, and the future treatment of Services recruited under the authority of Parliament. She has also great and vital interests on the economic side. It is a vital interest for Great Britain, with her industrial population dependent for their daily bread on trade overseas, to secure as large a share of the external trade of India as she can. It is not less a vital interest for India that Great Britain, on whom she is at present bound to rely almost entirely for her naval defence, and largely for her land protection, should be economically strong enough to fulfil these functions on behalf of India; until India can assume responsibility for them herself, and that would ultimately be impossible for Great Britain except upon the basis of prosperous trade.

And indeed, if the implications of any of these things are dispassionately examined I believe it will be found that when any association has grown so close as that between Great Britain and India, it is impossible to dissociate the real and permanent interests of one partner from the other. But that is a very different thing from saying that Great Britain is morally entitled to impose conditions on Indian constitutional development, which are not to the advantage of India, in the interests only, or primarily of Great Britain.

Such an attitude is indeed wholly inconsistent with the doctrine of British trusteeship, for India well-being. I am not here concerned to argue whether Indian nationalist opinion is or is not right and reasonable in resenting, as it does, this doctrine. That it does so is well known to anyone who is in touch with its thought, and it needs no great gifts of imagination to appreciate the grounds of this dislike. But what I am concerned to point out is that on this doctrine, to which appeal is often made, Indian interests must and should come first; for the same reason that he would be regarded as an indifferent and reprehensible trustee who used his position of trustee to advance his own interests in preference to those of which he was placed in charge.

But apart from the moral side, I can feel no doubt that any attempt to pursue a policy of regard to British interests, in preference to Indian, is foredoomed as a practical proposition to failure.

After all the greatest British interest is a contented India within the British Empire, and you will never secure that on a permanent basis, if you give cause to India to think that in the policy she pursues Great Britain is influenced by her own self-interest rather than by the interest of India. Take trade, in regard to which it is sometimes said that Government should take direct action in support of British interests. Leaving aside the question of how far the diminution of our import trade to India is due to general economic conditions—and I believe the effect of these is far greater than that of any propaganda against foreign cloth—it is surely evident that trade can only flourish and develop when you have willing buyers as well as willing sellers, and that, in other words, it must rest on the basis of good will. Where this is lacking you cannot force its flow any more than you can force water to run uphill. And the surest way to aggravate these difficulties in the trade sphere is to suggest that Great Britain should take some political action to coerce India into buying what she wants to sell. On the other hand, if Great Britain is prepared without reserve to show that she is only concerned to secure the true interests of India, she will find India very much more willing to meet her in devising practical means by which the partnership may operate to the mutual advantage of both parties.

The real difference between many of the critics of the policy of His Majesty's Government and myself is that they appear to believe that British interests of this kind can be secured by loud assertions of determination and vigorous action on the part of Great Britain, whereas I think that if they are to be permanently strengthened and maintained it must be and can only be, on the basis of mutual understanding and consent. The truth is that the people, who are disposed to question and even condemn the whole policy of trying to reach agreement with Indian thought through the Round Table Conference and blame the Conference plan for everything that goes wrong, are living in an unreal world, which is no longer true to the facts. They resemble the man who is beginning to go deaf, or lose his sight, and complains that his neighbours do not speak distinctly, or that the light is bad. And all the while the fault is nearer home. There is no good supposing however much you may wish to do so, that you can recreate the India of ten years ago, any more than it is possible for us to recapture the atmosphere of childhood, which we wistfully remember. The fate of Lot's wife is the traditional warning for those who would direct their gaze backward, instead of concentrating their efforts upon the achievement that lies before.

This Indian problem to-day is the biggest Imperial problem that this country has to face. We have had in our history to face others; sometimes, and most frequently, we have succeeded; sometimes we have lamentably failed. But when we have failed, it has been principally due to lack of the just spirit of faith and sympathy, which, not making light of real obstacles, has yet at other times, according to the law that trust begets trust, held for us the secret of success.

Most sincerely then let us pray that public opinion both here and in India may come to see how much to-day depends upon wisdom, restraint and understanding, and that these qualities may be vouchsafed to all in proportion to their need.

"Sastri Speaks"

"SASTRI SPEAKS"—with a Foreword by Jan H. Hofmeyr. Edited by S. R. Naidoo and Dhane Bramdaw. Price 8/-; Presentation Copy 15/-.

Messrs. The Natal Press (Pty.) Ltd., Pietermaritzburg, have published the above book which contains that eminent statesman's speeches delivered in South Africa during his term of office as the Agent of the Government of India in South Africa. A fine estimate of his work in the Union is made by Mr. J. H. Hofmeyr who has written a foreword to this book. He writes:

"This volume serves happily to enshrine South Africa's memory of Mr. Srinivasa Sastri's ambassadorship. It is well indeed that its preparation has been undertaken. Mr. Sastri's speeches were a real enrichment of our South African life. Their publication in this form will lend permanence to that enrichment."

Again:

"To the Europeans of our land his sojourn in our midst meant perhaps more than anything else the presentation of a new conception of India and its people. . . He made it real to us, and against the background he had created he made it possible for us to see what we have called our Indian problem in a different way."

The volume is not only a record of speeches, but contains valuable information on the Indian question. As an appendix to the book is included the Capetown Agreement, Mr. Sastri's Reports to the Government of India during his Agency, and other important matters that no one, interested in the Indian question, can afford to do without. The Press tributes and estimation of Mr. Sastri's services to South Africa form by no means an uninteresting addition to the book.

The Editors of "Sastri Speaks" are two well-known South African Indians who were intimately associated with Mr. Sastri during his sojourn in the Union. Mr. S. R. Naidoo was the secretary of the South African Indian Congress for several years, and represented the Natal viewpoint to the Government of India Delegation at the Round Table Conference at Capetown in 1926. Mr. Dhane Bramdaw is a well-known journalist, and the only Indian to be on the staff of a leading Natal daily. He is also Reuter's South African Indian correspondent.

The editors and publishers have rendered a very useful service to the country in bringing out this book which every student of Indian thought, we have no doubt, will find of inestimable value.

Indian Child Welfare Society Centre

150, BROOK STREET, DURBAN

Open daily, Monday to Saturday, 8-30 a.m. to 11 a.m. Infants, young children, nursing and expectant mothers.

Lady doctors give free attendance.

Tuesday morning 8-30 o'clock. Friday afternoon 3 o'clock.

TENDERS

INSOLVENT ESTATE OSCAR HEYMANN AND HEYMANN HIRSCH, Trading as OSCAR HEYMANN & Co., of District Pietersburg, C/15949.

Tenders are invited for the purchase of the above named General Dealer's Business as a going concern or alternatively the undermentioned Assets.

NOTE:—Special opportunity to obtain trading rights in Native areas.

Separate tenders for any individual trading concern may be made and will be considered.

The Stores are as follows:—

1. Bochem (with Post Office)
2. Tebanifontein (with Post Office)
3. Buffelshoek
4. Rosenkrantz
5. Uitkyk
6. Germaake
7. Innes
8. Mattenau
9. Vianen
10. Nairn

The Assets associated with each trading concern are under the following headings:

Store Buildings (Wood and Iron)

Stock-in-Trade

Outstanding Debts

Live Stock

Motor Cars and Lorry

Fixtures and Fittings

Household Furniture.

Leases of Trading Rights.

Tenders marked, "Tenders Insolvent Estate, Oscar Heymann & Co., C/15949," must be lodged in duplicate with the Master of the Supreme Court, P. O. Box. 441, Pretoria, not later than Noon on Monday the 24th August, 1931.

Full particulars may be had from the undersigned. The highest or any tender not necessarily accepted.

The Merchants' Trust, Ltd.,

Progress Buildings,

156, Commissioner Street,

P.O. Box 2037, Johannesburg.

W. D. MCFARLANE.

M. Heymann, Gordon (Pty) Ltd.,

109, Market Street,

P.O. Box 329, Johannesburg.

G. I. MASSEY HICKS.

Joint Provisional Trustees.

PEGASUS

THE PETROL FOR "ALL-ROUND" PERFORMANCE
VACUUM OIL COMPANY OF SOUTH AFRICA, LIMITED.

पेगसस

सार्वजनिक उपयोगने

भारतुं पेट्रोल.