


Indian Opinion

No. 1—Vol. XXVI.

Friday, January 6th, 1928.

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

NOTES AND NEWS

 WING to unavoidable circumstances we have had to hold over many important matters for next week. The report of the Kimberley Conference will be published fully in our next week's issue.

According to a proclamation in the current issue of the Government Gazette, the Asiatics in the Northern Districts of Natal Act, 1927, came into operation on Jan. 1, and a set of regulations under the Act are also gazetted. The Act makes compulsory the registration of Asiatics now resident in the northern districts of Natal, which formerly constituted an independent Republic, and were incorporated in Natal, after the Anglo-Boer War, and only such registered Asiatics will be entitled to trade. In effect, the new Act extends the provisions of the Transvaal law to the northern districts.

At a reception given in his honour recently in Colombo by the Ceylon National Congress, Mahatma Gandhi is reported to have said that "Congress" is a word in India to conjure with. They should follow the traditions of the National Congress of India, the parent body. Self-expression and self-government could not be taken or given to them by any one. Self-government depended entirely upon their own internal strength, upon their ability to fight against heavy odds. Truth is an integral part of the Congress creed. Attainment of Swaraj must be by legitimate means. Gandhiji deplored the existence of communalism which is totally opposed to nationalism. "Ceylon is endowed with men, money and natural gifts and with courage second to none. We cannot obtain Swaraj, the birthright of all countries, until communalism is dead and all communities live in a spirit of union." Continuing, Gandhiji urged to make politics as whole-time occupation and not to allow it to degenerate into spare-time hobby. He wanted the Congress to identify with the poor, especially the labourers and to vigorously participate in the abolition of the drink curse and also to introduce a full measure of spirituality into politics.

Interviewed by the Associated Press of India recently, Dr. Kitchlew is reported to have said: "I am giving these views in my individual capacity and not as Secretary of the All-India Muslim League. So far as I am concerned I do not think any foreign Government can willingly give self-government to a subject race. Self-government can only come through the concerted action of intense patriotism coupled with a feeling of self-sacrifice. To me the announcement of the Royal Commission's personnel is a god-send; for it is bound to serve as an eye-opener to those who pin their faith to the promises of the Imperial Government. The British Government has tried to take advantage of the present unfortunate differences between the Hindus and the Muslims, but in my opinion the Parliament has committed the greatest blunder. I have no doubt in my mind that the country will rally round the call of the National Party, provided the boycott is taken up in earnest."

Johannesburg, Jan. 4.—The prominent Trade Union leader whom it is proposed to bring from England for 12 months to act as adviser to the Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union in its reconstruction campaign has not yet finally been chosen. Mr. A. Creech Jones, of the British Transport and General Workers' Union, who is dealing with the matter, in a letter to Clements Kadalie, the general secretary of the I. C. U., received today, says: "I have met two or three officials regarding the proposal, but I have not yet discovered a man who is both suitable and free. I am continuing my inquiries." The idea is that one of the bigger British Unions should allow one of its officials, with special talents for organising, to come out on salary for a year to assist the I.C.U., the latter to be responsible only for his expenses.—Reuter.

A message from Madras states:—At the sixth Shivilliputtur Taluk Conference held recently at Rajapalayam, under the presidency of Mr. George Joseph, the following resolution was passed:—

"That in view of the policy behind the Royal Commission and the failure of the Congress representatives in Councils, Government Committees and local bodies to achieve any good for the people, this Conference is of opinion that there should be full Non-Co-operation with the Government and all these bodies must be vacated by such representatives and the country should accept the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi in carrying out the programme."

Indians In The War

Tribute By Lord Birkenhead

Lord Birkenhead, on October 7th, in unveiling the Memorial erected at Neuve Chapelle in memory of the Indian soldiers who fell in France during the War, delivered the following striking and impressive speech as reported by *The Times* (London):—

The outlines of the great story, to the mortal side of which to-day we pay homage, have been drawn by the distinguished soldier who succeeded Sir James Willcocks in the command of the Corps. I have nothing to add to his summary or to his narrative. But I ask leave to offer a word of affection, of gratitude, and of admiration to the memory of James Willcocks. Stout soldier, staunch friend, ardent patriot, he had for the Indian troops an affection which did not yield even to that of the illustrious Roberts. On him, too, may the earth rest lightly. If such things happen ever, or can happen, be sure that his spirit is in our midst to-day.

I cannot look at this memorial without emotion. It expresses in noble but simple architecture the gratitude of an Empire to the fallen dead of storied India. It was originally designed to commemorate those soldiers only whose last fate was unknown, and to whose bodies were denied the rites of pious sepulture. But a broader and a wiser decision has ordained that it shall stand here for all time to remind those who come after us, not only of the glory of the missing, but also of the sacrifice of the known

dead. And surely this decision was altogether right, for no man can do more than this—that he gave his life.

In three matters, while all who fought suffered greatly and wrought nobly, the endurance of the Indians was remarkable in a special manner.

Firstly, they fought thousands of miles from their homes, in strange and unfamiliar surroundings, among peoples whose tongues they did not know, whose ways were not their ways, whose civilisation—better or worse—was not theirs.

And, secondly, they fought in a climate to which their bodies were not inured and for the endurances of which they lacked habituation; most of them made swift exchange of the scorching heat of India for the weeping skies of Flanders. I saw them—I can see them now—shivering in those early and primitive trenches, standing up to their knees in foul water; their features always composed in that mask of fatalism which gives an impression of pathos already poignant. Their bodies were often broken by the elements, but their souls were never conquered.

And, thirdly, these men who have died fought in a quarrel of which their understanding was less perfect than was that of those by whose side they contended. The Belgian remembered a happy and innocent country which he had almost wholly lost. The French saw all round them the cruel signs of local destruction and, in the vivid eyes of imagination, must in dark moments have apprehended the loss of Paris the Incomparable, and the spread of that menacing invasion into yet further areas, unknown, incalculable. And so, too, in history, those whose valour was rendered immortal by Thucydides fought near to their homes and in a quarrel with known dangers. Nor did the Spartans who perished at Thermopylae offer their lives upon an issue obscurely understood.

It would be an insincerity to pretend that in this sense the objects with which this war was waged could have been known, or were known, to the majority of the Indian Army. Many a humble soldier, one suspects, must have thought of his far-away village, sun-swept, un-menaced, and wondered what inscrutable purpose of whatever deity he worshipped had projected him into this sinister and bloody maelstrom.

It is in all these circumstances the special soldierly virtue of these troops that they met with steadfast eyes the clash of a novel and horrible war: certainly without the clear, perhaps, without the discernible, stimulus of a danger to their own homes or to their own wives and children. Whence then came the spirit of endurance and of high endeavour? It came from the twin sources of an inborn and simple loyalty; of an instructed and very perfect discipline. Like the Roman legionary, they were faithful unto death. They had accepted a duty. They discharged it. More cannot be said; more need not be said.

But of another element in the gallant force, which is represented in this memorial, I must certainly add a word. There perished, in 14 months in France, directing and inspiring that force, 260 British officers. There were wounded over 1,000. The names of those who have no known grave are here recorded. I know enough of the minds of those who followed on the road of death to know that if they were with us they would most deeply resent any appreciation of their own worth which failed to include a tribute to the British officers whom they trusted and in whose company they met their fate.

In an alien soil we leave the Indian troops where they died. If the intuitive belief of mankind through the ages be well founded—if a region of happiness awaits the true and the valiant—may the spirits of these men, in that region, know that they did not die in vain!

Hindu-Muslim Unity

Mahatma Gandhi writes as follows in his *Young India* dated Dec. 1, 1927:—

Dr. Ansari told me when I was recently in Delhi, that he heard in Calcutta from reliable men that I had lost faith and interest in Hindu-Muslim unity, and that I was avoiding Mussalman friends such as the Ali Brothers. Dr. Ansari therefore proposed that in order to dispel any illusion and disarm suspicion, I should make a declaration of my faith before a public meeting in Delhi. I could not accept the proposal if only because the old Delhi of Hakim Saheb Ajmal Khan and Swami Shradhdhanandji had become the new Delhi of hoodligans where it was difficult for me to stay and much more so to address public meetings. I however promised Dr. Ansari that I would clear my position as early as I could through these pages. This I do now.

My interest and faith in Hindu-Muslim unity and unity among all the communities remain as strong as ever. My method of approach has changed. Whereas formerly I tried to achieve it by addressing meetings, joining in promoting and passing resolutions, now I have no faith in these devices. We have no atmosphere for them. In an atmosphere which is surcharged with distrust, fear and hopelessness, in my opinion these devices rather hinder than help heart unity. I therefore rely upon prayer and such individual acts of friendship as are possible. Hence I have lost all desire to attend meetings held for achieving unity. This however does not mean that I disapprove of such attempts. On the contrary, those who have faith in such meetings must hold them. I should wish them all success.

I am out of tune with the present temper of both the communities. From their own standpoint they are perhaps entitled to say that my method has failed. I recognise that among those whose opinions count, I am in a hopeless minority. By my taking part in meetings and the like I could not render any useful service. And as I have no other interest but to see real unity established, where I cannot serve by my presence, I regard it as some service if I abstain.

For me there is no hope save through truth, and non-violence. I know that they will triumph when everything else has failed. Whether, therefore, I am in the minority of one or, I have a majority, I must go along the course that God seems to have shown me. To-day non-violence as a mere policy is a broken reed. It answers well as a policy when there are no active forces working against it in your own camp. But when you have to reckon with those who believe in violence as a creed to be enforced under given circumstances the expediency of non-violence breaks down. Then is the time for the out and out believer in non-violence to test his creed. Both my creed and I are therefore on our trial. And if we do not seem to succeed, let the critic or the on-looker blame not the creed but me. I know I am often obliged to struggle against myself. I have not become incapable as yet of violence in thought at least. But I am striving with all the might God has given me.

Now perhaps the reader understands why I am not found in the company of the Ali Brothers as often as I was before. They still hold me in their pockets. They are still as dear to me as blood brothers. I am not sorry for having thrown in my lot with the Mussalmans in the hour of their need. I should do so again if the occasion arose.

But though we have a common cause we have not common methods to-day. They would have had me at Simla and Calcutta. Since the Kohat riots we have not been able to agree as to the reading of facts. But friendship that insists upon agreement on all matters is not worth the name. Friendship to be real must ever sustain the weight of honest differences, however sharp they may be. I regard our differences to be honest, and therefore let those who suspect a breach or even coolness between us know, that my friendship with the Ali Brothers and other Musalman friends whom the reader can easily name remains as firm as ever.

The Naivete of the English

Writing under the above heading the *Nation* (New York) says:—

India is shaken again. On Nov 8 last Parliament was informed that the British Government had appointed a commission to report whether India is ready for a further measure of self-government. This fact in itself would not be enough to shake that country: for, when the Government of India Act was adopted by Parliament in 1919, it was specifically provided that the reforms were to be effective for a first stage of ten years, and before the expiration of that period an inquiry would be instituted into the results achieved and recommendations for the future would be made to Parliament. The commission has not been appointed any too soon. Two years are not a long time for an investigation of such profound importance to more than 300 million people.

What has shaken India is the personnel of the commission. It consists of seven members, among whom there is not one Indian. Not only have the avowed Nationalists like Pandit Malaviya and Motilal Nehru been ignored, but men like Mr. Patel, who has officiated with the greatest satisfaction to all parties as the first elected president of the Indian Legislative Assembly, have been passed over, as has Mr. Srinivasa Sastri, who was long a "moderate" and seemed to have the confidence of the Government of India, and even those Indians of ability, occupants of posts of trust, who have been staunch supporters of the British Raj. All Indians have been omitted on the ground that "the desire, natural and legitimate, of Indian members to see India a self-governing nation could hardly fail to color their judgment of her present capacity to sustain that role." Could any but the most self-complacent Tory Government in history have uttered a statement of such perfect naivete?

There lies nowhere in the announcement a hint that India is in any degree possessed of either the right or the ability to make decisions concerning her own fate. Rather she is like a child before its parents asking for a dime to go to the movies, or with forbidden jam on its lips; or, perhaps in a better analogy, a plaintiff before a jury—or is she considered a defendant at the bar?—without even a jury of her own lowly peers! This is the spark which is kindling India's flame of resentment and in some quarters threatening a boycott of the commission. Once more India's self-esteem has been shattered on British arrogance. We predict that in the future as in the past Britain will get small satisfaction from her policy of governing this proud people in the manner of condescension, not to say of insult.

Yet the problems of governmental reform in India are not merely technical ones of division of administrative responsibility, extension of the franchise, collection, control, and expenditure of revenue. They are, in their most troublesome aspects, rooted deep in social and political anomalies. Until the violent Hindu-Moaleem hatred melts away, no

satisfactory system of representation will ever be devised. Each element, distrustful of the other, clamors for a different method. The Hindus wish a single, general electorate, such as we have in this country. The Mohammedans, forming only one quarter of the country's population, insist on the election of representatives to the various legislative bodies by separate religious communities. Otherwise, they argue, and perhaps justly, they would never be represented and their rights would be ignored. A somewhat similar situation exists in the southern part of the country between Brahman and non-Brahman communities. Of a totally different character is the problem of the Native States, governed by hereditary monarchs and with greater or less degrees of independence as regards their internal administration. These are in no respect bound by the system of government prevailing in British India. But since they are scattered through all parts of British India like polka dots, they create an unusual disharmony of autocratic with representative government.

These problems and others with them have baffled many excellent British minds for decades. We wonder what this commission's seven members, who start so innocent of Indian affairs, will accomplish in two short years. We suspect that until Englishmen admit the equal right—we should say even a better right—of Indians to discuss the government of India, all the commissions in the world can do no better than mark time. Englishmen who cannot see the imperial color of their own minds are an obstacle to progress wherever they flaunt their naive complacencies.

Lord Ronaldshay On The Statutory Commission

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT)

One of the most interesting regular gatherings in the City of London, the always crowded fortnightly Laymen's Lunch of the London Missionary Society in the Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, was addressed recently by Lord Ronaldshay, the late Governor of Bengal. Speaking on the subject of "Great Britain and India," he devoted himself almost entirely to a defence of the new Indian Statutory Commission.

"The small band of merchant adventurers," he said, "who went out to India about A.D. 1600 with a charter of Queen Elizabeth in their pockets only intended to carry on a lucrative trade with the East, and had no idea that they were carrying the foundation of a great Empire. I believe that the Indies fell to the Englishman's character and not to force. There has also been an element of chance, or, as I prefer to call it, providence. Britain appeared on the scene when India was torn by civil war, and her own rulers incapable of restoring peace and order. Thus Great Britain found a clear field for the display of British character and the present system in India has been gradually built up in consequence."

Step by step British statesmen and their advisers have realised that the presence in India of their countrymen was not an adventure but a mission, that they were not there to exploit India for wealth, but to hold it as a sacred trust for a people who had fallen on evil times and that Great Britain was given the task of assisting them again to their feet.

Lord Ronaldshay paid a tribute to the zeal and character of Lord Curzon and said that though he had understood the desire of India to govern herself Lord Curzon had thrust the implications aside with apostolic zeal as he did not believe the time had yet arrived.

"After Lord Curzon's departure, however," said Lord Ronaldshay, "the other idea came to the fore with the Minto-Morley Act as a first step and the Montagu-Chelmsford measure of ten years later. Great Britain has made it clear to the world that she has accepted the responsibility placed upon her shoulders of the tutelage of a great people. The British Government is now

taking a further step along this road and the fact that the step is two years in advance of what it need be is evidence of the determination of the Government not to be backward in fulfilling its obligations to the people of India."

"Two courses had been open to the Government. It could have appointed a committee of experts both European and Indian to frame a constitution to fit the situation as they found it. The other course was to appoint a commission of M.P.'s with no past experience of India who would go out to that country with fresh and unprejudiced minds. In other words, a commission which would act as jury and report to Parliament as judge.

"This has been the policy adopted and though we as citizens have no direct responsibility for the Government's decision yet we may accept moral responsibility for it, said Lord Ronaldshay, "in the sure knowledge that it has been an honest decision and that it is a public action taken with single-minded and dis-interested motives which will in history meet with its just reward."

Lord Ronaldshay admitted that he recognised that great disappointment would be created in India. "Knowing the psychology of Hindus as I do I have no hesitation in saying that there will be one of the waves of emotional nerve strain which will sweep across India and have its expression on the platform and in the press. Racial animosity will be excited and impetus given to those subterranean elements which wish to overthrow the Administration by violence. I assume that the Government, with all the most recent information before it thought nevertheless the decision they had made could be made without undue risk and I believe they were right. Nothing has distressed me more than to observe that Indians of moderate views and of sound judgment have declared their intention of boycotting the Commission. From the bottom of my heart I do believe they are making a profound and grievous mistake and I pray that they may pause before they take this line of action which will inflict irreparable injury upon India. I believe that when the initial spasm of disappointment has passed they will realise that the decision of the Government has been an honest one and taken solely in India's interests."

The Story of My Experiments With Truth

[BY M. K. GANDHI]

Part IV. Chapter I.

LOVE'S LABOUR LOST

Mr. Chamberlain had come to get a gift of 85 million pounds from South Africa, and to win the hearts of Englishmen and Boers. So he gave a cold shoulder to the Indian Deputation.

'You know,' he said, 'that the Imperial Government has little control over self-governing Colonies. Your grievances seem to be genuine. I shall try my best but you must try as best you can to placate the Europeans, if you will live in their midst.'

The reply cast a chill over members of the deputation. I was also disappointed and saw that it was an eye-opener for us all and that we should start with our work *de novo*. I explained the situation to my colleagues.

In fact there was nothing wrong about Mr. Chamberlain's reply. It was well that he did not mince matters. He had brought home to us in a rather gentle way the rule of might being right, or the law of the sword.

But the sword we had none. We scarcely had the nerve, and the muscle even to receive sword-cuts.

Mr. Chamberlain had been given only a short time to the sub-continent. If Shrinagar to Cape Comorin is 1,900 miles, Durban to Capetown is not less than 1,100 miles, and Mr. Chamberlain had to cover the long distance at hurricane speed. From Natal he hastened to the

Transvaal. I had to prepare the case for the Indians there too and submit it to him. But how was I to go to Pretoria? Our people there were not in a position to procure the necessary legal facilities for my going there in time. The War had reduced the Transvaal into a howling wilderness. There were neither provisions, nor clothing available. Empty or closed shops were there waiting to be replenished and opened, and that was a matter of time. And even refugees could not be allowed to return there until the shops were ready with provisions. Every Transvaaler had therefore to obtain a permit. The European had no difficulty in getting it, but the Indian found it very hard.

A NEW DEPARTMENT

During the war many officers and soldiers had come to South Africa from India and Ceylon, and it was considered to be the duty of the British authorities to provide for such of them as decided to settle there. They had in any event to appoint new officers and these experienced men came quite handy. The quick ingenuity of some of these created a new department. It showed their resourcefulness. There was a special department for the Negroes. Why then should there not be one for the Asiatics? The argument seemed to be quite plausible. When I reached there the new department had already been opened and it was gradually spreading its tentacles. The officers who issued permits to the returning refugees may issue them to all, but how could they do so in respect of the Asiatics without the intervention of the new department? And if the permits were to be issued on recommendation of the new department, some of the responsibility and burden of the permit officers could thus be lessened. This was how they had argued. The fact however was that the new department wanted some apology for work and the men wanted money. If there was no work the department would be found unnecessary and be discontinued. So they found this work for themselves.

The Indians had to apply to this department, a reply would be vouchsafed many days after. And as there were many intending to return to the Transvaal, there grew up an army of intermediaries or touts, and they with the officers looted the poor Indians to the tune of thousands. I was told that no permit could be had without influence and in some cases one had to pay up to a hundred pounds in spite of the influence that one could bring to bear. Thus there seemed to be no way open to me. I went to my old friend, the Police Superintendent of Durban, and said to him: 'Please introduce me to the Permit Officer and help me to obtain a permit. You know that I have been a resident of the Transvaal.' Immediately he put on his coat, went out with me and got me a permit. There was hardly an hour for my train to start. I had kept my luggage ready. I thanked Superintendent Alexander and started for Pretoria.

MEMORIAL DRAFTED

I now had a fair idea of the difficulties ahead. On reaching Pretoria I drafted the memorial. In Durban I do not recollect the Indians having been asked to submit in advance the names of their representatives. But there was the new department here, and so the Indians were asked to do so. The Pretoria Indians had already come to know that the officers wanted to exclude me.

But another chapter is necessary for this painful though amusing incident.

Chapter II.

AUTOCRATS FROM ASIA

The officers at the head of the new department were at a loss to know how I had entered the Transvaal. They inquired of the Indians who used to go to them, but these could say nothing definite. The officers only ventured a guess that I might have succeeded in entering without a permit on the strength of my old connections. If that was the case, I was liable to be arrested!

It is a general practice, on the termination of a big war, to invest the Government of the day with special powers for a time. This was the case in South Africa. The Government had passed a Peace Preservation Ordinance which provided that any one entering the Transvaal without a permit was liable to be arrested and imprisoned. The question of arresting me under this provision was mooted, but no one could summon courage to ask me to produce my permit.

The officers had of course sent telegrams to Durban and when they found that I had entered with a permit they were disappointed. But they were not the men to be defeated by such disappointment. Though I had succeeded in entering the Transvaal, they could still successfully prevent me from waiting on Mr. Chamberlain.

So the community was asked to submit names of the representatives who were to form the deputation. Colour prejudice was of course in evidence everywhere in South Africa, but I was not prepared to find here the dirt and underhand dealing among officials that I was familiar with in India. In South Africa the public departments were maintained for the good of the people and were responsible to public opinion. Hence officials in charge had a sort of courtesy of manners and humility about them, and coloured people also got the benefit of it more or less. With the coming of the officers from Asia, came also its autocracy, and the habits that the autocrats had imbibed there. In South Africa there was a kind of responsible Government or democracy, whereas the commodity imported from Asia was autocracy pure and simple; for the Asiatics had no responsible Government, there was a foreign power governing them. In South Africa the Europeans were settled emigrants. They had become South African citizens and had control on the departmental officers. But the autocrats from Asia now appeared on the scene, and the Indians in consequence found themselves between the devil and the deep sea.

I had a fair taste of this autocracy. I was first summoned to see the chief of the department, an officer from Ceylon. "Lest I should appear to exaggerate when I say that I was 'summoned' to see the chief, I shall make myself clear. No written order had been sent to me. Indian leaders had often to visit the Asiatic officers. Among these was the late Sheth Tyeb Haji Khan Mahomed. The chief of the office asked him who I was and why I had gone there.

"He is our adviser," said Tyeb Sheth "and he has come here at our request."

"Then what are we here for? Have we not been appointed to protect you? What can Gandhi know of the conditions here?" asked the autocrat.

Tyeb Sheth answered the charge somehow. "Of course you are there. But Gandhi is our man. He knows our language and understands us. You are after all officials."

The Saheb ordered Tyeb Sheth to fetch me before him. I went to the Saheb in company with Tyeb Sheth and others. No seats were offered, we all kept standing.

"What brings you here?" said the Saheb addressing me.

"I have come here at the request of my Indian brethren to help them with my advice," I replied.

"But don't you know that you have no right to come here? The permit you hold was given you by mistake. You cannot be regarded as a domiciled Indian. You must go back. You shall not wait on Mr. Chamberlain. It is for the protection of the Indians here that the Asiatic Department has specially been created. Well, you may go." With this he bade me goodbye giving me no opportunity for a reply.

But he detained the other companions. He gave them a good scolding and advised them to send me back.

They returned chastened, and we were now confronted with an unexpected problem.

Natal Licensing Boards

Appointments For The Current Year

His Excellency the Governor-General has appointed the following as members of Natal Licensing Boards for the period Dec. 1, 1927, to Nov. 30, 1928:—

Alfred (Harding): William Arthur Hutchinson and John Edward Brown.

Bergville: Dr. G. B. Jones and G. H. H. Coventry.

Camperdown: Harry Baker and Walter Robertson Blackhurst.

Dundee: Cornelius Martinus Meyer and Harry Augustus Greenhough.

Durban: Alfred Platt and Arthur Ellis Mallinson.

Entonjaneni (Melmoth): Dr. James Petrie and Hugh Thomas James.

Eshowe: Casper Hendrik Badenhorst and William Thomas Brockweil.

Estcourt: Colonel David Watt Mackay, C.M.G., and George Wemyss Armstrong.

Helpmekaar: Jurie Johannes Kemp and Johannes Reinrich Christoph Nuss.

Impendhle: Charles Christopher Lewis and Thomas Lewis Hill.

Inanda (Verulam): Robert Jarold Harrison and Charles Rodi James.

Ixopo: Alexander Henry Walker and William King Anderson.

Klip River (Kliprivier) (Ladysmith): Philip Jacobus Meyer and James Charles Henderson.

Krantzkop: George Henry Fraser and Dr. Harry Samuel Gordon.

Lions River (Howick): James Morton and William Henry Sutton.

Lower Tugela (Stanger): Fredrick Matthew George Wickelo Nichols and Alfred Townsend.

Lower Umfolozi (Empageni): Robert Henry Baines and Ralph William Anderson.

Mtunzini: Percy Clifford Lilburn and George Harold Moor.

Newcastle: Adam Johannes Potgieter and Angus Hamilton Claude Drummond.

New Hanover: Riby William Smith and Charles Carter Comins.

Ngoishe (Louwsberg): Jan Theodorus Jansen van Rensburg and Jacobus Johannes Wessels.

Nkandhla: Elias Titlestad and William Cecil Pitcairn.

Nongoma: Dr. Frederick Wilfred Walters and Benjamin Henry Bond.

Paulpietersburg: Bernard Johannes Frederick Meyer and Maritz Liebenberg.

Maritzburg: Adrian Johannes Stephanus Maritz and Chase Albert Carbutt Edmonds.

Pinetown: Percy Hannibald Tomlinson and Cecil Burges Margetts.

Polela (Bulwer): Lawrence Cuthbert French and Walter Little.

Port Shepstone: Alfred Harry Garnet Blamey and Alfred Eyles.

Richmond: William Comrie and Ethelbert James Bligh Hosking.

Umvoti (Greytown): William John Sawden Newmarch and Heinrich Jacobus Torlage.

Umzinto: Robert George Archibald and Norris Lewis Davey.

Utrecht: Dr. Frederick Langley Aubert Gace and John Jesaya Potgieter.

Vryheid: Frederick Volker and A. J. Netter.

Webson: Phillip Jacobus van Rooyen and Henry

ઈન્ડિઅન ઓપિનિઅન.

પુસ્તક રૂ ૬ છુ.

ફ્રીનીક્સ, શુક્રવાર, તારીખ ૬ જાન્યુઆરી ૧૯૨૮

અંક ૧

શાહિ કમીશનનો અહિંકાર

સુખઈના શહેરીઓની પ્રચંડ બહર સલા

સુખઈમાં સર કાવસજી જહાંગીર હોવામાં તે દક્ષિણ તરફે પાશુ હું તે સુખઈના ઇતિહાસમાં મહેલીજ વાર ભેવામાં આવતું હતું. આથી વિશેષ પ્રતિનિધિત્વ ધરાવતી અને આથી વિશેષ ઉત્સાહી સલા અગ્રણી ત્રણી ન હોતી. આટલી જોરવાળી અને આટલા હલ નિશ્ચયથી અમારું સુખઈ એ કદી ચોતાનો અભિપ્રાય વ્યક્ત કર્યો નથી. સઘળા રાજસ્વારી પક્ષીના આજેવાનો આવી રીતે અગાઉ ભેગા થયા નથી.

સમાજી સમય સાડા પાંચનો હોવા છતાં લગભગ ૪ વાગ્યા સુધીમાં તે આખો કોઈ વિચાર ભરાય ગયો હતો અને તે પછી ઘણા આવનારાઓને જગ્યાને અભાવે ઉભું રહેવું પડ્યું હતું અમર પાંજા જવું પડ્યું હતું. સુખઈના ક્ષત્રિય તમામ પક્ષીના આજેવાન રાજસ્વારીઓએ હાજરી આપી હતી. સર દિનશા પિટીટ, સર ચિમનલાલ સેતલવાડ, શ્રીમતી સરિશની નાયક, શ્રી. મહમદઅલી શબ્બા, સર શ્રીરોહ શેઠના શ્રી. જોશ. સ્વાર. જયજી, શ્રી. જમનાદાસ મહેતા, મહલાના શકિતઅલી, શ્રી. હોનીમન, શ્રી. સઘવદ અબ્દુલ્લા શેઠવી, શ્રી. કનીયાલાલ માલિકજી, શ્રી. શ્રી. જયજીમલાલ મહેતા શ્રી. એમ. સી. આમલા, શ્રી. આલુમ, શ્રી. દેસાઈ વત્રેર હાજર રહેલાઓમાં સુખ્ય હવા.

સર દીનશા પિટીટ

સર દીનશા પિટીટ તાજાંઓના સમગ્ર સરકારે પ્રમુખસ્થાન ધીપા ત્યાં કાર્યાલય કરતાં જાણીતા છે.

સ્વાતંત્ર્યની ભાવનાને હીજુપ-હોદના બંધારણની તપાસ કરવા નીમાવવા, કમીશનમાંથી હોદીઓને આપત્ત રાખવા ત્યાં વિરોધ કરવા ત્યાં સલા મળી છે. આપણા દેશનું ભાવિ ત્યાં કરવાનું છે તેમાં આપણે કોઈ દેશબંધુ ના હોય એ આપણી સ્વાતંત્ર્યની ભાવનાને ધીજુપ લગાડનાર છે. આવા કમીશનમાં આપણને કોઈ કોઈ કંઈ નહીં. જો કમીશનમાં હોદીઓ કોઈ તો તે હોદીના દરિયાઈથી સાક્ષીઓને તપાસે અને સમજવડથી કમીશનના નિર્ણય ઉપર અસર કરે. તેથી જ્યાં સુધી કમીશન ની કામ ત્યાં સુધી તેના બંધારણમાં હોદીઓને કોઈક કામ જોઈને રેકાર ન કામ ત્યાં સુધી તેની સાથે આપણે જોડાવું નિર્ણય છે.

આજતની લાગણી કોઈ અસુકળ રાજસ્વારી પક્ષમાં છે એમ નથી. પણ તમામ વર્ગમાં છે અને આ સભા તેમજ આજેવાનો બહાર પાડેલી યાદીઓ ઉપરથી સરકારને પણ તે વિશે જાણી રહી હોય.

સમગ્ર હોદી પ્રજાનો વિરોધ

આપણે સરકાર સાથે સહકાર કરવા માગીએ છીએ, પણ જ્યાં સુધી આપણને સમાન કક્ષાએ સુકે નહિ ત્યાં સુધી તેમ ચર્ચ કરે નહીં. કેટલાંકો આજણી આ પ્રકારને અસહકાર

કહે છે, પણ હું કહું છું કે આ સહકારની મર્યાદા છે. સરકાર આપણી સાથે સહકાર કરવા માગતી નથી. કોઈ એમ કહે છે કે સહકારીઓ અસહકારીઓવા પ્રકારમાં થયાં મયા છે. પરંતુ હું કહું છું કે અસહકારીઓ સહકારીઓની સાથે મળી સહકારની માગણી કરી રહ્યા છે. અસહકારીઓ સરકારને અસહકારી બનાવી રહ્યા છે. સરકારની સાથે જેમણે ચાલુ સહકાર કર્યો છે તેઓ પણ કમીશનમાં જોડાવા માટે અસહકાર બન્યા છે અને સરકારમાં જવાબદાર જોડી ભોગવનારાઓને પણ વિરોધ કર્યો છે. મતલબ કે આ વિરોધ સમગ્ર હોદી પ્રજાનો છે.

તે સહી સર શ્રીરોહ શેઠનાએ પ્રમુખતા કહેવાથી સર મનોમોહનદાસ રામજી અને શ્રી નરિશતમદાસ મોરારજીનાં સમાના કહેવા સાથે સહકારીઓને હર્ષાહારા બમલો વાંચ્યા હતા.

હોદીના હકની ચોખી ના

તે પછી સર ચિમનલાલ સેતલવાડે નીચેથી ફરિયાદ રજૂ કર્યો હતો:

“સુખઈના શહેરીઓની આ બહર સલા જારણુરકે જણાવે છે કે બહર સહેલું બંધારણની તપાસ કરનાર કમીશન હોદીની પ્રખ માનવ રાખી કંઈ એમ નથી કરણ કે તેમાં દેશનું ભાવિ બંધારણ ધડવામાં ભાગ લેવાના હોદીની પ્રખતા હકની ચોખી ના માડવામાં આવી છે. વિશેષમાં આ સલા ફરિયાદ છે કે આવા સંયોગોમાં દેશના નમામ હોદીઓને કમીશન સાથે કોઈ પણ તપાસે મા કોઈ પણ કમીશનમાં કોઈ પણ સંબંધ રાખવો નહીં.”

ફરિયાદ ફરિયાદ રજૂ કરતાં સર ચિમનલાલે જણાવ્યું કે કમીશનના બંધારણ વચ્ચે સર્વત્રી તપાસકારી હકાલપત આપણે મળ્યા છીએ. આપણી વલણને માટે આપણી મરદારી કરવામાં આવી છે, પણ એ કંઈ પહેલીજ વાર બનતું નથી અને જોઈ આપણે આપણા નિશ્ચયમાંથી જરા મજા આપવા નથી. આપણે લાગણી અને વિવેકથી બેનને ઉપયોગ કરી આ માર્ગ લીધા છે. હોદીનાં ભવિ બંધારણ ધડવામાં હોદીઓને સમાન હિસો ન મળે એ સિકાંત આપણે માન્ય રાખી કમીશને તેમ નથી.

આજુબાજુ અને અસહકાર

સરકારના આ પગલાનો અર્થ એ થાય છે કે કમીશનમાં જોડાતાં કમીશન અને તટસ્થ સ્તિ ધરાવવા હોદીઓ નથી આ સુચન અજુબાજુ અને અસહકાર છે. આવા પ્રકારનું કમીશન ધણી સુરીયતોમાં આવી પડશે. તેઓ આ દેશ અને પ્રજાની લાભ આપવા છે. અને હોદી સાથીઓની સરકારનીમાં તેઓ આજણ રજૂ થતાં પુરાવાની તેઓ ચોખ