

Indian Opinion

No. 19—Vol. XXIX.

Friday, May 8th, 1931.

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

“HEAVY INDICTMENT OF SOULLESS SYSTEM”

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT KARACHI CONGRESS BY SARDAR VALLABHBHAI PATEL

AFTER expressing regret at the deaths of Pandit Motilal Nehrū and Moulana Mahomed Ali, and at the execution of young Bhagat Singh, Sukhdev and Rajguru, the President-elect of the Indian National Congress, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel delivered the following address:—

You have called a simple farmer to the highest office to which any one can aspire. I am conscious that your choice of me as the first servant is not so much for what little I might have done, but it is the recognition of the amazing sacrifice made by Gujarat. Out of your generosity you have singled out Gujarat for the honour; but in truth, every province did its utmost during the year of greatest national awakening that we have known in the modern times and, thanks be to God, that awakening was a call to self-purification.

Though there have been aberrations, it is a fact beyond challenge that India has given a singular proof to the world that mass non-violence is no longer an idle dream of a visionary or a mere human longing. It is a solid fact capable of infinite possibilities for a humanity which is groaning for want of faith beneath the weight of violence of which it has almost made a fetish. The greatest proof that our movement was non-violent lies in the fact that the peasants falsified the fears of our worst sceptics. They were described as very difficult to organise for the non-violent action and it is they who stood the test with a bravery and an endurance that was beyond all expectations. The women and the children, too, contributed their great share in the fight. They responded to the call by instinct and played a part which we are too near the event adequately to measure and, I think, it would not be at all wrong to give them the bulk of the credit for the preservation of non-violence and the consequent success of the movement looked at in the light of non-violence. Our struggle is a world-struggle and it is a matter of great satisfaction that the nations of the earth, especially the United States of America have heartened us by their sympathy.

The recent settlement, however, renders it unnecessary to dwell at greater length upon this heroic period in the national life. Your Working Committee has entered into a settlement in anticipation of your approval. You are now invited formally to endorse it. The Committee having accepted it as your accredited representatives, it is not, I take it, open to you to repudiate it but it is open to you to pass a vote of no-confidence in the present Executive and appoint better agents. But whilst it is but meet I that should draw your attention to the constitutional position, I have no doubt whatsoever that you will endorse the settlement which I hold to be perfectly honourable for the parties. Had we not accepted the settlement we should have put ourselves in the wrong and thereby undone the effect of the sufferings of the past year. Indeed we had always claimed, as the Satyagrahis must claim,

to be ready and eager for peace. When, therefore, the way seemed to be open for peace we took it in view of the clear demand on the part of the British Indian delegation at the Round Table Conference for full responsibility and in view of the British parties having accepted the position and in view of the appeal made to the Congress by the Premier, the Viceroy and many of our distinguished countrymen the Working Committee thought that if an honourable truce could be arranged and if it was open to the Congress to press without any reservation for what it considered to be the best for the country the Congress should, if invited, take part in the Conference and attempt to reach an agreed solution of the constitutional issue. If we failed in the attempt and there was no way open but that of suffering, then it was a privilege of which no power on earth could deprive us.

Under the constitution clause of the settlement, it is open to us to press for “Purna Swaraj,” to ask for complete control over defence forces, foreign affairs, finance and fiscal policy and the like. There would be safeguards or reservations or, as late Pandit Motilalji called them, adjustments conceived in our own interest. When the power passes from one to another by agreement there are always safeguards in the interest of the party in need of reparation or help. The continued exploitation of India for close on two centuries renders it necessary for us to seek assistance in several respects from external sources. This we would gladly take from Britain if she is willing to give. Thus we would need military skill and there is no reason why we may not receive English assistance in this direction.

I have taken only one telling illustration out of others that may be suggested. The defence safeguard may, therefore, be the retention of British officers or, as some would say, even privates; but we could never let our defence be controlled by the British. We must have full power to make mistakes. We must gratefully receive British advice, but never dictation. The fact is that the British army in India is an army of occupation. Defence is a misnomer. Frankly the army is for defending the British interests and the British men and women against any internal uprising. I cannot recall a single instance in which the Indian army was required for protection of India to fight a foreign power.

In my opinion, if we need an army, we certainly do not need the octopus we are daily bleeding to support. If the Congress has its way the army will suffer immediate reduction to its desirable proportion. Nor can we divide the financial control with the British Government. The nation cannot grow to its full height if it has not exclusive control over its finance.

We have, claimed that many of the charges laid upon India are wholly unjust. We have never

(Continued on page 150)

"YE SUFFER FROM YOURSELVES"

MODERN civilisation i.e. the system political, social and economic, by which our lives are presently ordered, is based upon the "principle" of competitive rights. The earth is regarded as a field for the exploitation by the bold, the shrewd and the venturesome and of making their own all that they can succeed in appropriating to individual ownership and enjoyment. Each has the "right" to acquire as much earth, as much of the necessities and commodities of life, as he can. He may make them his exclusive property and exercise control over them, forbidding to others their use and enjoyment altogether, or save in exchange for what is termed consideration. He may, if he be astute and ingenious enough stand between the labourer and the raw material upon which the latter seeks to expend his skill, except upon such terms as he chooses to impose. He may throttle ideas and inventions that would contribute to the world's happiness if he considers them dangerous to his vested interests. He may, by means of financial control impose his will upon whole states, and virtually enslave their peoples. In its nakedness this system is the very negation of brotherhood. Its gospel is "Each for himself! The weaker to the wall! No sentiment in business! Your needs, my opportunity!" It appeals to man's lowest instincts, encourages his meanest impulses, degrades him below jungle-level, deifies the satanic and stifles the divine in him. Its selfishness and egotism masquerading under attractive names erect barriers of enmity and hatred between races and nations, in reality complementary of each other and as between which reason urges the wisdom of co-operation. Rivalries and wars are its inevitable concomitants; the heresy of separateness the banner under which it pursues its operations; the Four Horsemen, the captains of its hosts.

Mankind has been saved from the full force of its logic, from its incidence and implications only because Man is more than he knows, is better than he himself realises, rises superior to his professed convictions, because of the element of the divinity, the spiritual leaven, "deep-seated in the human heart". Because of this he has transcended the limitations of his doctrines, has under the dictates of the heart over-ridden the iron laws decreed by the pundits to be

inviolable and sacrosanct and, albeit sometimes shamefacedly, *has* made himself "his brother's keeper". To-day he finds himself at the parting of the ways. Conservatism, tradition, convention, die hard; they cling as the ivy to the oak. Yet it becomes more and more apparent that the old order has worn itself out, is already far advanced in decay. (The poison of materialism that was at its root from its inception foredoomed it!)

Simultaneously, the call of the inner voice grows louder and more insistent. That voice speaks to him of a Self higher and other than the personal 'I' of envies, lusts, passions and rivalries with which hitherto he has identified himself, of a Self common to all beings and of which his own self-hood is but a partial expression. It reminds him that the true law of his life is service, sacrifice, loving-surrender; that wealth of every denomination, of power, of knowledge, of ability, of possessions, is properly employed only for service and help of the needy, not for selfish exploitation. For some time past he has endeavoured to compromise, to accommodate his life and activities to both the demands of the lower and the appeals of the higher in his being. Now, he sees the system that is the very embodiment of the former crumbling by virtue of its inherent falsity. He thrills to the other appeal, feels in his soul that he should respond to it, yet fears to abandon his time-honoured idols and shibboleths altogether. It is precisely at this juncture and in this regard that Gandhi comes to serve us and if the "leader world" did but realise it, to lead mankind out of its age-long Egyptian bondage to the Promised Land wherein Brotherhood, Toleration and Co-operation shall once again be enthroned in the realms of human endeavour. Gandhi has already made a host of converts, for he who himself lives his faith surely justifies it. Gandhi has already demonstrated to the World that Soul-Force can and always will, when faithfully employed, overpower Brute-Force. Given the opportunity, Gandhi and India will yet, by way of object lesson, demonstrate that with Service restored as the motive force in human relationships, the problems that harass and the agonies that afflict deluded mankind under its self-imposed rule of egotism and selfishness vanish with the delusion that created them.

WILL THE UNION FOLLOW THE EXAMPLE?

THE Associated Press has given information to the effect that the Queensland local franchise law has now been amended and the existing disability of Indian residents in the State has been removed and they will now enjoy the right to vote. It will be remembered that Indians settled in the State of Queensland in Australia did not enjoy the right to vote at elections for the State Legislature. The Rt. Hon. V. S. S. Sastri when he visited Australia in 1922 drew the attention of the authorities to this difficulty with a view to seeking redress. The matter also formed the subject of representations subsequently by Diwan Bahadur T. Rangachariar, Sir Darcy Lindsay and Mr. R. K. Sanmukham Chetty when these gentlemen visited Australia. This news will be warmly welcomed by all as a friendly gesture by the Australian Government towards a partner in the Commonwealth of British nations.

The Dominion of South Africa is also an equal partner in the Commonwealth of British nations. Indians have settled in this country for nearly a century. They are part of the permanent population of this country. Nearly 75 per cent. of them are born in this country, hence they are as much South Africans as any other European community in this country. They have contributed much in the advance of this country. Natal is called the garden colony of the Union. It has become a garden colony by the labours of Indians. The sugar industry of Natal owes its existence to Indian labour. Indians like other European communities equally pay taxes and add to the income of the Union Government. But the treatment that Indians are subjected is so unequal that they have no voice at all in the administration of the country. They are repressed and suppressed by drastic new legislation every year. They are not entitled to equal opportunities for progress though they are made to pay equal taxes and equal wages. Though Indians have consented to adopt the European standard of civilisation they are not only kept in subordination but such a policy is adopted with regard to them that their numbers are being reduced from this country every year. This is a deplorable situation. We hope that the Union Govern-

ment will follow the example of the Australian Government and show respect towards India which is now an equal partner within the Commonwealth of British nations by granting full citizenship rights to Indians who are a part of the permanent population of the Union.

The Congress

The Hindu Illustrated Weekly comments as follows in its issue of April 12 :—

The forty-fifth session of the Indian National Congress held at Karachi recently marks a historic turning-point in the life of the great national organisation and its influence on the political life of the country. The ratification of the Delhi Pact is not merely a great personal triumph for Gandhiji; it is a vindication of the strong sense of discipline which has made the Congress the power that it is, and of that steady grasp of the realities of the situation which its traducers have often facetiously accused it of lacking. The resolution has re-affirmed the position that India shall accept nothing less than the substance of independence. It is from this point of view that the Congress will further examine (to use the words of the Gandhi-Irwin Pact) the proposals formulated at the Round Table Conference, and it has indicated broadly the tests it will apply to see whether these proposals meet the National Demand. Since these proposals are in the main provisional and since the Congress has also authorised the acceptance of any such adjustments as may be demonstrably necessary in the interest of India, a definite agreement should not be beyond the reach of the combined wisdom of Indian and English statesmen, provided the will is there. The Congress has, at the same time, recognised that there is at least one paramount issue to be settled in India and without the intervention of the Government or any other third party, in order that it may be armed with irresistible power to enforce the will of the people. No formal resolution was passed about the Hindu-Muslim question, but Gandhiji in his speech on the main resolution made clear his own view that it would not be worth while to go to London without having solved this all-important problem first. When there is no general desire in either community to manoeuvre for position or to play into the hands of interested outsiders, the rabid communalists will find their occupation gone. While thus taking active steps to promote a political and communal settlement, the Congress has no intention of relaxing the constructive work. It was resolved that the anti-drink and drug campaign should be continued with renovated vigour. Another important resolution which attracted a good deal of discussion related to methods of making the nation self-sufficing in the matter of clothing itself. Other resolutions passed demanded justice for Indians in South and East Africa, untrammelled opportunity for Burmans to discuss and settle their own political future, and self-government for the N.W. Frontier Province. The discussion on the first of these should open the eyes of the Governments concerned to the intensity of feeling in this country against the shabby treatment meted out to its nationals abroad, a feeling which they would be wise not to provoke to action, as they assuredly will if they persist in their policy of pin-pricks and evasion, for a self-governing India will assuredly not tolerate these insults. The last resolution to be discussed by the Congress was certainly not the least in importance, as was shown by the keen controversy it excited. It aimed at

indicating what in the view of the Congress are the fundamental rights of the people which should be respected and recognised by any constitution drawn up for a self-governing India; it also outlined broadly the social and economic policy which the Congress favours as conducive to the happiness of the people at large. It is unnecessary to discuss it at length here, for these planks in the Congress platform are admittedly provisional, and have been drafted mainly with a view to translating in concrete and popular language the general ideals for which the Congress stands. In the circumstances it seems unnecessary even for those who honestly feel that this resolution treads in some ways on dangerous ground to take too tragic a view of the situation. The Congress executive for its part must realise that there are striking differences of opinion within the Congress itself on the merits of particular items in the programme. In view of this and of the imperative necessity for pushing on with the work in hand, they would be well advised not to distract and divide energies on questions which, however important, can become live issues only when Swaraj is a reality.

Chinese Woman's Appeal

A considered judgment was delivered by Mr. Justice Maritz in the Supreme Court, Pretoria, in the application of Lai Shee versus the Commissioner for Immigration.

Reviewing the facts, his lordship said the applicant was born in Canton in 1906. In 1930 she was married by proxy there to Fan Sik Ah Wing, carrying on business in Johannesburg. Admittedly the marriage was not one recognisable in the Union. She left Canton in order to live with him, and arrived at Lourenco Marques in September, 1930. He deposited £40 with the authorities on being advised of her arrival, and at Lourenco Marques a permit was issued to her to proceed to the Transvaal. Together they proceeded to Johannesburg.

Although she stated she did not know what happened at the port of entry, Komatipoort, it was accepted that she was served there with a prohibition notice. Permission to enter was refused on the ground that she was a prohibited immigrant, and she was informed that in terms of the statute she could appeal if she desired. She was allowed to proceed to Johannesburg in accordance with the general practice on a temporary permit. A few days after arrival there she was told she would be deported, but was given a quota indentification card, and handed back the £40 originally deposited in connection with the application for admission to the Transvaal.

Her right to remain here was not disputed by the respondent till March this year, when she was told to leave because of the prohibition notice served on her in October at Komatipoort. In Pretoria she was arrested under the prohibition notice, lodged in gaol, and released on bail.

A rule had been issued calling on respondent to show cause why he should not be restrained from deporting Lai Shee, and the question was whether the rule should be made final or not.

The respondent asserted that she was at no time released from the prohibition notice, and that he was justified in acting as he did under the Immigrants Regulation Act.

The applicant was in possession of an indentification card as the holder of a quota permit, complying with the form set out in the regulations. It was safe to assume that the applicant complied with all the formalities for the issue of the indentification card. As far as the Quota Act was concerned she was lawfully in the Transvaal when arrested.

Statute Disregarded

For reasons difficult to follow, added his Lordship, the respondent seemed to have disregarded some of the provisions of the statute. He said that the refund was made owing to the applicant being released from the conditions of the temporary permit, but she was not released from the prohibition notice. It mystified one how the respondent could contend that the prohibition notice was of force and effect when, if it was in force at all, it was superseded by the indentification card.

In ordering the arrest of the applicant, the respondent acted under the provisions of the principal Act, the terms of which deprived a court of law of jurisdiction to interfere with proceedings of the immigration authorities under the Act relating to the detention or removal of a person dealt with as a prohibited immigrant; but, in accordance with the Appellate Court's decision in 1923, the court was entitled to interfere where there was a manifest absence of jurisdiction on the part of the Immigration Department. In his Lordship's opinion, on the facts, the actions of the respondent were cognisable by the court. In applying the principal law to the applicant's case, the respondent acted in defiance of rights conferred upon her by the Quota Act and the Immigration Regulation Act, rights under which she was not refused permission to enter; nor was her residence here unlawful.

By consent, the rule, which had been too widely stated, would be amended to show cause why the respondent should not be restrained from deporting applicant from the Union under the provisions of section 21 (b) of Act 22 of 1913. The rule as amended would be confirmed, and the respondent ordered to pay costs.—*The Star*.

Japanese Invasion Peril

The committee which was established at a public meeting of protest held in Johannesburg has issued a pamphlet headed the "Peril of Japanese Invasion," in which the dangers of the Japanese trade agreement are set out at length. The pamphlet, printed in both official languages, is signed by Mr. J. Frank Brown, C.M.G. (chairman of the committee) and Messrs. Geo. A. Hay, W. A. Harper, J. H. Jeffreys, Ben Jenkins, Victor Kent, C. H. Leon, W. A. Martin, Dr. A. M. Moll, and Messrs. A. Law Palmer, and W. Perry.

After setting out the clauses of the agreement, the pamphlet states:—

"We ask the Government to treat this definitely as a non-party question, and to view it from the national point of view. Even in a few years' time it must affect labour, industry and employment in factories.

"We ask the Government to give notice of revision, and in any revision to define that, as far as facilitating export of produce, the agreement must be confined to the admittance of buyers only, and a clause inserted that their families cannot remain in the country for longer periods than two years consecutively.

"We ask the Government that Japanese be not given trading licences, or be allowed to take employment in factories, shops or warehouses, or to farm or to be employed by farmers. If admitted, it must be as buyers only, and for a strictly limited period."

Low-Paid Labour

On the economic issue the pamphlet points out that in 1929 the exports to Japan amounted to £87,094, whereas the imports were valued at £1,399,820. In 1930 the exports were valued at £101,934, and the imports had risen to £1,570,968. It is pointed out that Japanese goods are manu-

factured under conditions of labour and pay infinitely lower than in South Africa. Once the Japanese gained a footing that was the type of competition that would have to be faced.

With a balance so enormously in its favour, Japan, it is stated, has no claim for any increased facilities to market her goods in South Africa in exchange for any additional purchases which she may make of Union products.

Regarding the danger of admitting Japanese to settle on the land, the pamphlet states that just as farmers in California and British Columbia have found it impossible to compete with Japanese, so would it be the case with the farmers in the Union.

Whites' Slogan

"Were it not for North American resistance," it is stated further, "Latin America (flooded as it is with Japanese goods, merchants, commercial missions, financial agents) would long ago have been a Japanese continent. Another factor of importance is that both in North and South America they affect to be the champions of the coloured man, needlessly causing race friction. Their willing reservoirs of population demand an outlet, and would neglect no opportunity to ease this pressure. All decent white communities have written across their doors the slogan: "No Asiatics wanted." On this point, Australia, America, British Columbia and New Zealand are united. If Japan restricts or excludes white settlers, it is a thousand times more urgent for us to exclude Japanese. We cannot admit to South Africa any class of person if we are not prepared to grant him in due course education facilities, franchise, social privileges—including that of marriage.

"The only way to solve a race problem is to stop it before it begins. Our pioneers and voortrekkers have declared our coast to be a white frontier. We can only maintain its integrity by drastic measures. The permanence of South African civilisation depends upon our rejecting any kind of Asiatic immigration.

Overwhelming Birthrate

"Apparently the Japanese Consul has full control as to the numbers admitted. What about their children born in the country? In other countries birth statistics show that the danger to the community is not in the first instance the Japanese soldier, but their startling birth-rate.

In California, for example, if the present birth-rate continues for ten years, there will be 150,000 Japanese children born, and only 40,000 whites. In 1949 the majority will be Japanese."—*The Star*.

"Too Many Lawyers"

Several qualified attorneys, it is stated, have recently sought employment outside their own profession at very modest salaries. Commenting on the state of the profession, a leading lawyer of Port Elizabeth said, "there are too many people in the legal profession, but there are not too many of the right calibre." He added that overcrowding predisposed the more unscrupulous ones to sharp practices. Another prominent attorney blamed the universities as "so many mills churning out educated young men and women every year, all of whom are intent on entering the small number of professions."

(Continued From Front Page)

suggested the repudiation of a single obligation, but we have asked and must continue to ask for an impartial investigation into the demerits against us wherever we cannot agree. There is no receding from the Lahore resolution of Complete Independence. This Independence does not mean and was not intended to mean a churlish refusal to be associated with Britain or any other power. Independence, therefore, does not exclude the possibility of equal partnership for mutual benefit and dissolvable at the will of either party. If India is to reach her independence through consultation and agreement, it is reasonable to suppose that there will be British association. I am aware that there is a strong body of opinion in the country to the effect that before a partnership could possibly be conceived there must be a period of complete dissociation. I do not belong to that school. It is, as I think, a sign of weakness and of disbelief in human nature.

The Federation is a fascinating idea; but it introduces new embarrassments. The Princes will not listen to severance, but if they will come in true spirit it will be a great gain. Their association must not be to impede the progress of democracy. I hope, therefore, that they will not take up an uncompromising attitude that may be wholly inconsistent with the spirit of freedom. I wish they would, without any pressure, give us an earnest of their desire to march abreast of the time-spirit. Surely the fundamental rights of their subjects should be guaranteed as of the rest of the inhabitants of India. All inhabitants of Federated India should enjoy some common elementary rights and if there are rights there must be a common court to give relief from any encroachment upon them. Nor can it be too much to expect that the subjects of the States should be to an extent directly represented on the Federal Legislature.

As regards Burma, Press censorship has rendered it impossible for us to know the true situation there. Whether Burma should be separate from India or should be the part of a Free India is for the Burmese alone to decide. But it is our concern, indeed it is the world's concern, to see that all sides are heard. It is well known that there is a Unionist Party in Burma. It is as much entitled to freedom of opinion as the Separatists.

But before all else comes the question of Hindu-Muslim or rather communal unity. The position of the Congress was defined at Lahore. The Congress can be no party to any constitution which does not contain a solution of the communal question that is not designed to satisfy the respective parties. As a Hindu I would adopt my predecessor's formula and present the minorities with a Swadeshi fountain pen and paper and let them write out their demands and I should endorse them. I know that it is the quickest method, but it requires courage on the part of the Hindus.

What we want is a heart unity, not patched-up paper unity that will break under the slightest strain. That unity can only come when the majority takes courage in both hands and are prepared to change places with the minority. This would be the highest wisdom whether unity is reached that way or any other. It is becoming plainer day after day that it is useless to attend any conference unless that unity is achieved. The conference may give us an agreement between the British and us. It can perhaps help us to come nearer to the Princes. But it can never enable us to achieve unity that must be hammered into shape by ourselves. The Congress

must leave no stone unturned to realise this much-desired end.

It must be clear to all of us that the Congress can be useful for attaining "Purna Swaraj" only to the extent that it has gained power. The past twelve months have undoubtedly given it a power which he who runs may see; but it is not enough and can be easily frittered away by a hasty action or by pride. He is a spendthrift who lives on his capital. We must therefore add to our power. One way to do it is on our part to fulfil to the letter conditions of the settlement; the other is to consolidate our gain. I therefore propose to devote a few lines to this part of our activity.

We have made much headway in the matter of the boycott of foreign cloth. It is a right as well as a duty. Without it impoverished millions of India must continue to starve, for, if cheap foreign cloth continues to be dumped down in villages of India, Charkha cannot flourish. Foreign cloth must, therefore, be banished from the land. It is dear even if it could be obtained free. Millions who starve do so not because there is not enough in the land, but because they have no work during the off-season. It is, therefore, the want of easy employment in their own villages that leads to starvation. Incessant propaganda is necessary to rid the country of chronic unemployment which has become second nature with our peasantry. The best propaganda is to do the sacrificial spinning ourselves and wear khadi. The All-India Spinners Association has done much valuable work. But it is for the Congress to create the spinning and 'Khaddar' atmosphere. This to my mind is the best and the most effective propaganda of the boycott.

It has been suggested that the argument against foreign cloth applies to indigenous mill cloth. This is true to some extent. But our mills do not produce all the cloth we need. For years to come they may continue to supply the balance that may be required over and above hand-spun cloth. But even our mills may prove a hindrance, if they compete with Khaddar or resort to questionable devices to push their wares. Fortunately, many mills are patriotically working in co-operation with the Congress and are beginning to appreciate the virtue of Khaddar in the interest of the toiling millions. But I can certainly say that if our mills unpatriotically hurt Khaddar instead of complementing it, they must face an opposition somewhat similar to that against foreign cloth.

The foreign cloth merchants will do well to bear the Congress attitude in mind in this regard. Foreign cloth boycott is a permanent thing not conceived as a political weapon but as an economic and social measure of permanent value for the welfare of the masses. These merchants, therefore, if they will look into the future and think of their country, will do well to give up their foreign cloth trade. Everything possible is being done to help them but some very big sacrifice on their part is essential.

English, Japanese and other foreign merchants will, I hope, not misunderstand the Congress attitude. If they will help India they will deny themselves the Indian trade in foreign cloth. They have other markets and other enterprises.

This brings me to picketing. This has not been and cannot be given up. I give below the relevant clause of the Settlement:

"Picketing shall be unaggressive and it shall not involve coercion, intimidation, restraint, hostile demonstration, obstruction to the public, or any offence under the ordinary law; and if and when any of these methods is employed in any place, the practice of picketing in that place will be suspended."

Picketing is a common law right. But you will observe that within the limits prescribed, it is not only inoffensive but highly educative. Its function is gentle persuasion, never coercion or violent restraint on liberty. I use the adjective 'violent' advisedly. The restraining force of public opinion there always will be. It is healthy, elevating and conducive to the growth of liberty as distinguished from licence. Non-violent picketing is designed to create public opinion, an atmosphere which should become irresistible. This can best be carried on by women. I hope, therefore, that they will continue the marvellous work begun by them and earn the eternal gratitude of the nation and what is more, the blessings of the starving millions.

In this connection, let me say a few words regarding boycott of British goods. This idea is almost as old as the Congress. We know that after the advent of Gandhiji on the political platform, boycott of British goods was replaced by that of foreign—not only British—cloth. He interpreted it in terms of economic and social uplift, whereas the boycott of the British goods as such is a political and punitive measure. This was effectively employed during the recent hurricane campaign. Now that there is at least temporary peace, and we seek to reach our goal through consultation and conference, we must withdraw the political weapon. We cannot be sitting at the friendly conference table and outside making designs to hurt British interests. Whilst, therefore, we must for the time being withdraw British goods' boycott, we must intensify Swadeshi which is the birthright of every nation. Whatever we produce in our country, we must encourage to the exclusion of foreign whether British or other. This is the condition of national growth. Thus, we must encourage and carry on intensive propaganda on behalf of indigenous insurance companies, banking, shipping and the like. We may not belittle or neglect them on the ground of their inferiority or dearness. Only by wide use and helpful criticism may we make them cheaper and better.

There is much loose talk about equality of treatment. What is equality of treatment between the strong and the weak, between giant and dwarf, between elephant and ant? If Lord Incheape with his fabulous wealth and resources claimed equal rights with Seth Narottam Morarji of lamented memory, it would be a travesty of equality. It will be time enough to talk of equality of treatment after Narottamdas's successors have made some little approach to Lord Incheape's resources. Equality of treatment in the case of hopeless unequals ought to mean raising the less favoured up to the level of the most favoured. Thus equality of treatment for suppressed classes, on the part of the so-called superior classes, means raising the former to the latter's level; the latter sacrificing their substance and stooping to conquer. In relation to the British we have hitherto occupied a position in some respects lower even than the suppressed classes. Protection of Indian industries and enterprise to the exclusion of British or foreign, is a condition of our national existence even under a state of partnership. Protection within even the British Commonwealth is no new-fangled notion. It is in vogue in the Dominions to the extent necessary for their growth.

Just as boycott of foreign cloth is an economic necessity for the sake of the starving millions, boycott of intoxicating drink and drugs is a necessity for the moral welfare of the nation. The idea of total prohibition was born before its political effect was thought of. The Congress conceived it as a measure of self-purification. Even if the Government earmarked the revenue from this traffic for purely

prohibition purposes, our picketing for these shops would continue, no doubt subject to the same severe restrictions as in the case of foreign cloth. I invite the Government during the transition stage, to anticipate the verdict of the national legislature and not merely tolerate picketing of the two things—foreign cloth and drink and drugs, but make, if they will, common cause with the nation. But whether they will go or no, we cannot rest still so long as there is a yard of foreign cloth entering the country or a single liquor shop corrupting our misguided countrymen.

One word regarding salt. The salt-raids must stop. Defiance of salt laws for the sake of civil disobedience must stop. But the poor, living in the neighbourhood of salt areas, are free to make and sell salt within that neighbourhood. The Salt Tax is not gone, it is true. In view of the likelihood of the Congress participating in the Conference, we may not press for the immediate repeal of the tax which is bound to come very soon. But the poorest on whose behalf the campaign was undertaken are now virtually free from the tax. I hope that no traders will seek to take an undue advantage of the relaxation.

The foregoing perhaps shows you how uninterested I am in many things that interest the intelligentsia. I am not interested in loaves and fishes, or legislative honours. The peasantry do not understand them, they are little affected by them. I believe that Gandhiji's eleven points mean the substance of Swarajya. That which does not satisfy them is no Swarajya. Whilst I would respect the rights of landlords, rajas, maharajas and others to the extent that they do not hurt the sweating millions, my interest lies in helping the down-trodden to rise from their state and be on a level with the tallest in the land. Thank God the gospel of Truth and Non-violence has given these an inkling of their dignity and the power they possess. Much still remains to be done. But let us make up our minds that we exist for them, not they for us. Let us shed our petty rivalries and jealousies, religious feuds and let everyone realise that the Congress represents and exists for the toiling millions and it will become an irresistible power working not for greed or power but for the sake of common humanity.

There is one part of the constructive programme which I have not dealt with already; that is the all-important work of removing untouchability. It is no use tinkering with the problem. The recent heroic struggle on the part of the nation would have been more glorious if Hindus had purged Hinduism of this evil. But heroism or glory apart, no Swarajya would be worth having without this supreme act of self-purification; and even if Swarajya is won whilst this stain continues to blacken Hinduism, it would be as insecure as a Swarajya without a complete boycott of foreign cloth.

In conclusion, I may not forget our brethren overseas. Their lot in South Africa, in East Africa and in the other parts of the world is still hanging in the balance. Dinabandhu Andrews is happily in South Africa helping our countrymen. Pandit Hirdayanath Kunzru has specialised in the Indian question in East Africa. The only consolation the Congress can give is to assure them of its sympathy. They know that their lot must automatically improve to the extent that we approach our goal. In your name I would appeal to the Governments concerned to treat with consideration the members of a nation which is bound at a very early date to enter upon her heritage and which means ill to no nation on earth. We ask them to extend to our nationals

the same treatment they would have us, when we are free, to extend to theirs. This is surely not asking too much.

I invite you to conduct your proceedings, over which you have asked me to preside, in a manner befitting the grave occasion at which we have met. Differences of opinion are bound to exist; but I trust that every one here will co-operate to make our deliberations dignified and conducive to the attainment of our goal.—*The Mahratta*.

“The Social Aspect Of The Native Question”

“We have got to provide for some sort of social contact with the native, both in the towns and on the land,” said Mr. J. D. Rheinalt Jones recently when lecturing on “The Social Aspect of the Native Question” to the Transvaal Workers' Educational Union in the Y.M.C.A. Hall (Johannesburg).

He cited the Transkei as a very good example of the benefits of territorial segregation, but lately these were being endangered as poor whites were slowly invading the Transkei in search of land and many were actually squatting on native holdings.

The natives in the Transvaal and Natal were very much scattered, being distributed among the various locations. This made territorial segregation very difficult of achievement. To-day 92 per cent. of the land was in the hands of the whites, and only 8 per cent. in the hands of the natives. A magistrate in Lady Grey told him there were several thousand natives in his district who had no land. Many had emigrated to Angola on that account. Some people were of the opinion that no natives should be allowed to live in the towns, but if they were expelled from the towns it would mean the complete reorganisation of our social system.

To-day our housing system in the towns was causing the better class native a great amount of trouble. He found it very difficult to live decently and morally with a large family in two rooms. Yet he would probably have to pay about 30s. a month in rent for those rooms. That was roughly more than 25 per cent. of the family income.

“It should be our policy, said Mr. Rheinalt Jones, “to assist the native to live under the best town conditions.”

He paid a tribute to many municipalities for the valuable work they were doing in bettering the conditions under which the native had to live. But there was still much to be done.

Medical services for natives in particular were very inadequate. It had often been argued that natives would not go near the hospitals and clinics provided for them. This was not true now because they had outgrown their fear of the white man's medicine, as witness the splendid work of the Johannesburg Non-European Hospital.

The speaker said that he was of the opinion that complete social segregation was impracticable, if not impossible. Even if the natives were segregated there was no land to give them.

“We must face up to the very definite fact that in the future we are going to have a large permanent native urban population,” said Mr. Rheinalt Jones in conclusion. “I repeat, it is our duty to teach them how to live under town conditions.”—*Star*.

Estcourt News

[BY JAMES AUGUSTINE]

Glorious weather conditions favoured the match between the Bells F.C. and the Nestles F.C., on Sunday the 26th April, on the Coloured Recreation Ground. Mr. Lalla refereed.

The Nestles were not in a position to field in their best team on that particular day. James Augustine, T. Cassim were not available. The Bells also had the same experience. The match from the commencement was fairly fast. Joe Augustine for the Bells made a breakway, and having run a considerable distance passed to Naidoo, who just managed to kick the ball over the bar. Hanif after beating the Bells half division passed nicely to Dawood who made a dash netting the first goal for the Nestles. The Bells pressed their way forward but were beaten by the Nestles' Backs. James David scored a nice goal for the Bells. Half time arrived, the score being 1-1. After half time both teams tried hard to score but without success. The game terminated in a draw of 1-1.

—o—
Mr. A. M. Samuel of Modderspruit (Ladysmith) accompanied by his wife and child came on a flying visit to Estcourt by car.

—o—
Mr. Manuel James, brother of Mr. Patrick James of Estcourt, spent a few days in Estcourt.

—o—
The Government has voted a sum of nearly £4,000, towards the erection of a new Indian School in Estcourt. The site is unknown yet.

We have received the following for publication:—

Owing to the distress prevailing in Cawnpore (India) at the present time, it was recently decided by the Mohamedan community in Springs, to make a collection for the relief of those Mohamedans who have suffered thereby. Messrs. Ally Mia Sadroodeen, E. M. Matwadia and E. H. Bhyat were appointed to make the collection and a sum of £21 5s. was realised, which has been sent to Khilafat, Bombay. The thanks of the collectors are due to the following gentlemen for donations:—

Messrs. Saheb Khan £5, E. M. Matwadia & Co., £3 3s., Suliman Moola £2 2s., Fareed Khan & Son £1 1s., E. A. & M. Mohamed £1, E. H. Bhyat 10s. 6d., Ebrahim Khan 10s. 6d., Dawood Khan 10s. 6d., E. I. Akoodie 10s. 6d., Akhalwaya 10s. 6d., Hassan Essop Hajat 10s. 6d., A. R. Charfaray 10s. 6d., M. F. Abid 5s. 6d., Abdul Aziz 5s., Ismail Mahmud Jogee 5s., E. S. Seedat 5s., S. A. Loonat 5s., F. E. Matwadia 5s., Essop Ismail 5s., A. I. Matwadia 2/6, M. E. Mayat 2/6, M. M. Karolia 2/6, E. H. Loonat 2/6, I. M. Seedat 2/6, G. M. Pansary 2/6, I. E. Laher 2/6, I. D. Pahad 2/6, Suliman Bhabha 2/6, Hassan Ghanchi 2/6, Haffjee Saheb 2/6, E. F. Abid 2/6, M. F. Pandor 2/6, A. J. Belakhdy 2/6, H. E. D. Jal 2/6, M. H. Akoodie 2/6, Saleh Hassan Rajah 2/6, H. M. Laher 2/6, Adam Laher 2/6, Adam Ismail Jogee 2/6, Moosa Ahmed Jogee 2/5, Moosa Hassan Lombat 2/6, E. A. Seedat 2/6, Mobamed Khan 2/6, L. M. Hurzak 2/6, Tamal Barber 2/6.—£21 5s.



Mobil Oil

The World's Quality Oil
is made and sold in
one quality only

With Mobil Oil use PEGASUS—The Modern Spirit of Mileage and Power!

MOBIL OIL COMPANY OF SOUTH AFRICA, LIMITED.