

# Indian Opinion

No. 45—Vol. XXXI.

Friday, November 10th, 1933

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

## CONTENTS.

	Page
NOTES AND NEWS	349
Who Is An Untouchable	"
Not The Way To Peace (Leading Article)	350
Place of Indians In S.A.	352
The Agent's Official Visit To-Klerksdorp	"
The Late Mr. Cachalla's Estate	353
Provincial Finance Committee	"
Asiatic Land Tenure Act Commission	"
Indians In Kenya	355
A New Method Of Anti-Indian Propaganda	"
Review	"
Sports	356

## Notes and News

### An English Paper's Sympathy With Mahatma Gandhi's Movement.

WHEN Mahatma Gandhi was last in prison and the authorities refused to give him the necessary facilities to carry on his work in connection with the removal of untouchability the *Manchester Guardian* made some comments which are worthy of note:

"It is impossible to pretend," the paper wrote, "that Mr. Gandhi's position is similar to that of any other Indian prisoner. His campaign for the raising of the Untouchable class, however socially controversial it may be in India, is one that everybody in the West must follow with profound sympathy—that disinterested sympathy, it may be said, which is always reserved for reforms which do not affect ourselves. Mr. Gandhi has founded a great movement. Up and down India, in nearly every province, a Servants of the Untouchables Society is at work trying to raise the status of those millions that orthodox Hinduism has cast out, securing their admission to temples, to drinking wells, to schools, exhorting them to refrain from drink and the eating of carrion—in a word, attempting to smooth the way for their readmission to "polite" Hindu society. Mr. Gandhi has his own domestic enemies to face among the caste Hindus. There is no reason why Britain should stand in his way, in the way of an attempt to change the secular fabric of Hinduism which may be remembered when his work for a phase of Nationalism is almost forgotten."

### American Tribute To Mahatma Gandhi

AN amazing drama involving the rights and social welfare of millions of people and the stability of a great Empire has just passed its climax, for the present at least, in India. That drama, says the *Christian Science Monitor*, centers around the wizened little figure of Gandhi, whose hunger strike sent frock coated diplomats scurrying about, caused the rulers of the British Empire to sweat through midnight emergency conferences and literally stood the British lion on its ear.

We of the Western world may look with small concern on India and the struggle of her teeming millions, but there is being enacted there an object-lesson whose profundity deserves our attention and understanding. Western civilisation, we say, with its mighty mass industrial machine and scientific progress, leads the world, yet our civilisation has not progressed so far that we do not depend upon force.

Supreme force that encounters resistance can always win. Force that meets no resistance is

a loss. A Gandhi leading an army in the field could be crushed overnight. A Gandhi in an Indian prison starving himself to death for an ideal is beyond force and vastly more powerful. Gandhi is a disciple of peace—the accomplishment of great deeds and works without the iron heel force.

### A Learned Pundit To Visit S.A.

PUNDIT Mehta Jaimini, B.A., L.L.B., M.R.A.S., Ph.D., who is a preacher of the Vedic faith is expected to visit South Africa on a similar mission at the end of this year or early next year. The Pundit has a very wide knowledge of the Eastern culture and philosophy and has lectured, we understand, in East Africa, Siam, Singapore, Malaya, Mauritius, Fiji, New Zealand, Zanzibar, America, Japan and many other places. The learned Pundit's visit to South Africa, we have no doubt, will therefore be looked forward to with keen interest not only by Indians but also by many Europeans.

## Who Is An Untouchable?

[The following prose-poem which is a free translation by Mr. B. Madhava Baliga, Basavangudi, Bangalore, of a poem in Canarese by the well-known poet-saint, Kanakadas of Udipi is reproduced from *Harijan*:—Ed. I.O.]

Fool, why look for the untouchable in the far-off paria lanes?

Cannot you open your eyes and see that he is here within the town?

He is an untouchable who wishes to possess much, but cares to give little;

He is an untouchable who esteems himself a better man than others;

He is an untouchable who speaks an untruth or gives much liberty to profane speech;

And a foul untouchable is the fiend that takes another's life.

Why look for the untouchable, then, in the pariah lanes,

Is he not elsewhere found within the town?

He is an untouchable who knows how to borrow, but not how to repay;

He is an untouchable who meekly lets himself become his passion's slave;

He is an untouchable who does an ill turn unto him whose salt he once did eat;

Why look for the untouchable, then, in the pariah lanes,

When you can find him anywhere in the town?

He is an untouchable whose promises are like pie-crust, made to be broken;

He is an untouchable who, devoid of charity, seeks his own good in all his doings;

He is an untouchable who fails to bring to light the wrong he knows;

And a foul untouchable is the sinner who forgets to serve his Master and Maker;

The untouchable is not born in a pariah home, He is everywhere found within the town.

## NOT THE WAY TO PEACE

**S**WAMI Bhawani Dayal Sannyasi has addressed to me the following letter :—

My dear Manilaji,—For the reverence and devotion I bear towards that great soul Mahatma Gandhi, and for the love and affection I have for you, I feel that I would be failing in my duty if I were not to write and point out to you, that the path of bitterness and the policy of pettiness you have lately thought fit to adopt for your journal, is not in keeping with the dignity and high office that you occupy as Editor of *Indian Opinion*.

May I remind you that the Editor's chair you occupy is an heritage you have succeeded to of no less personages than Mahatma Gandhi, Henry S. L. Polak, M. H. Nazar, Rev. Doke and A. H. West.

You have brought the high tradition of *Indian Opinion* to a narrow pass, of your personal dislikes and feelings of antagonism towards certain persons; your letters are not the opinions that once were rightly Indian opinion, but one can say without hesitation that *Indian Opinion* is now a misnomer. "*Mahilal's Opinion*" would be the right term.

I say with all the sense of responsibility that I can command, that to you, and the views that you have lately thought fit to express, the division of the community can and must be attributed.

Your support of the views of those that are now anti-Congress is in thy opinion not because you believe in them, but because you have found common cause with them in their bitterness and indulgence in personalities.

It is a matter of deep sorrow to me that one whom I regard as a brother and as a co-worker, should follow this narrow path, and glory in it, as you do when you express yourself in the columns of *Indian Opinion*.

I do not wish nor desire to enter into the merits or demerits of the colonisation enquiry, nor of the attitude of the Congress on the question as the representative organisation of the Indians of South Africa, and as such acknowledged and known the world over, and which authority up to very recent times was supported by *Indian Opinion* and yourself, nor do I wish to discuss the wisdom or folly of forming the new Colonial Born and Settlers Association, of which you are its much flouted vice-chairman.

My sole desire in writing this letter is to point out to you the folly of your actions and the blot you are making on the fair name of Indian journalism in this country. I have not the time nor the inclination to record in detail all that you have been doing, but suffice will it be to state the following few instances:—

- (a) The mass meeting of the Natal Indian Congress held in the Durban Town Hall regarding colonisation was a most important event, what was your attitude towards it as a journalist; you kept your readers in the dark as to what occurred there, but yet you commented adversely against the meeting and its convenors; this was I am sure you will agree little bit of twisted journalism.
- b) When the meeting of the Colonial Born and Settlers Association was held you not only gave it a national significance but in your bitterness attacked a fellow Indian journalist in the most uncalled for manner.
- (c) You gave grudging and reluctant publication to the meetings of the Congress held in Dannhauser, Glencoe and Newcastle, in connection with the colonisation enquiry, but I presume you gave publication in order to publish the misleading report of one of your friends from Dannhauser. When a report to this mischievous report was sent by a leading and well known worker of Dannhauser, you took refuge behind the much misused usage of expediency practiced by some journalists, by saying that the publication of the letter will not serve any useful purpose.
- d) When public meetings were held by the Congress on the deaths of Dr. Annie Besant and President Patel you thought fit to publish the events in a few lines as if they were of no significance.
- (e) Last but not the least your attitude regarding the report of the Hindu Conference held on the 21st and 22nd October, 1933, is worthy of comment. The Natal dailies and the *Indian Veltis* gave the proceedings the publication it deserved, but you who were present and stated in your speech at the opening of the Conference, that you sympathised with the movement, and that you were present as the reporter of *Indian Opinion*, did not publish a single line about the proceedings of the Conference, thus casting a slur on the Hindu Conference as one not worthy of mention in your journal, from this is one to conjecture that despite your sympathy as a Hindu with the Conference, you had to obey the orders of one of your friends, with whom you have formed an unholy alliance of disrupting the Congress, and who holds definite views against Hindus co-operating for their social and educational uplift. If such is the case—and it can be no other—then one can do nought else but bow his head in shame that *Indian Opinion* and Manilal the son of the Mahatma have come to such depths.

In conclusion I appeal to you to discard from your heart the feelings of bitterness and pettiness and once again uphold the high tradition of the editorial chair you occupy by virtue of being the son of an illustrious and revered father, whom you so often proclaim that you follow.—Yours faithfully,—BHAWANI DAYAL SANNYASI.

If I were to follow strictly the rules of journalism I would not be doing wrong in taking no notice of Swami Bhawani Dayal's letter. But the letter I think merits some attention as I have reason to believe that it is written not altogether out of love and affection professed by the writer for me but with a fixed design to unpopularise me as the Swami and his associates have been doing by making misrepresentations throughout the country.

If Swami Bhawani Dayal had any reverence for Mahatma Gandhi and love and affection for me I would ask the Swami why it never once occurred to him to take an opportunity of discussing my change of attitude in private. Bitterness is easier to remove by heart to heart talks than keeping poles asunder. Further this letter does not convince me of Swami Bhawani Dayal's professed sincerity or inspire me to have the same regard for him for it is not even a personal letter written to me. Not one but three cyclostyled copies have come to me and I understand they have been circulated among many others.

I can assure Swami Bhawani Dayal and the public that I bear no bitterness towards anyone. I am certainly strongly opposed to the attitude of the Congress on the colonisation question and its present policy of sacrificing honour and self-respect for paltry material gains. Its passive submission to the working of the Transvaal Asiatic Land Tenure Act and the Transvaal Licences (Control) Ordinance and the Immigration Act and its active support in the formation of a colonisation scheme, the openly declared object of which is to reduce the Indian population of this country to its irreducible minimum, is ample proof of it. Much misrepresentation has been made in connection with the latter by alluding to the "word of honour." I totally disagree with the Congress that by its non-participation with the Colonisation Inquiry Committee it would be violating its "word of honour." I would humbly submit that it is not so much the keeping of the "word of honour" that the Congress is so frightfully anxious about but it is the great fear of the pistol that is pointed at its head, that should it not co-operate in the unholy scheme of reducing its numbers the Government would revert to its original policy and the community would be faced with the Class Areas Bill with all its horrors. This attitude only shows to what depths of degradation the Congress has sunk. If it at all had the keen sense of honour and the love for Truth that it professes it would never have resorted or submitted to any subterfuge methods of dealing with the Indian question. It would have fought a straightforward fight and stood for righteousness unmindful of the consequences.

Indeed it should not require me to remind Swami Bhawani Dayal that Mahatma Gandhi had wasted his precious twenty years in this country for no other purpose. And I have no hesitation in saying that in so far as INDIAN OPINION is concerned it has been my endeavour always to follow in his footsteps.

If, therefore, my attitude appears to have changed, and I count myself among the anti-Congressites, I have some reasons for it.

I take the strongest exception to Swami Bhawani Dayal's allegation which he and his associates have

been making all along that my changed attitude is due to my personal dislikes and feelings of antagonism towards certain persons. This is the limit of misrepresentation. My changed attitude, as I have drummed it sufficiently in these columns and from public platforms is due only to the utterly wrong attitude taken up by the Congress on the colonization issue.

In so far as indulgence in personalities goes I think I have a grievance perhaps more than anyone else. Personal attacks have been made against me from Congress platforms and most unbecoming and vulgar attacks are continuously being made in the Press to which Swami Bhawani Dayal with all the love he professes for me has taken no exception. But my back has been hardened by the lathi charge in India and it will stand without bearing the slightest ill-feeling as many attacks that my countrymen may wish to make. I am unaware of having indulged in personalities in INDIAN OPINION barring stating facts where they have had to be stated on relevant matters.

I am not unconscious of the responsible position that I hold in this country and I have made that point clear long before Swami Bhawani Dayal's reminder. It was out of that sense of responsibility that I declared at the very first mass meeting held in Durban on the question of colonization, when after Swami Bhawani Dayal and his co-Congress officials had been given a fair and full hearing, the meeting voted by 900 to 50 odd votes against the decision of the Congress to participate with the Inquiry Committee, that I would stand alone on the issue even if I had no following.

As I have already stated, if anyone is responsible for the present division in the community it is firstly the highhandedness of the Congress in flouting public opinion—indeed the opinion of those very people whom any such scheme is going to affect mostly—and their action in keeping the Agent of the Government of India with them. It is as convenient for the Agent to be with them at present as it has been convenient for him to kick the Congress aside and to hob-nob with the Transvaal Indian Commercial Association.

It pains me to criticise the action of the Agent rather in severe terms but has he, I would ask in all earnestness, besides calling all those who are opposed to the Congress on the colonization issue fools, taken any steps to bring about reconciliation between the two parties? No. He has taken the word of the Congress as gospel truth and has ignored the public.

INDIAN OPINION is not a paper which has been established merely for journalistic exercise. It has always stood for a cause. So long as the Congress was going in the right direction it supported the Congress and represented it. To-day the outlook of the Congress is altogether changed and I cannot see my way to falling in with its attitude.

I have no hesitation in challenging Swami Bhawani Dayal to prove that the Congress represents the voice of the public in its attitude on Colonization. Public opinion on that matter is neither in South Africa nor in India with the Congress.

According to Swami Bhawani Dayal it would appear that so long as the views expressed by INDIAN OPINION were palatable to the Congress they expressed Indian opinion and now that they are not palatable to the Congress they are "Manilal's own views." This, I would humbly suggest, is arrogating to the Congress rather undue authority.

With regard to my comments on the Congress meeting held in the Town Hall to which Swami Bhawani Dayal refers, I can only say that the pomp of power, the air of arrogance, the utter hypocrisy, the exploitation of Mahatma Gandhi's name, the show of his portrait and the behaviour of the Congress volunteers was all so unholy and unbecoming that no criticism of it would be too strong.

It certainly did not reflect any bravery on the part of Swami Bhawani Dayal Bannayasi and his associates to keep away from the very peaceful meeting of over 3,000 of the Colonial-born and Settlers' Association. They would have been given better hearing than they gave their antagonists at theirs. It also reflected a lack of propriety on the part of those who were responsible for taking away the Agent of the Government of India on such an important occasion for it was the duty of the Agent to hold the scales evenly between the two sections of the community.

In so far as reporting of Congress meetings is concerned I attach as much importance to the present day Congress activities as it was customary for the Congress to attach to those of the Federationists. But I have given them a little more consideration owing to the past career of the Congress.

If any misstatements or misrepresentations have been made it is always open for the Congress officials themselves to make the necessary corrections. But my attention has been drawn to no such misstatements having been made by them. The present day activities of the Congress seem to be prompted, more than anything else, with a desire of propaganda work to make people abroad believe that Congress really is a representative body. I would certainly not call a meeting attended by a hundred or two hundred a "mass meeting."

As Swami Bhawani Dayal ought to know INDIAN OPINION has never dealt with purely religious subjects excepting in principles of general application. I agree, however, that a short report of the proceedings might have been published for general information. But hard pressed for time as I was I was not able to go through the shoals of literature sent to me and to frame a report. The Swami is not unaware of the handicaps under which I have to work. If he or his co-workers would have taken the trouble of sending a short report of the proceedings it would certainly have been published. The report was left out only because I was not able to handle it in time and the subject became stale. Swami's conjecture therefore that it was not published in obedience to the orders of one of my friends, with whom I have formed an unholy alliance of disrupting the Congress, is totally incorrect.

And pray whom does the Swami refer to as my allies. Are they Messrs. A. Christopher, P. R. Pather and S. L. Singh? If they are I need hardly be ashamed of being associated with them for were they not the Congress pillars all these years? And have they become untouchables now that they are not with the Congress? Let me assure the Swami that I take dictation from nobody. I always take advice and value good advice but act according to the dictates of my own conscience.

In conclusion I must most emphatically say that there is no one more anxious than myself for peace. But broadcasting of open letters such as the one Swami Bhawani Dayal Sannyasi has chosen to address to me is most decidedly not the way to peace. The only way to peace is for the Congress to scold down a little, and rather than demonstrating their pomp of money power and attempting to work in rivalry with the Colonial born and Settlers' Indian Association and thus creating and engendering bitter feelings, make an honest and sincere attempt to explore avenues to befriend those whom they have antagonised by their utter highhandedness.

MANILAL GANDHI.

## Place Of Indians In South Africa

The Kunwarani And Prof. Brookes  
Address Indian Women

Addressing the Indian women at a public meeting in the Asiatic Bazaar, Pretoria, under the auspices of the Pretoria Indian Women's Association the Kunwarani Lady Maharaj Singh is reported to have said:—"You belong now to this country. This country is the birthplace of many of you, and you have to make—you must make—your contribution to the culture and the development of the country that is now your domicile. You must see that that contribution is worthy of your own great country. If you don't make your contribution, then you are not worthy of this young country. I am going to see to it that you have equal chances with your European compatriots."

### Prof. Brookes' Speech

Dr. E. H. Brookes, of the Institute of Race Relations, spoke on the place of the Indian in South Africa. The Indian had to be considered as a permanent member of the South African community. He was in South Africa to stay and some permanent provision must be made for him, on general grounds of justice and humanity. Three-quarters of the total population of the British Commonwealth were Indians, and so long as they owed allegiance to the King in common with other subjects of the British Commonwealth Indians could not be treated as strangers. Nine-tenths of the Indians in South Africa were South African by birth. The Capetown Agreement was a pledge of honour binding on Europeans, and a place must be made for Indians in South Africa for the simplest and most cogent reason of all—that they were not going to leave South Africa.

If Europeans wished to be of service to Indians they should study the facts of Indian life close at hand. Indians had nothing to apologise for in the culture they represented. Their civilisation was one of the most famous and most ancient in the world. But in all the South African universities there was

not one chair for the study of Indian culture. In almost every other field the Indians could do something for themselves, but it was for the Europeans to fight prejudice and unfair legislation. The Europeans were the governing classes in South Africa and the responsibilities of the governing classes should weigh upon them heavily.

On the other hand, Indians must help themselves. They could use the education facilities offered them to the full. The wealthier among them could help their own depressed classes.

"We shall not solve this problem unless the wealthier Indians in general will do what some of them have already done. Indians can keep their trade methods so absolutely above reproach as to remove all argument for discrimination. Lastly, Indians can emancipate their women as far as it is possible. Perhaps I should say that the Indian women should emancipate themselves."

—*Rand Daily Mail.*

## The Agent's Official Visit To Klerksdorp

(From A Correspondent)

On Wednesday Nov. 1, the Agent of the Government of India, Kunwar Sir Maharaj Singh, accompanied by his secretary Mr. G. S. Bozman, paid an official visit to Klerksdorp. A dinner was given in his honour by Mr. A. R. A. Gani, a leading merchant of the town.

The Agent addressed a public meeting in the Railway Institute Hall, admission to which was by invitation. There was a large attendance, the hall being well filled, and the audience included a big representation of Klerksdorp Indian community.

The Mayor, Cr. G. de Kock, who presided, and said he was very much honoured to do so, thanked the Agent for visiting the town in his official capacity and assured him of the goodwill of the white citizens.

The Magistrate recalled the "stink bomb" incident connected with the visit of his predecessor, Mr. Sastri, and remarked on the calmer, undisturbed atmosphere in which the Agent was now visiting them. Having thanked the Indian community for affording him the opportunity of meeting the Agent, Mr. Oettle endorsed the Mayor's welcome and trusted that some measure of success would attend his efforts on behalf of his countrymen in South Africa.

Mr. Patel followed with an address of welcome to the distinguished visitor.

Rising amid applause the Agent expressed himself as deeply touched by the Mayor's welcome and after touching upon the ancient history of India to show that India was not altogether an uncivilised country nor its inhabitants all "coolies" the Agent went on to draw comparison between the treatment in regard to educational advantages and licences to trade meted out to Indians in the Transvaal, and that accorded to Europeans by Indian authorities in, say, Bombay and Calcutta. The Indian problem in the Transvaal he regarded as artificial, and Europeans here were surely not afraid of the trivial 1% proportion which Indians represented to the total population—3% when compared to the European population. He knew it would be said that they represented a larger percentage in trade, but even this was not so large as popularly imagined; in Johannesburg, for instance, the volume of trade in the hands of Indians was not 5%, though he admitted it might be larger in the smaller outside towns. Apart from being general dealers or fruiterers, what other avenues existed, he asked, for the Indians, of whom 80% were South African born.

## Local Indians Have No Grievances

He was glad to learn, the Agent said, that the relations between Europeans and Indians in Klerksdorp were satisfactory; the local Indian leaders said they have no complaints against the Europeans, and this reflected credit upon both communities. He appealed to the Europeans to take their courage in both hands and treat Indians here as well as India treated Europeans there. With all their faults Indians are not ungrateful, and should be treated with justice. "You cannot keep any community in a ditch without yourself having to remain in the ditch to keep them down. If you degrade another, you must degrade yourself." The Agent concluded with thanks for the charming speeches addressed to him and for the kind and patient hearing he had received.

## The Late Mr. Cachalia's Estate

### Judgment Against Administrators

Judgment was delivered in the Appellate Division Bloemfontein, on Oct. 26, in Ahmed Mia versus Cachalia, who had instituted proceedings in the Witwatersrand Division of the Supreme Court against Mia and his co-administrators of the estate of Cachalia's late father, of which he was one of the heirs, for an account of their administration.

They had been responsible for the administration of the estate from June, 1923, and had sent Cachalia a statement of certain receipts and payments and other items without dates.

It had been pleaded by the administrators that they had sufficiently accounted in the statement referred to.

Cachalia had denied that the statement was a proper account.

At the hearing of the case in the court below the parties had put in by consent certified extracts from the will and the final liquidation and distribution account, but no evidence was adduced.

The court held that the administrators must furnish a full account within six weeks, the costs of the proceedings to be paid by them out of their own pockets.

Mia was the only one of the administrators who had appealed.

Mr. Justice Beyers handed in the considered judgment of the Appeal Court, which decided that the statement given by the administrators was not such a proper account as it was their duty to furnish, and the appeal was accordingly dismissed, with costs.—Reuter.

[The late Mr. A. M. Cachalia was one of the most respected leaders of the Transvaal Indians who was in Mahatma Gandhi's time the president of the Transvaal British Indian Association and had given up all his material interests in the service of his compatriots.—Ed, I.O.]

## Fountain Of Wisdom

—A living failure is better than a dead masterpiece.—G. BERNARD SHAW.

—It costs more to revenge injuries than to bear them.—THOMAS WILSON.

—Power acquired by guilt is never used for good purpose.—TACITUS.

—A fault confessed is a new virtue added to a man.

## Provincial Finance Committee

### The Congress Case

The following is a summary of the statement submitted by the Natal Indian Congress to the Provincial Finance Committee:—

(1) Increase of subsidy for primary education that the provincial authorities may provide: (a) further facilities for children now receiving tuition and to provide for those who remain unprovided for, (b) free primary education; (2) Sastri College to be subsidised on similar lines to those of the European training colleges and secondary schools; (3) create technical classes for Indians as a branch of the Natal Technical College.

Hospitals: The finances of the province be so adjusted as to allow for better facilities for Indians in hospitals and for the training of Indian nurses.

Land: Safeguards that in future provincial legislation no discrimination would be made between classes and races, and a recommendation for the elimination of any powers now existing for such discrimination.

Licences: Recommendations of the Capetown Agreement of 1927 be given effect to.

Franchise: The restoration of the municipal and township franchise that the Indians would have a voice through the electorate in the administration of the local authorities.

## Asiatic Land Tenure Act Commission

### Evidence of Mr. Mahomed Essop Gathoo

(Continued from last week)

CHAIRMAN: Is there any one else who wishes to ask the witness any questions? Mr. Brink, you opened witness's evidence by getting him to tell us that he is Chairman of this school. Has he anything more to tell us about the school. I thought you were going to tell us something about the school site.

Mr. BRINK: He has told us he has been shifted and he is not there now. Perhaps he might give us some information.

CHAIRMAN: Some statement was made to us during our tour that the school was anxious to acquire property adjoining the school for a playground.

Mr. BRINK: Yes; we might perhaps ask him. (To Witness): Do you know anything about this Indian school now in Burghersdorp; about its affairs? Now I do not do any business there, but Mr. Coovadia is attending to that.

Mr. Coovadia will attend to that. You do not have anything to do with it?—No.

JASSUR BRAHIM, duly sworn;  
Examined by Mr. Brink, K.O.

Mr. BRINK: You are a merchant, and you carry on business in Johannesburg, and you are a large property owner as well?—Yes.

Your properties are situated in this part of Johannesburg, west of Sauer Street. You have properties there?—Yes.

Will you just tell us where your properties are?—In Market and Kort Street; and Market and Diagonal Street; also the corner of President and Diagonal Street; also at Market Street and West Street corner; and also in President Street, near the Star office.



Q: You have properties all over?—Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Are those properties held in the names of companies?—Companies, yes.

Q: Are there more than one company?—More than one company.

MR. BRINK: None of them are held in a European's name, in trust for you?—Not down there. We have one the other side. Those properties are all in Indian companies' name; limited companies.

Q: When did you come to Johannesburg first?—In 1892.

Q: And except for visits to India have you always lived here?—Not always. I went to India.

Q: For how long were you away?—I went to India in 1896. I came back to the Transvaal in 1897.

Q: Did you go to India again?—I went back to India during 1898.

Q: When did you come back again?—In 1902.

Q: Have you always lived in Johannesburg, except for your visits to India?—Yes.

Q: In those early days in 1892 where did the Indians in Johannesburg live. In what localities did they live and trade. Can you tell us that?—Most of the Indians were about Market and Delters Streets.

Q: You yourself lived down there in Market and Delters Streets and large numbers of Indians lived there, that is, East?—Yes.

Q: Was it known by a particular name?—They called it Natal Camp in those days.

Q: Was that because most of the Indians came from Natal?—Yes; most of them.

Q: Were there any Indians around about where you own property to-day; west of Sauer Street?—Yes.

Q: Many or few?—There were many.

Q: And have there always been Indians in this area ever since then?—Yes.

Q: Carrying on business there and living there?—Yes.

Q: Before the Boer War did you live in this part west of Sauer Street yourself?—Before the Boer War, yes.

Q: Near the Power Station; where the Power Station and the Tramway sheds are?—Yes.

Q: Did you put up the building there on the stand belonging to Messrs. Hayman, Gordon & Company?—Yes.

Q: And the shops, living rooms, and so on?—Yes.

Q: That was before the Boer War?—Yes.

Q: You went away during the Boer War and came back. Did many come back to the same spot?—Yes.

Q: And you lived there for some years?—Yes.

Q: When you moved to Minnaar and Malherbe Street?—The Municipality took my ground.

MR. MAC WILLIAM: It was the expropriation of an imaginary area which is practically Newtown?—Yes.

MR. BRINK: The Municipality expropriated the ground you were on then?—Yes.

Q: That was about 1904-1905?—Something like that.

Q: So you had to move?—Yes; I had to move.

Q: You moved to the corner of Minnaar and Malherbe Street?—Not at that time. I went to Fordsburg for a short time.

Q: For how long?—about twelve months. To Avenue Road, Fordsburg, for about twelve months.

Q: And then?—Then I went to Burgersdorp.

Q: To the corner of Minnaar and Malherbe Street?—Yes.

Q: Then I think the next year, 1906, you built that large house which the Commission has been on its tour of inspection?—Yes.

Q: You lived in that house until recently?—Until 1927.

Q: You have now let it to Indian residents?—Yes.

Q: And you yourself live on your property at the corner of Market and Diagonal Streets?—Yes.

Q: Coming back to when you first came to Johannesburg in 1892, do you remember Natal Camp. Were there any Europeans living in what was known a Natal Camp?—Yes, it was also mixed.

Q: There were Europeans living there?—Yes; some Europeans.

Q: Were there more Europeans or more Indians?—As far as I remember, more Indian.

CHAIRMAN: When was this?

MR. BRINK: In 1892, when he came there, there were more Indians than Europeans living in Natal Camp, around what is Market Street now?—Yes.

Q: Were there Indians living there ever since?—Yes.

Q: To-day they live mostly east of Troy Street?—Yes.

Q: In the early days did they live nearer to Eloff Street?—Yes. There are still Indians in cottages near Von Weilligh Street. In the olden days they lived in wood and iron cottages nearly to Eloff Street.

Q: They have been pushed eastwards?—Yes.

Q: Did Coloured persons live in this Natal Camp as well as Indians?—Yes, also.

Q: As regards this area west of Sauer Street and round about Sauer Street, where there Indian shops in Sauer Street in those early days before Boer War?—Yes; before the Boer War.

Q: Were there Indian shops east of Sauer Street?—Also.

Q: They were in President Street?—Yes.

Q: And now that the market has been moved have they withdrawn themselves further west?—Yes.

Q: What would you call east? Where would you draw the line of the Asiatic part—the Asiatic trade?—I think from Sauer Street westwards.

Q: As regards Sauer Street, there are some Indian shops there now, facing the back of the new Library?—Yes.

Q: The question is whether it is not desirable that they should move because it is a principle street which runs right from the south of Johannesburg, which is an entry from Entchehofatrom and those parts, right to the north. What do you say about that?—You had Indians always down there as far as I remember.

Q: Not only on the north of Market Street but also on the south of market Street?—Yes.

Q: Do you think the presence of Indian shops is going to lower the locality in Sauer Street and spoil the street?—I do not think so.

Q: Do you think that if the Indians had secure tenure there they would perhaps improve the place?—Oh, yes.

Q: The class of trade that is done in these little shops all round Diagonal Street; greengrocers shops, fruit shops; whom they deal with?—All mixed I think. White and Coloured.

Q: And the soft goods shops there further down?—Yes; further down.

Q: Whom do they mostly deal with?—It is all mixed I think.

Q: Do they deal a good deal with the natives?—Yes; a d al with the natives.

Q: And as you get near to the Pass Office, do the shops near the Pass Office deal with White people as well as natives?—Mostly natives I think.

Q: Those shop-keepers to a large extent are Indians?—Yes, Indians.

Q: There are some Europeans there too?—A few.

Q: Not so many as Indians?—No.

( To be continued )



## Indians In Kenya Questions And Answers In Indian Assembly

Mr. Bajpai, replying to Mr. G. P. Singh, said that the restriction against Indians buying lands in the highlands of Kenya applied only to agricultural land. The matter had been referred to a select committee of the Kenya Council. The Government had asked for a copy of the report, and after considering it, would take suitable action, if necessary.

Mr. Joshi: In view of the fact that racial discrimination has been placed against Indians in Kenya, may I ask whether the Government of India will represent to the British Government that the Government of India should have similar power in the future constitution, of imposing restrictions on the subjects of these colonies?

Mr. Bajpai: The Joint Committee are considering the whole question of constitutional changes.

Mr. G. P. Singh raised the question of retrenchment of Indians on Tanganyika Railways and the report on railway rates and finance.

Mr. Bajpai replied that the Government of India had considered the report, and proposed to address the Secretary of State shortly.

## A New Method Of Anti-Indian Propaganda

The Rev. C. F. Andrews writes as follows in the July number of the *Modern Review*—

The following was sent to me, through my publisher, Messrs. Allen & Unwin, by a gentleman living in a sea-side town in England, who has given me full permission to use it. It shows to what lengths this invidious anti-Indian propaganda is now being carried on in Great Britain. It also reveals the extraordinary ignorance about India on the part of the average reader in Great Britain, and the obtuse mentality which is not uncommon about India especially in a provincial town. It shows at the same time that there are Englishmen who thoroughly object to this crude form of propaganda, and are doing their best to put an end to it.

The memorandum reads as follows:

"The other day I borrowed from a well-known circulating library a copy of C. F. Andrews' book, *India and the Simon Report*. I found that a previous reader had given vent to violent anti-Indian sentiments by annotations in the margins. I was glad to think that these remarks were written in pencil so that I was able to remove them entirely before the book reached another reader. And I also had an opportunity of drawing the attention of the library assistant to the danger of allowing books out to subscribers in such a condition. Thus I hope, in this instance, the offence will not be repeated.

"But what a method of a propaganda! How unspeakably mean and underhand. Not deliberate perhaps, but actual! Such a book is probably going to be read by hundreds afterwards; and in every case a seed is to be sown which may bear tragic fruit in producing or at least encouraging an anti-Indian mentality. These are some of the comments (there are too many to produce *in extenso*) which I have collected. In inverted commas I have put Mr. Andrews' own words taken from his book. Then, in brackets, I have put the comment of this reader upon what Mr. Andrews has written.

"The title-page: 'By C. F. Andrews, (comment: The Renegade.)'

"P. 51: 'Gandhi ... is always practical' (comment: 'The most impractical visionary alive.')

"E. 80: (General comment: 'You can do nothing with such a stupid race, which gets head over ears in debt when a near relative dies and keeps millions of superannuated cows in a parched land.')

"P. 94: 'India a conquered nation' (comment: 'No, a vast mass of tribes.')

"P. 105: 'Indian ... as wards of the British Government ... had become entirely helpless and defenceless' (comment: 'they were always so') a whole people (India) who had once been so great and noble' (comment: 'what a lie.')

"P. 107: 'Villages and bazaars were still overhung by a cloud of poverty and squalor' (comment: 'they always have been so, it is their own fault and could be cured by altering their habits') (general comment: 'they never could and never did defend themselves.')

"Such were a few of the chief comments pencilled in the book which came into my hands. There was also a plentiful sprinkling of such words as 'Rot', 'Bosh' and 'nonsense'. Comment on such a method of propaganda seems superfluous, but perhaps a warning may not be out of place."

It is hardly necessary for me to add a single word to what this friend of India has written. Here in Great Britain the battle has to be fought and won against an insidious campaign carried on by weapons such as these. Many times over, in the course of the past year, I have cabled to Mahatma Gandhi and also to the Post, Rabinranath Tagore, seeking advice as to whether it would be better for me to return to India or to stay here in England, carrying on the necessary work which has to be done here. On each and every occasion they have cabled back to me and written in letters that they have no question whatever that my work has to be done in England rather than in India at this crisis. More than once I have actually booked my passage and cancelled the order again later on receiving such messages from India, and on such occasions the outcome of events has proved conclusively how wise and right the instructions which I had received were. No one in India, I am sure, will question these decisions which have been made only after the most earnest search to find out what is best for the Indian cause itself.

Meanwhile the uphill work here which has to be done in order to counteract this vicious propaganda is enormous.

## Review

### Sidelights On The Problem Of Indian Nationality

—*Love of my country does not demand that I shall hate and slay noble and faithful souls who love theirs, but rather that I shall honour them and seek with them for our common Good*—ROMAIN ROLLAND.

What is the foundation on which the future of the Indian nation is to be based? This is a topical question of vital importance, and is the one fully asked and discussed in the cursory treatise: *Sidelights on the Problem of Indian Nationality*, recently published in India. It is no doubt an absorbing study of the value of culture in relation to politics and will be read by all political theorists as well as by the layman with keen interest. Despite its brevity, the tractate is not lacking in profundity and besides, is extremely provocative.

The writer, Dr. Ishwar Nath Topa, is a professor of Indian cultural history in the Osmania University, Hyderabad, and, apparently, is well conversant

with the facts of Indian history. In addition, we feel, he has the ability and prophetic acumen to make the generalisations he does in regard to India's future national welfare. His method is both comparative and historical. The answer to the question he asks, therefore, will be found in an honest interpretation of the facts of India's past history. The past is inseparably linked up with the future and the future naturally is largely dependent upon the present. Acting on this assumption, then, the writer attempts to offer a constructive policy for the development and intensification of the spirit of Indian Nationalism. At the moment a feeling of nationalism does exist in India but it is based, the writer avers, merely on political and patriotic sentiments. It lacks permanency. Such a foundation is insecure and with the passing of the years the edifice of Indian nationalism, as it stands to-day, will crumble and result inevitably in natural chaos.

What then is to be the basis of a sound nationalism? Nationalism, if we interpret the term correctly, is nothing else than a feeling of communalism existent not in a clan or a tribe but in a group large enough to be called a nation, and dependent upon some interest common to this entire group. If we accept such a definition then Indian nationalism can have only one foundation. And that is Culture; for India not only has a culture but has a culture peculiar to itself. The plausibility of such a theory now immediately suggests itself. What is more, nationalism on such a basis entirely eliminates all possibilities of there ever existing a narrow, selfish patriotism, which history teaches us, is invariably followed by a deep-seated envy of and hatred for others.

But accepting the possibility of such a theory why, it may be asked, was the growth of Indian nationalism in the past so slow, especially as a culture distinctly Indian was in existence long before the invention of the printing press? The writer forestalls his critics by himself asking the question. And on reviewing the history of the past he finds that the nationalism of the Indian people has been stunted both by the pernicious caste system as well as by the conflict between Hindu and Muslim. These have been the spokes retarding India's progress.

Firstly the institution of caste is diametrically opposed to nationalism. Under the caste system a feeling of communalism does exist but it is confined to a small group and moreover, the fealty of the members to such groups is such that the groups are constantly at variance with one another. Loyalty, then, confined within such narrow limits even by evolution cannot merge into nationalism. The spirit of the system is alien to a universal brotherhood. As long as the caste system prevails, therefore, the complete nationalisation of the people of India will be impossible.

Secondly, the Hindu-Muslim conflict is an artificial one—a conflict that is to be attributed to the evil and narrow religious motives that have attended the writings of historians in the past. The interpretation of India's past has been biased, to such an extent that the problem has to-day assumed gigantic proportions. The writer offers but one solution to the problem, and that is toleration and broadmindedness in dealing with the problem.

Before nationalism on a large scale is feasible, therefore, India will have to be purged of the system of caste prejudices on the one hand and the religious bigotry which is largely responsible for the Hindu-Muslim conflict on the other. They have impeded the growth of Indian nationalism in the past and will in the future, until such time as they are removed, root and all, from the life of India.

The essence of the Indian nationality, therefore, must be Indian culture. On such a basis alone will India's future depend. Whether such theorisation is practicable or not the reader must decide for himself.

Philologically, too, the treatise is interesting. The style is perhaps a little too pedantic and high-flown which seems to be a feature characteristic of much that is being poured out of the Indian press to-day. The large number of words used is far incommensurate with the size of the tractate. The essence of the tractate we feel, might have been squeezed with more clarity and definiteness into half its size. But this is a minor criticism for the value of the publication as a readable contribution to the Indian national question is by no means unimpaired.

G. S.

## Sporting News

(BY SPORTSMAN)

### Stanger Stars Football Club

The annual general meeting of the above club was held on Sunday, October 29, at Sudir's Hall. In the absence of the president Mr. E. M. Moola, the chair was occupied by Mr. A. J. Bux. The chairman briefly outlined the activities of the club during the season just ended and emphasised the necessity of more harmony between the members and the officials.

The hon. secretary Mr. G. A. Mather stated in his report that during the year they had the pleasure of playing the school teams from the Transvaal and teams from various centres of the Natal coast and Zululand. He thanked the various supporters of the Club for their assistance financially and materially.

The financial statement audited by Mr. Shaikh Abdulla reflected a credit balance of £ 16s. 11d. in cash.

Among the other speakers were Messrs. V. Thomas and Shaikh Abdulla who stressed the necessity of better discipline amongst the players.

The secretary was presented in appreciation of his services with an address in the form of a frame inscribed with holy words from The Koran.

### Verulam Vs. Durban

A friendly tennis match took place at the Plaza Tennis Court, Durban, between M. Raghavjee's six of Verulam and Essop Paruk's six of Durban. The result was a win for M. Raghavjee's six by 5 sets to 4. The following represented M. Raghavjee's six: M. Raghavjee (Captain), V. Jutha, S. R. Maharaj, J. R. Singh, A. I. Bhabha, Gafoor Bux.

FOR SALE—Prospect Hall Rd., Durban North,—Substantial Brick House, Large Dining and Bedrooms (5), K.P.B., verandah front and one side, enclosed back,  $\frac{1}{2}$  acre, outhouses, 4 tanks, well, abundance water, ideal suburban residence.

SWANBY, Reynolds St. Port Shepstone.