

為求解放東方及全世界被壓迫民族之半月刊

第五卷

第八期

東方民族

曾傑題



中華民國二十二年四月十六日出版

恭錄總理遺囑

余致力國民革命，凡四十年，其目的在求中國之自由平等。積四十年之經驗，深知欲達到此目的，必須喚起民眾，及聯合世界上以平等待我之民族，共同奮鬥。

現在革命尚未成功，凡我同志，務須依照余所著：建國方略，建國大綱，三民主義，及第一次全國代表大會宣言，繼續努力，以求貫徹。

最近主張開國民會議及廢除不平等條約，尤須於最短期間，促其實現，是所至囑！

唐紹儀論廢領判權

——特權友誼市場——
三者不可得兼

撤銷領判權問題。現已成爲國人一致之要求。政府與人民。已下最大決心。於最短期間。促其撤廢。日昨唐紹儀氏。又在上海大陸報。發表英文論文。力主撤廢領判權。茲譯爲華文如次。

『領判權爲舊時代之遺物。決不適用於現代。其應早日廢撤。而代以適合國際法原則之制度。業經中外所公認。現所爭執者。僅在撤廢之辦法。中國主張無條件之全都撤廢。而各國則主分期逐漸撤廢之。吾等試問外人何爲而來華乎。其爲貿易而來，意至顯明。欲求對華貿易之發展。第一步應先獲得華人之好感。若華人不願

購買外貨。各國在華軍艦雖多。恐亦無法強制華人購置之也。

領判權之意義。在外僑在華。可任意違犯中國法律。而不受中國法律制裁。各國之政府。果願其國民在華任意違犯駐在國之法律。而不受該國法庭制裁乎。恐不盡然。

蓋任何守法之國民。皆無庸治外法權之保護。而後始能安居也。從中國方面言之。領判權之存在。實令華人心目中受劣等民族待遇之痛苦。此種理想。實不應存在。各國果願維持在華少數外人之特權。而置多數本國人民對華利益於不顧乎。各國若願增進在華之友誼。則應立即取消中外友誼障礙之領判權也。

由各國之立場觀之。領判權。友誼。市場三者。不可得兼。欲保留特權。則友誼與市場。勢必無法維持。若欲維持對華友誼與市場。則領判權勢不容其繼續存在。簡單言之。亦可以下列公式表明之。

(特權：友誼+市場)
其意至顯。各國似應權其輕重。擇其有利者行之也。

所謂特權者。爲時甚暫。且僅及於少數人民。而中國之友誼與市場。則各國將咸受其益。且能垂於數世之後。該項特權。至今已成強弩之末。其撤銷僅屬時間問題。爲各國計。與其將

來該項特權被中國強制取消。何如自動撤廢之。以見好於華人乎。

各國人士。應期中國人民。對於撤銷領判權。已下最大決心矣。國民會議。於五星期後。即將召集。是時自不容容領判權之繼續存在。若有關之少數國家。仍不圖將領判權問題。圓滿解決。則大會勢必議決。令政府對關係各國採較強硬之政策。其結果則全國人民對外惡感日深。大規模之抵制外貨。經濟不合作等。恐將不旋踵而發生矣。目前之形勢。可謂至爲嚴重。非各國政府放大眼光。由中外將來之友誼上設想。實不足以挽救目前之危機。該少數各國之代表。其不願放棄該項特權乎。抑利用目前之時機。爲中外友誼謀增進。爲世界和平保障乎。是則不能不視各代表之眼光是否遠大矣。(錄建業日報)

印度將來

孫斗南德

麥克唐納爾之所謂給予印度自治如是！

當倫敦圓桌會議閉幕時。英首相麥克唐納爾曾宣告。一俟新憲法制定及某種必需之籌備就緒後。英政府之意旨。即給印度以負責之政府及自治。但尚須保留某種條件以爲保障云云。

味唐氏斯言。若其命意果在給予印度自治。俾建設其對印民完全負責之政

The Eastern Peoples

(FORMERLY GHADAR DHANDORA)

A Bi-weekly Devoted To The Salvation Of The Oppressed
Peoples Of The East And The World

VOL. V APRIL 16 1931. NANKING, CHINA. NO. 8

DR. SUN YAT-SEN'S WILL

For forty years I have devoted myself to the cause of the people's revolution with but one end in view, the elevation of China to a position of freedom and equality among the nations. My experience during these forty years have firmly convinced me that to attain this goal we must bring about a thorough awakening of our own people and ally ourselves in a common struggle with those peoples of the world who treat us on the basis of equality.

The work of the revolution is not yet done. Let all our comrades follow my "Plans of National Reconstruction," "Three Principles of the People," and the "Manifesto" issued by the First National Convention of our Party, and strive on earnestly for their consummation. Above all, our recent declarations in favour of the convocation of a National Convention and the abolition of unequal treaties should be carried out into effect with the least possible delay. This is my heartfelt charge to you.

(Signed) SUN WEN.

TRADE COMPETITION WILL CAUSE EXTRALITY ABOLITION

(The Chinese, one and all, demand the abolition of extralimity, which both the Government and the people resolve to carry into effect with the least possible delay. Dr. Tong Shao-Yi, in special China Press article of April 1st stressed the immediate necessity of friendly relinquishment of the extraterritorial privileges on the part of the Powers concerned as a very important step towards gaining the good-will of the Chinese People. We particularly publish below Dr. Tong's original text of paramount importance, which the die-hards may well take as a very good lesson. As a matter of fact, the extralimity abolition will take real effect at any cost and not at a distant date. - ED.)

By Tong Shao-Yi

High adviser to the National Government and Magistrate of Chung Shan Model District

It is generally recognized that the extraterritorial system in China is obsolete and must be replaced by one more in conformity with the accepted principles of International Law. The only question at issue seems to be the method for bringing about such a transformation. China insists upon immediate and unconditional abolition, while the remaining powers concerned desire to have it effectuated gradually and under certain conditions.

What, it may be asked, are the primary considerations that induce foreigners to reside in China? Surely the first place, trade, and, in the last analysis, again trade. It will not be denied that these purposes cannot be accomplished without Chinese goodwill, and notwithstanding the presence of foreign gunboats in Chinese waters, the Chinese people cannot be cajoled into buying foreign goods if they do not desire them.

Unique Privilege

To the Chinese, the essence of extraterritoriality seems to lie in the fact that foreigners can violate Chinese Laws and be exempt from the jurisdiction of Chinese Courts. Do the compatriots of these aliens and their Governments at home intend to encourage or con-

nive at such infraction of Chinese laws as well as contempt of Chinese tribunals?

In no country does a law-abiding foreigner require the protection of extraterritorial privileges, and the Chinese should not be made to feel that they are in any way inferior to other nations by the continuance of extraterritoriality in their country. Are the Chinese to understand that the Governments of the few Powers concerned would rather uphold the fast-dying privileges of a minority of their nationals in China than cultivate Chinese friendship and thereby promote the interests of the overwhelming majority of their nationals at home?

Extrality Formula

To the man in the street, the apparently complicated problem of extraterritoriality is reducible to the following simple formula: PRIVILEGE VERSUS GOODWILL PLUS MARKET.

Privilege is only temporary and concerns the vanity of a few nationals while China's goodwill and commercial market involve the economic welfare of many generations to come. The death-knell of such privileges has been sounded, and it is only a matter of days before the obsolete system will be technically illegal. Will it not conduce to the greater dignity of the few powers concerned to make an unmistakable gesture of friendliness towards the long-suffering Chinese people now by voluntarily giving up these privileges instead of waiting to be compelled to do so?

Results of Persistence

It should be plain to every "Die-hard" that the Chinese people are irrevocably committed to the task of abolition of unequal treaties. The People's Convention is scheduled to be convened in another five weeks, and it is manifest that the question of extraterritoriality will not be overlooked. Human nature being what it is, the delegates to the convention will, in the absence of a satisfactory agreement between China and the few remaining Powers most assuredly adopt resolutions calling upon the National Government to pursue a firmer and stronger policy towards the Powers concerned. It is apprehended that these resolutions will eventuate in serious repercussions—repercussions culminating in nationwide resentment, boycotts and economic non-cooperation.

The situation is candidly delicate. What is demanded now is not so much the diplomatic pound of flesh, but wisdom and courage on the parts of the few Governments concerned to look ahead and envisage the problem from the angle of permanent friendship and goodwill of the Chinese people.

Will the representatives of these few Powers continue to chase after the will-o-the-wisp, or will they seize the golden opportunity by the forelock, not as bargainers or hagglers, but as statesmen with an unerring eye to the reciprocal benefit of China and the countries concerned as well as the permanent peace of the world?

INDIA'S FUTURE

By Rev. Dr. J. T. Sunderland, New York,
(Author of "India in Bondage," etc.)

At the close of the London Round Table Conference, announcement was made by Premier MacDonald, that it is the intention of the British Government, as soon as a New Constitution can be framed and certain necessary preliminaries can be arranged, to grant India "responsible government," "self-rule" but with certain "reservations," certain "necessary reservations" as "safeguards."

If this means that India is to be given real self-rule, a government really and fully responsible to the Indian people, which she has long demanded as her right, then there seems every reason to believe that Indian discontent will cease, and the dark cloud full of thunderings and lightnings which today hangs over India and over the British Empire on account of India will pass away.

But is this what the proposed "self-rule with reservations" and "responsible government with reservations" really mean? Practically all India is troubled. Why are reservations necessary for a great historic nation which in the past ruled itself for two or three thousand years without reservations, and occupied a place of honor and influence in the world second to that of no other nation? Cannot such a nation rule itself now? If not, why not? Has 170 years of British rule caused such degeneration in her that she can not do again what she did for so long a period with distinguished success. India feels insulted by these reservations.

She also distrusts their meaning. What can their real meaning be? Are they not another "smoke-screen" such as she declares she has experienced so often from her present foreign rulers? Is not offering self-rule with these reservations, on the part of Great Britain, another instance of professing to give without really giving? Of "giving with one hand and taking back with the other?" Under the name of granting India self-rule, does not Britain by her reservations really deny her self-rule, refuse to give her self-rule. If I may quote the language of the Editor of New India (Madras.)

"In holding out to India so-called self-government with these limitations attached, are India's foreign lords offering her anything whatever but the trappings of self-government without self-government at all?"

These are vital questions. Word comes that virtually all India is asking them with intense earnestness.

Just what are the reservations? The answer is as follows:

1. Great Britain is to control India's "Defense," that is, India's "Army." India possesses, and is to continue to possess, a large army. What does control of it mean? If we, in the United States, had a large army and had it controlled by Germany, or France, or Japan or Great Britain, and if we had not a single soldier under our control, could it be said in any true sense that we were free or possessed self-rule? This exactly illustrates what British control of the Indian army means. Does not all the world know that any nation whose army is wholly in the control of a foreign power, instead of being free and self-governing in any true sense, is under serious and dangerous bondage?

2. In the New Constitution which is to be offered to the Indian people, Britain is to control India's Foreign Political Relations. What does that mean? It means that

India cannot officially communicate with any other nation, she cannot make a foreign treaty, or do any kind of foreign business. She cannot send to any nation an Ambassador, or a Minister, or a Consul, or any official to represent her; nor can she receive any Ambassador or Minister or Consul or official representing any foreign nation. She cannot be recognised as a nation by any other nation, she can have no place among the nations of the world. To all the world she is not to be a nation at all, but simply a subject province of Great Britain. Will this be self-rule? Will it be anything but unbearable bondage?

3. Britain is to control India's Foreign Finance, Foreign Exchange Foreign Credit. That is to say, in financial matters India is to be in the absolute power of Great Britain. Indian financiers claim that one of the important causes of India's impoverishment has been the fact that in the past India's finance has been under British control. They claim that by changing the value of the rupee and manipulating India's currency in the interest of Britain, and by creating artificial ratios of exchange between India and England, the British Government has drained from India untold millions of her wealth. Under the proposed New Constitution for India, all this is to go right on. It is an axiom in statesmanship that economic power underlies and controls political power; and that whoever controls the credit of a nation really controls the nation. Under such conditions, will the claim that India possesses self-rule be anything but a mockery?

4. While in the proposed New Constitution for India the Viceroy (or Governor General) is to be responsible in a measure to the Indian National (Federal) Legislature, and therefore indirectly to the people of India, he is to be given autocratic and arbitrary power greater than any past Viceroy has ever possessed. In other words, he is to have power to dismiss Ministries at his will, which means that, in what he may claim to be a time of "emergency," he can control legislation, or even dismiss the Legislature, and rule the country by arbitrary edicts, or virtual martial law, exactly as Lord Irwin has done for nearly a year past - imprisoning tens of thousands of India's worthiest citizens and filling the land with unpardonable brutalities.

Nor is this all. Since the Governors of the provinces (as well as the Governor General) are to be appointed by Great Britain without India having voice or power in the matter, there is no way in which India will be able to prevent great provinces from being governed by tyrants like Sir Michael O'Dwyer, or to prevent British Generals like General Dyer from being forced on communities with power to perpetrate massacres like those of the Punjab or future massacres like that at Amritsar. Will this mean Self-Rule for India?

Such then are the four main "Reservations" (there are others but these are the most important) which Great Britain makes an indispensable part of the New Constitution which she graciously offers to the Indian people.

Under such a constitution, will India in any true sense possess "Responsible Government?" On the contrary, will she not be a subject nation as really as in the past? The chains with which she is to be bound will be somewhat different in form, and they will be slightly longer in this direction and in that so as to allow her a little more liberty of movement in her bondage, but are they not to be chains still, chains of steel, essentially as strong and as bitter as those of the past have ever been?

COMRADE CHANNAN SINGH

Following his escape from the S. M. Goal to the Chinese Territory on the 28th of last December, Comrade Channan Singh, an active member of the Indian Youth League of China was re-arrested by the Chinese Police at the request of the British authorities at Shanghai. He is still in custody of Chinese Police. The Indian Youth League and Eastern Oppressed Peoples' Association sent several applications to the Chinese National Government demanding Channan Singh's release on the plea of his being a "political refugee" but so far he has not yet been set free. However, he is healthy and well-treated.