

HINDU IMMIGRATION

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

RELATIVE TO

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION OF
HINDU LABORERS

APRIL 30, 1914

PART 5



WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1914

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS.

JOHN L. BURNETT, Alabama, *Chairman*.

ADOLPH J. SABATH, Illinois.

JOHN A. M. ADAIR, Indiana.

HENRY M. GOLDFOGLE, New York.

JAMES L. SLAYDEN, Texas.

WILLIAM A. OLDFIELD, Arkansas.

JOHN E. RAKER, California.

JOHN A. KEY, Ohio.

FRANKLIN BROCKSON, Delaware.

AUGUSTUS P. GARDNER, Massachusetts.

EVERIS A. HAYES, California.

J. HAMPTON MOORE, Pennsylvania.

EDWIN A. MERRITT, Jr., New York.

JAMES MANAHAN, Minnesota.

ALBERT JOHNSON, Washington.

P. W. BURNETT, *Clerk*.

HINDU IMMIGRATION.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Thursday, April 30, 1914.

The committee this day met, Hon. John L. Burnett (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, there is a gentleman here who wants to be heard in regard to the Hindu proposition. If it is satisfactory to the committee, we will hear the gentleman now. His name is 'T'Ishi Bhutia Kyawgh Hla'.

Did you desire to make some statement, Mr. Bhutia?

STATEMENT OF MR. 'T'ISHI BHUTIA KYAWGH HLA', OF DARJEELING, INDIA, AND BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Mr. BHUTIA. Mr. Chairman, I only represent one of the parties, one of the Indian societies in this country. We have a number of them among the young men of India who are attending the colleges in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Where are you living now?

Mr. BHUTIA. In New York.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your address?

Mr. BHUTIA. I live in Brooklyn, N. Y. My office is there; my residence is 4151 Bainbridge Street, Brooklyn, N. Y. I have been a permanent resident of Brooklyn ever since I entered college and graduated from college in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. What business are you in?

Mr. BHUTIA. I am at the present time interested in the importing business. I am a broker and importer of jute and burlaps in this country. We are carrying on an active business in this country.

A number of young men have asked me to come down here and look into this question in regard to the question of the literacy test bill, and I really came here, gentlemen, to be instructed upon this literacy test.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not pending before the committee now. The House has passed a bill in regard to that. There is a bill here introduced by Judge Raker and also a bill introduced by Mr. Johnson, and also one introduced by Mr. Church, that perhaps relate specifically to the Hindu people, and it is in regard to that subject we are holding hearings to-day.

Mr. BHUTIA. I came down to find out particularly about this Hindu immigration question. We are not emigrating from India to this country in very large numbers, not very many Hindus.

Mr. JOHNSON. How many?

Mr. BHUTIA. I think in the last 10 years not more than 6,000 Hindus. That is, that many have come to the ports of the United States. I have not at hand sufficient information, and I have not any access to statistics so as to be able to give you definite, exact figures, but it is around that number.

And, furthermore, I may say that the Hindus are coming to this country not so much as laborers, but the young men who come here, most of them, enter your colleges and universities. There is an idea of assimilation now being carried into India in which we think the Occidental civilization as presented in America will be the greatest help to us in India.

Mr. RAKER. What do you mean by that?

Mr. BHUTIA. By having our young men come over here and assimilate the conditions of the Americans, assume the American civilization, and go back to India and create an environment that will assume the same conditions presented in this country, and that is a greater salvation for us than the sending of missionaries. We have a number of active representative religious organizations that create that condition. They are rather hampered by that, simply because they have not understood our language and understood our cast system.

Mr. RAKER. To what caste do you belong?

Mr. BHUTIA. I am a Brahmin.

Mr. RAKER. What is the distinction between that and the Hindu?

Mr. BHUTIA. It is the same thing; only a religious caste system. The Brahmin is considered to be similar to the Jesuits of this country. They are the philosophers, so it is only—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). It is a religious distinction?

Mr. BHUTIA. Just a religious order, and to show the different caste systems we have in India—

Mr. RAKER. What number of religious denominations have you there?

Mr. BHUTIA. We have just two large denominations in India, the Mohammedans and the Hindus.

Mr. RAKER. What is the belief of the Hindus?

Mr. BHUTIA. The Hindus believe in a God. We believe—

Mr. RAKER (interposing). What do you call those people?

Mr. BHUTIA. We call them Hindus. The term "Hindu" is rather a misnomer as it is carried in the minds of most people in this country. There are a good many people who seem to call or think of all the people of India as Hindus, but they are not. They are by religion Hindus, by nationality they are Indians.

All the large dictionaries seem to take it for granted that the only Indians are the Indians of this country, but that is a misnomer. If we were to call ourselves Indians in this country, as we would before an intelligent audience of people, they would doubt our statement, because we do not look like what you ordinarily think of as Indians.

Mr. RAKER. You are all Indians—that would be your designation?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Now, on the religious side, you have the Mohammedans?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes; and the Hindus.

Mr. RAKER. What did you say you are?

Mr. BHUTIA. I am a Brahmin. The Brahmins are only a religious order of the Hindus, just as we have the Roman Catholics in this country. In this country we have the Jesuits, who are considered to be the philosophers of Roman Catholicism.

We have four religious orders, or classes; they are called castes. The caste system in India is a thing we are trying very hard to get rid of, and the people who are coming to this country can help a good deal in that. We are sending out so many young men who get an understanding of your idea of the principles of democracy.

Mr. RAKER. What are the names of the four castes?

Mr. BHUTIA. They are the Brahmins, the Sudras, the Kshatriya, and the Vaisyas, and then we have the Chatras and the Dhoms.

Mr. RAKER. What is the distinction among the four?

Mr. BHUTIA. Our caste system really originated from the fact that every man was supposed to be proficient in his particular line of business. The Brahmins were all intellectual people, only given to study. The Sudras were the warriors. They were entirely devoted to engaging in war and the defense of their country. They were brought up with the idea of self-defense, defending their country, and aside from that they engaged in no other pursuit, I think, except to train themselves so that they might be in position to protect their mother country from any danger.

The Kshatriyas are the lower class of people, who are given to trade pursuits. They are merchants. The Kshatriyas are men of the lower pursuits of life. Take, for instance, the men who do labor. In that class is where you find quite a number of the men who are coming in here. These Kshatriyas have tried to come into the labor field. I mean the Dhoms. Those are the men the people of this country will not assimilate.

I am perfectly candid in my opinion on that, because as I travel about I find they do not assimilate in India.

Incidentally, the Oriental citizen—

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you contend that the Brahmins and the Dhoms are all Indians of the same blood?

Mr. BHUTIA. They are both Caucasian.

Mr. JOHNSON. You all claim to be Caucasian; you claim the right to be naturalized in this country?

Mr. BHUTIA. Oh, yes. I have taken out my first papers.

Mr. JOHNSON. You do not deny that right to the Dhoms?

Mr. BHUTIA. We give them the same right. As far as equality is concerned, we give them all the same equality, but we do not treat them—that is, they can not come and eat off the same table with us. They have not the rights to certain things that we enjoy.

The CHAIRMAN. Have they the right of intermarriage?

Mr. BHUTIA. No.

Mr. JOHNSON. You are willing, however, that they should all become American citizens and marry as they please?

Mr. BHUTIA. We are all alike in this country—that is, the Hindu and the Dhoms sit down together in the same restaurant and eat. The conditions and the environments in India compel us to carry out this strict law. In a foreign country that law might be susceptible of change.

Mr. RAKER. The Dhoms could not intermarry with a Brahmin?

Mr. BHUTIA. Oh, no; the caste is very rigorous.

Mr. RAKER. Always composed of the same people, so far as that is concerned?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. But if a man gets into the Dhom class, it makes no difference what his intelligence or his ability, the surrounding situation is such that he can never get into the Brahmin class?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, never. And we have a reason for that. If you were to read the history of India you would find that those people were once our slaves, and in that their condition is the same as in this country. Our slaves will never assume the same level as that of their master.

Mr. JOHNSON. So your statement a while ago that the young men who come here as students would go back to India to teach a pure democracy does not amount to anything?

Mr. BHUTIA. We want to teach the people of India that all men are free and equal, and we want to eradicate ourselves of the caste system. England does not offer that.

Mr. SABATH. For the purpose of education?

Mr. BHUTIA. For the purpose of education, and thus to create an altruism.

The CHAIRMAN. You just stated it never could be. How would you expect your educated men to bring that about?

Mr. BHUTIA. As far as I am concerned I know the caste system has existed, but I do not believe that the system is going to exist permanently, since our civilization is so rapidly advancing.

Mr. JOHNSON. Say a friend of yours, a student, should go out to the State of Washington and, in the course of time, there should come there some of the women of the lowest caste—some of the women of the lowest caste should come in—would that friend of yours ever marry one of them?

Mr. BHUTIA. My personal thought is that I would marry one of them myself. Having come to this country I have received a different idea and different training from that which I would have received in India.

Mr. JOHNSON. In a case of that kind, would you go back to that country with your bride?

Mr. BHUTIA. That is rather a difficult question to answer. I would not like to go back to India and renounce my citizenship in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that you have taken out your first papers?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir; I have taken out my first papers, and my second paper is due a year ago last November.

The CHAIRMAN. How long since you took out your first papers?

Mr. BHUTIA. Some three years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did you take that out?

Mr. BHUTIA. In Brooklyn, N. Y.

The CHAIRMAN. Before what judge?

Mr. BHUTIA. I do not know; I could not tell you that.

Mr. SABATH. That is immaterial.

Mr. BHUTIA. My first papers—I do not know whether I had to present myself before a judge or not—I went before the clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. And filed your declaration?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What court was he the clerk of; I mean, in what court did you do that?

Mr. BHUTIA. That is only one district in Brooklyn.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you know anything about a shipload of Indians (Hindus) who are being brought to Vancouver?

Mr. BHUTIA. We are doing this to test the legality of their constitution.

India is a possession of Great Britain, and we extend hospitality to all the English coming into India and to all South Africans, and they occupy large places in India; they have gotten into the civil service; they have the jobs which pay sometimes as high as ten or twelve thousand dollars a year. These men come to India and I do not think it is fair for them to try to prevent us from entering their country and carrying on an honest business.

Mr. JOHNSON. Who is the man in charge of that shipload of Hindus?

Mr. BHUTIA. A man by the name of Singh.

The CHAIRMAN. He was here, I think.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is he a representative of your new association?

Mr. BHUTIA. No; he is not a representative of our association. He is merely a member. I am the secretary.

Mr. JOHNSON. Did your association contribute something toward bringing that shipload of people here?

Mr. BHUTIA. We have nothing to do with that contribution; in fact, we are trying to stop labor emigrating from India into this country.

Mr. RAKER. What is the class of this shipload of people; are they all Brahmins?

Mr. BHUTIA. No; they are not. I could not tell you exactly the nature of that shipload. They are being picked up from Shanghai and Hongkong, and I would imagine therefore that they are men of the warrior type, because these men are army men who are taken from the Indian army and given positions as policemen in China.

Mr. RAKER. Some of the workingmen are coming in?

Mr. BHUTIA. I am not able to tell you definitely whether they are laborers, or exactly what class constitutes that shipload of people.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, they are coming from China and not from India?

Mr. BHUTIA. Not directly from India. The Indian people discourage as much as possible any men coming to America.

Mr. JOHNSON. You mean Canada and the United States as well?

Mr. BHUTIA. No. We find that we are by right naturally entitled to be admitted into Canada.

Mr. JOHNSON. You were until this order in council suspending immigration?

Mr. BHUTIA. That was revoked.

Mr. JOHNSON. How many Indians do you think there are in western Canada now?

Mr. BHUTIA. I would not undertake to give you the exact figures, but probably from 5,000 to 7,000 people—Indian people—there. You must understand one thing, when we come to this country we have to come from the farthest west to the farthest east. New York City is a central location, and when an Indian immigrant has to

come from India, that is the farthest east he can come to. He has to pay a lot of money for the trip.

Mr. JOHNSON. He has no place to go except here.

Mr. BHUTIA. I will show you that the Indians are traveling all over the world. They are found in Stockholm. I have found them there, men respected in every community, and men looked upon as good business men.

Now, in regard to South America, I was in the Argentine Republic not long ago, and I found that the most progressive men there and the most aggressive men there were men who went there from India. When you come to some of those—

Mr. JOHNSON (interposing). How about Australia?

Mr. BHUTIA. We have not very many there.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they not having trouble in the colonies of South Africa?

Mr. BHUTIA. I have a detailed account of that in the Atlantic Monthly for June, in which I am giving you a detailed account of that. We are not having that trouble any more. The South Africans imposed a tax of £3 for every Hindu, and immediately the people of India began to retaliate, and they had to ask those men who were occupying big positions in India to resign. We immediately cut off the supply of coal from South Africa. We are taking this natural, aggressive method, simply because we feel that we are being imposed upon. We are a nation, and we would like to be respected, and we would like to respect all nations as well. This tax to which I just referred has since been revoked. We have not had any more trouble, and things are amicably adjusted in India. We had 180,000 laborers in South Africa alone.

Mr. RAKER. You have a lot in Cape Colony, have you not?

Mr. BHUTIA. Not as far as I know. They have a literacy test in Australia.

Mr. RAKER. That excludes them all except one-half of 1 per cent, does it not?

Mr. BHUTIA. In the test they exclude all oriental languages. Their language is English. The language upon which the immigrant must pass an examination is English. The Australian law is the only law that beats around the bush. It is not a law—

Mr. RAKER. What is the effect of it?

Mr. BHUTIA. The moral effect is that it ceases to be law. It is a law that says the immigrant must read and write. If we were given the option of stating what language we want to be examined in, every Hindu would get in there, because our language is the simplest of all languages in the world.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. What is the percentage of illiterates among the Indians?

Mr. BHUTIA. We have a very large percentage of illiterates, and they themselves are unable to read and write their own language. If you have a literacy-test bill which would include one of our oriental languages, I doubt very much if there will be 1 per cent of the people who will be able to pass in their own language.

Mr. RAKER. Let us get back to Australia a moment. Whether you call it a law or a regulation or whether you say it is an improper administration of it, nevertheless the effect is that it keeps out practically all Hindus from Australia.

Mr. BHUTIA. Mohammedans and Armenians as well.

Mr. RAKER. Does it have that effect?

Mr. BHUTIA. Oh, yes; it does.

Mr. RAKER. In your position, you came here as a student to this country?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Now, one of the bills which is under consideration, No. 102, does not exclude Hindu students, does it?

Mr. BHUTIA. I do not think it excludes the Hindu students.

Mr. RAKER. Of course not. You do not want any more than the Hindu students to come in here?

Mr. BHUTIA. We do not want the laborers in this country, but we do want the Kshatriyas. They are very valuable. They are natural-born agriculturists, and I think this country—the real American has outgrown the farm, and the farm laborer has changed into the manufacturing laborer; and then the Hindu comes here, he comes here to compete with foreign labor only, and he does not compete with American labor, and so it becomes the law of the survival of the fittest.

Mr. JOHNSON. You want enough of the second class to come in here to crowd out the Russians and other foreigners?

Mr. BHUTIA. No. I do believe, however, that the Hindu—I have looked into the Russian labor problem with some detail, and I think I may say that as a class the Indians are far better living, far more hygienic in their methods of living than the lower Russians are, and some of the southern Europeans, because these men themselves are the embodiment of health. They are strong, and in that way none can compare with them.

Mr. RAKER. Now, on the question in regard to the students. The bill here does not exclude those who come as students and desire to enter our colleges and universities.

Mr. BHUTIA. As students, they may have to work or not; the students who are coming here work. That is the reason why this country is considered a good place to come, because it will give to us the benefit of an example that will last forever. I came to this country as a student, and I worked my way through Harvard College. In the beginning, when I first went to Harvard College, I used to get up at 5 o'clock in the morning and tend the furnace. After I had tended my furnace and worked hard, I had to prepare my lessons.

Mr. RAKER. That is the same as we do.

Mr. BHUTIA. That is what we want.

Mr. RAKER. I did it. I swept the school out.

Mr. BHUTIA. My father has probably enough wealth to send me through college with flying colors. Such a thing is illustrated by what happens in England. The reason why a great number of our students have gone to England and attended English universities, is because the English people generally discourage the student going through college in that way. We see men going to England and assuming this condition, and getting a diploma, and they go back to India as Hindus. They admit they do not assume the condition of the Occidental Englishman. When he comes over here he works, and by that he sees that he is assimilating your condition, and he

goes back to India and shows the other men there how to do it in the same way.

Mr. JOHNSON. What are these Indians earning in making this burlap which you import?

Mr. BHUTIA. Now, as far as my burlap bagging is concerned, when you come to that in India, they would earn 3 rupees a day—\$1.05 a day.

Mr. JOHNSON. In that case, why do they come to this country to work for 50 cents a day?

Mr. BHUTIA. If they are working for 50 cents a day it is the fault of the American for getting them to work. They have to do it, because when they come into this country their hands are tied. They must get in somewhere; they recognize that. They are levelheaded and they accept anything at first, but after they are here awhile they say, "We want a raise."

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you mean to tell this committee that the common Indian laborer in his own country earns \$1.05 a day?

Mr. BHUTIA. Oh, yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is that the average wage?

Mr. BHUTIA. Oh, yes. They get as much, probably, as 35 cents a day.

The CHAIRMAN. What about the domestic servants? We had the wife of a consul before us not long ago, the wife of the consul in one of the Indian cities, who stated that she got servants over there at less \$10 a month.

Mr. BHUTIA. Our \$10 a month is 30 rupees a month.

The CHAIRMAN. She said in American money.

Mr. BHUTIA. In India, a man can live on 30 rupees a month and save probably as much as \$5 a month.

The CHAIRMAN. When you say they earn \$1.05 a day, do you mean \$1.05 a day American money?

Mr. BHUTIA. No; the gentleman asked me the question as to how much a man making burlap would get, and I said, "\$1.05 a day."

The CHAIRMAN. Money of this country?

Mr. BHUTIA. Do you think if I could have it done cheaper here that I would resort to importing it to this country and paying the duty on it and all the expense of getting it here?

Mr. JOHNSON. What does the commonest laborer in Indian receive?

Mr. BHUTIA. Take a farm laborer. The farm laborer gets about 65 cents a day. I am talking about American money now.

The CHAIRMAN. American money?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes; only American money.

Mr. JOHNSON. As a student, were you a student of the Ferrer School in New York?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir; I studied medicine in Columbia University. No, I was not a student in that school. But I have not been a scholar in any instance except the large institutions over here.

As far as the labor question is concerned, when the laboring man comes into this country from India he comes from a warm country into a cool climate. He has to buy more clothes than the American has to buy. But he is living better than the Americans, since he has to eat a tremendous amount of vegetables. Most of the people of that country are natural vegetarians. A laborer from India can not

eat a piece of pie and a cup of coffee and go out and sing the Doxology all day on it.

Mr. RAKER. I understand your people would be satisfied with the admission of students to this country?

Mr. BHUTIA. We want students to come into this country. We want that, of course.

Mr. RAKER. The bill I referred to does not prohibit students coming in who desire to go through our schools or colleges. None of the bills pending before this committee do that, provided they stay in the school.

Mr. SABATH. But the bill would prevent them from earning a living by working in any occupation outside while attending the school.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, no. While he is at school, he may work his way through.

Mr. BHUTIA. We can not stand aloof from American society and say we do not want to work.

Mr. RAKER. Do you think the agriculturists ought to come in?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes. I think if the agriculturists are given an opportunity, they will increase your agricultural population, and that is exactly where the United States of America requires increase of population.

Mr. RAKER. Men that have come here so far have not gone into the agricultural pursuits.

Mr. BHUTIA. I have made the statement that if the United States Government would grant to us those unreclaimed lands west of the Mississippi River in Arizona and in any of those other States where land is simply lying idle now, if they will give the Hindus the opportunity to reclaim that land, giving them the idea that they can possess that land after a period of years, do you know we could probably flood every acre of land in those States and have it so beautifully cultivated that it would be in a short time a veritable Utopia.

Mr. RAKER. So far they have not gone into agricultural pursuits?

Mr. BHUTIA. Oh, yes; they have gone into agricultural pursuits in California.

Mr. RAKER. How many?

Mr. BHUTIA. We have 3,000 in California on farms.

Mr. RAKER. There are only 6,000 in the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you not think there are more than 6,000 in California alone?

Mr. BHUTIA. No; I do not think so. I think in the last 10 years we have only had about 6,000.

Mr. RAKER. Where are they in California?

Mr. BHUTIA. They are in San Bernardino, in Los Angeles, and in Fresno.

Mr. RAKER. Are they farming the lands themselves?

Mr. BHUTIA. They are in the potato lands and in the raisin fields and in the orange groves.

Mr. RAKER. They are simply common laborers?

Mr. BHUTIA. They are, because they have not had an opportunity—

Mr. RAKER. Let us distinctly understand you. You do not mean to say that any Indians have gone into agricultural pursuits individually?

Mr. BHUTIA. I do not believe there are any of them owning land, because they are not American citizens.

Mr. RAKER. They have not rented lands?

Mr. BHUTIA. Oh, yes.

Mr. RAKER. Are not the great bulk of them acting as laborers on farms and on the roads and in the railroad camps?

Mr. BHUTIA. Oh, yes; I will admit we have a number of laborers, because we have not the means of getting the land. But if you allow us to take the lands and give them to us on the same basis that you give them to others we will begin to cultivate the land for you.

Mr. RAKER. Is it your theory that the Hindus who come to this country come to possess this land?

Mr. BHUTIA. No; I do not think so. I think this country is to be especially kept for the Americans.

Mr. RAKER. And that they should come here and be granted tracts of land, get homesteads, like other people?

Mr. BHUTIA. I do not think they ought to have that, because in that event we could throw into this country probably about 30,000,000 people. That would be disastrous to the economic value of this country.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is what you are trying to do.

Mr. BHUTIA. No; we are trying to stop these people who are coming here merely and simply to make money. They come to live in this country and they come to escape religious persecution.

Mr. RAKER. Your idea is that they ought to own real estate?

Mr. BHUTIA. If they are granted the rights of citizenship, they have the right to own land.

Mr. JOHNSON. You say they can live cheaper and do better than all the other foreigners?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir; we do not say that when he comes into this country he can live cheaper than the American. Inasmuch as he is living at a bigger rate of expenditure than in India, in India itself he could live cheaper than the American could in America, but when he comes here he has to compete with the American; he has to spend more money than the American must spend.

Mr. JOHNSON. Did you not say he could do better than any other foreign class that came here?

Mr. SABATH. He did not say he could live cheaper.

Mr. BHUTIA. When he comes into this country he comes into a cold climate. He has to spend a large amount of money for transportation. Then he has to change his habits and his clothes; he has to throw away his turban.

Mr. RAKER. Where do they change their customs and habits?

Mr. BHUTIA. You have a representative right here before you of that.

Mr. RAKER. You are only one.

Mr. BHUTIA. I can show you 99 per cent of them who have done it.

Mr. RAKER. In California?

Mr. BHUTIA. They may wear their headgear. They are putting on American trousers, and there are some of them who have silk shirts.

Mr. RAKER. Do not 90 per cent of them dress in the native costumes?

Mr. BHUTIA. They are compelled—they have to dress in English clothes.

Mr. RAKER. Your idea is that they should be naturalized?

Mr. BHUTIA. Oh, yes; if they are going to assume a condition, it is right they should be naturalized.

Mr. RAKER. Your theory further is that they are Caucasians?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. And are entitled to be naturalized now?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. There would be no distinction as to the Brahmins and the Dhoms and the other two classes?

Mr. BHUTIA. As far as naturalization is concerned, and as far as labor is concerned, if you are to protect your laborers in this country, it would not be advisable to bring the laborers over here from India.

Mr. JOHNSON. What society are you secretary of?

Mr. BHUTIA. We call it the Hindustan Association of the United States of America.

Mr. JOHNSON. Who is the president?

Mr. BHUTIA. I think Mr. Bose is the president.

Mr. JOHNSON. What are his initials?

Mr. BHUTIA. K. G. Bose.

Mr. JOHNSON. Are you connected or have you any connection with the society in Portland, Oreg.?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir. That is to say, we are connected in this respect that we want to see every Hindu get a square deal.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you write back and forth to that society?

Mr. BHUTIA. We have correspondents all over the world.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you write to a similar organization in San Francisco?

Mr. BHUTIA. I have not written anyone in San Francisco. We have no communication with the Western States. We want to interest the easterners.

Mr. JOHNSON. In round numbers, how many East Indian people are there in the Philippines?

Mr. BHUTIA. The Philippine Islands are pretty close to India, and there are quite a few of them. I think probably a thousand in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. JOHNSON. Only a thousand?

Mr. BHUTIA. I do not think there are any more. They have been trying to come into this country, but the United States has debarred them.

Mr. JOHNSON. How many are there in Hawaii?

Mr. BHUTIA. I do not think there are many.

Mr. JOHNSON. How many are there east of the Mississippi River?

Mr. BHUTIA. I think we have about 1,800 Hindus.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You spoke of Hindus endeavoring to escape religious persecution. Can you tell us what persecution you are experiencing now?

Mr. BHUTIA. We have the Mohammedan element, and the Mo-ammandans are not merely Islamites, but they believe in fatalism. Their object is to shed blood. Naturally the poor Hindus, who want to live in peace, would like to get out of their clutches. That is no reason. We do not want to fight. Our idea is that the shedding of blood should be prohibited. We do not even kill an ordinary fly.

Mr. JOHNSON. What do they call themselves?

Mr. BHUTIA. They call themselves Brahmins and Kshatriyas.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you not think the people of the Pacific co very largely do that very thing?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir; I do not think they can. In the first place, they wear shoes, and the shoes they wear prevent the feeling of the insect under their feet. They can not go about bareheaded because it is cold. Their constitution will not stand the cold climate.

Mr. RAKER. Have you been out in California lately?

Mr. BHUTIA. One year ago to-day.

Mr. RAKER. You say they are not wearing their turbans?

Mr. BHUTIA. I say they are wearing their turbans. I go about the United States of America. I live in the Y. M. C. A. and one-half of those fellows there take me for a Mexican, or they take me for an Indian, but they do not know me as a Hindu. If I told them I was a Hindu they would say I was a devil.

I think they ought to have the right to retain their identity in that particular life.

Mr. RAKER. You say, I believe, that no one gets in here unless he has a—

Mr. BHUTIA. Something to show that they are Hindus.

Mr. RAKER. You say that anyone who gets in here, as soon as he gets into the United States—your view is that he is a white man and therefore should be entitled to be naturalized under our present law?

Mr. BHUTIA. That is my view.

Mr. JOHNSON. Even down to the common laborer?

Mr. BHUTIA. You are asking me my view as to the common laborer, when I am a Brahmin. I should say that the Sudras should not be given the rights of citizenship. You say since they are all equal, why do you not give them the same rights?

The CHAIRMAN. But you would give them the same rights, would you not?

Mr. BHUTIA. My contention is that you keep them out by a literacy test which they are unable to pass.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You say you favor the literacy test?

Mr. BHUTIA. Oh, yes; I do; in that respect I do. I say the Sudra who is unable to read and write does not rise to the status of American citizenship.

Mr. JOHNSON. How many of the members of your first caste can read their own language?

Mr. BHUTIA. Probably about 99½ per cent.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do the higher caste people in India admit that the low caste people are of the Caucasian race?

Mr. BHUTIA. We do not admit that the low caste people are. We believe they are Malays. I have looked up the records of that, and some have said that the stock are of a semi-Mongolian race. The Malay race is to be found in Burmah and Siam, and in some parts of southern India. A man coming from Siam is a Malay, and our belief is that they are not Aryans, and that they do not belong to the same race as we do.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is the basis of your caste?

Mr. BHUTIA. That is the basis of our caste.

Mr. RAKER. Have you kept distinct all these centuries from intermarriage?

Mr. BHUTIA. My dear sir, it almost seems incomprehensible, but we have, since from 5,000 years B. C.

Mr. RAKER. They do not intermarry at all?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir; they are as rigid as you can imagine about that.

Mr. RAKER. Do you think it would be a lamentable thing for them to intermarry?

Mr. BHUTIA. I think, as far as eugenics are concerned, I do not think, however, it would be a very good idea. I am told, however, that Rudyard Kipling's mother was an Indian woman and that his father was an Englishman, a war painter, and he is a very valuable factor to India. We have had some very great men in the last year, and we had the man who won the Nobel prize for literature. We have this ability and talent lying dormant in them, and the only way we can resuscitate it is to assimilate them in occidental civilization.

Mr. RAKER. Would you believe it would bring a better race if the Hindus were permitted to come to the United States, and then intermarry after they came here?

Mr. BHUTIA. They are the same race of people.

Mr. RAKER. That does not answer my question. Your view is that they ought to intermarry.

Mr. BHUTIA. My view, from scientific research, is that by intermarriage they might produce a progeny that might be detrimental—

Mr. RAKER. Then your view is that they would produce a progeny that would be of value to the country?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. And therefore that they ought to intermarry.

Mr. JOHNSON. You say they are of the same race now?

Mr. BHUTIA. I say the Hindus, outside of the Sudras, the Hindus are Caucasians, and you can look up any authority and find that that is so.

Mr. JOHNSON. How many Brahmins, in round numbers, are there in India?

Mr. BHUTIA. I would say about 25,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON. How many of the next caste?

Mr. BHUTIA. I could not say exactly; I am unable to state definitely, because I have no accurate statistics. I will be very glad to present full figures to you later on. I would say the next four castes of India could be divided into—the 200,000,000 people can be divided into the next four castes, and that will give about 90,000,000 Mohammedans.

Mr. JOHNSON. That would give to the bottom caste about how many?

Mr. BHUTIA. That is the majority in the bottom caste.

Mr. JOHNSON. Two hundred million?

Mr. BHUTIA. Not so much as that. The whole Hindu element comprises about 200,000,000. It is rather difficult to give you definite statistics.

Mr. BROCKSON. You say there are about 300,000,000 people in India?

Mr. BHUTIA. In India?

Mr. BROCKSON. Yes.

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Do you believe the literacy test should be applied to everybody coming in?

Mr. BHUTIA. The preliminary test should be applied to the people coming over here, and there ought to be a second literacy test in this respect, that when they go to vote, they must show that they are capable of voting, and, I think, in that way we could have a better class of men; a class of men who could not be easily influenced and who would be self-reliant.

Mr. RAKER. Would it be your idea that they should be intermixed with the American people all over the country?

Mr. BHUTIA. If they come here and show evidences of being able to mix with the Americans, I think they ought to.

Mr. RAKER. You would not be in favor of having a Hindu colony in any place?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir. That is one reason why I say we ought not to have them here to such an extent as to make it a formidable thing. We can put here a number of men from India, but they will be distributed all over the United States. That is one reason we do not have them here.

Mr. RAKER. To what extent do the English people intermarry with the Hindus.

Mr. BHUTIA. We find in the last census of India that as high as 20 per cent of the English intermarry with the Hindus.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they marry into the lower classes?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir; nobody will marry into the lower classes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it the lower class of laborers, the members of the lower class of laborers now coming into California and Oregon and Washington?

Mr. BHUTIA. There is a mixed class coming in there.

The CHAIRMAN. They are not slaves in India?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. They are free to come to this country, as far as the laws of India are concerned; I mean the members of the lower class?

Mr. BHUTIA. India does not put any ban upon emigration to any country. We say India is open to the world, and we think the various countries of the world should be open to us.

The CHAIRMAN. Yet you do not think we ought to open our country to the lower class.

Mr. BHUTIA. As far as the status of American citizenship is concerned.

They CHAIRMAN. They ought not to come?

Mr. BHUTIA. They ought not, because it—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). I am not asking your reason for it. What I am asking you is this: Do you believe the lower class ought to be admitted indiscriminately into this country?

Mr. BHUTIA. That is rather a difficult question to answer, and unless I can answer it with an explanation—

The CHAIRMAN. I do not want an explanation.

Mr. SABATH. I think he ought to have a chance to explain in his answer.

The CHAIRMAN. He can answer yes or no.

Mr. BHUTIA. I would have to give an explanation of this, because there is an explanation demanded.

The CHAIRMAN. You believe that the lower class of Hindus ought to be admitted indiscriminately into this country?

Mr. SABATH. He ought to be permitted to answer it in his own way.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you desire not to answer that question categorically?

Mr. BHUTIA. I can say yes and no.

My way of saying "yes" is to say that this country is a democratic country and opens its doors to immigration regardless of the caste system, and does not recognize the caste system, and then it should admit all classes of Indians. But if this country is going to protect the status of American citizenship, then that particular class will not assist any in lifting the status of American citizenship. The members of that class will bring Americans down to their level, and not raise themselves to the American level. That is my idea.

The CHAIRMAN. Would not the same proposition apply to the Chinese, under that theory? Under that theory, would it not be better for us to admit the better class of Chinese?

Mr. BHUTIA. I would say it would apply to all countries of the world.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do the members of this lower class get \$1.05 a day over there of our money?

Mr. BHUTIA. No; the laborer of that class gets as much as 65 cents.

Mr. JOHNSON. Does he get as much as 65 cents?

Mr. BHUTIA. Oh, yes.

Mr. RAKER. Do I understand that the members of this lowest caste are not given educational advantages?

Mr. BHUTIA. In England we do not have a free-school system.

Mr. RAKER. Do the members of the lowest caste get the benefit of schools at all?

Mr. BHUTIA. Oh, yes; they do.

Mr. RAKER. Now, if some of the brighter members of this lowest caste, who have a strong mentality and are physically strong, grow up to become strong men and women, can they not move up out of the lowest class?

Mr. BHUTIA. They can take up these subjects; the man who won the Nobel prize is nothing less than that; he is in the middle class.

Mr. RAKER. Very well; he goes up from the lower class because of his brains and physical strength. He goes from the lower to the next caste?

Mr. BHUTIA. No; he never goes into another caste. He is just like your American negro, who can never become an American white man.

Mr. RAKER. That is the condition there?

Mr. BHUTIA. That is the condition.

Mr. RAKER. Does he come into contact with the members of the other classes, and does he get into the various lines of industry?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes; he becomes everything. He has the law of the survival of the fittest applied to him.

Mr. RAKER. Does he not have business dealings with all classes?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes; with the world at large.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Does he enter into the social fabric of the other classes?

Mr. BHUTIA. That is where the difference is. It is just like the case of the American negro. Would you give the advantage of your homes to him? He is a distinct class, and therefore is not admitted into your society.

Mr. RAKER. One of these men of the lower caste, we will say, becomes a priest; in that case does he not get all the benefits and does he not have all the associations of a priest of the highest caste within the church?

Mr. BHUTIA. The highest caste recognizes him as a priest; that is all.

Mr. RAKER. Does he commune with his parishioners?

Mr. BHUTIA. In his own caste. We are not having progress in India just because we have a British domination. India is looking forward to the time, when, by assuming the conditions of the more independent races of the world, she will overthrow the British yoke. That is what we all want.

Mr. JOHNSON. As a matter of fact, you are one of the many organizations in various parts of the world which are interested in fomenting a movement for the overthrow of the British authority in India?

Mr. BHUTIA. We are not creating, sir, civil war or revolution in foreign countries. In India—you asked me the question whether people in foreign countries are doing it. We do not want to be put down as saying we are filibusterers.

Mr. RAKER. I have a whole bundle of papers in my office which contain inflammatory articles, and statements that the Hindus in this country and other countries are working for the purpose of gathering all the strength they can with the hope eventually of overthrowing the English Government in India.

Mr. BHUTIA. You are perfectly right. We are doing it by means of arms, but by means of passive resistance.

Mr. JOHNSON. And every student you can get goes to work on that schedule, with that idea?

Mr. BHUTIA. The British doom is already sealed. That is going to be done by means of utilitarianism.

Mr. RAKER. In other words, every student you can get from India to come into the United States, you want to put into an English and an American organization with as much power as you may have so that he can return to India to cooperate with others of like position and ideas, to overthrow, eventually the English Government?

Mr. BHUTIA. That is only thing. Our object is to take these men and bring all the caste systems together, unite them all as one.

Mr. SABATH. And advance the civilization and conditions of the people in India.

Mr. BHUTIA. Our civilization has been in a state of advancement since 1,000 years B. C. If you will consult the records you will find that for centuries the literature of India was the great literature of the world. We have been educated, as far as mentality was concerned, and in that respect we can take our place with the great nations of the world. Unfortunately, we are being dominated by another government. We are striving to overthrow that.

Mr. SABATH. You are very much interested in the new government in China?

Mr. BHUTIA. Certainly; we are interested in the new governments in the whole world. Anything that makes the individual or society self-reliant, we are interested in.

Mr. SABATH. You think and believe that you are the superior race of the world?

Mr. BHUTIA. It would be a rather egotistical thing to say that, but we will take our place with the nations of the world.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You said that it was impossible for these castes that you referred to to be united, but a moment ago you spoke of their being united. How do you reconcile those statements?

Mr. BHUTIA. I said before, when the question was put to me whether they could be united, I said since they have not been united there is no reason why they will not be united in the future.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You said it was impossible to unite them.

Mr. BHUTIA. It is, so far as intermarrying and things of that kind are concerned. But that is fast becoming obsolete.

We are, by means of the assimilation which I spoke of, coming in contact with people over here, improving our condition, and certainly there has never been a race of people, a class of people, who have done more toward uniting a people than the emigrants have. They go back to India and begin to bring out the occidental civilization, and when the emigrants go back and show these other people—show them the benefits of this occidental civilization, then they begin to want to be free, and they get backbone.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You believe that the barriers that exist between the castes can be broken down in the way you have just mentioned?

Mr. BHUTIA. By emigrating the laborers. They are the only people who can break down the caste system.

Mr. JOHNSON. By emigrating the laborers? Where are you going to send the laborers?

Mr. BHUTIA. Oh, they go all over the world.

Mr. JOHNSON. Did you not say a while ago that you did not want them to come to the United States?

Mr. BHUTIA. The Sudras will not raise the status of American citizenship.

Mr. RAKER. Let us get back to that for a moment. If you emigrate the laborers to this country, your purpose is to bring them here so that they may obtain homes and become part of this country?

Mr. BHUTIA. Sure; by their coming here they are coming here with the intention of becoming a factor in American society.

Mr. RAKER. How are you going to get the effect, so far as your home Government is concerned, if those people stay here?

Mr. BHUTIA. Our home Government does not care. What does the American Government care if an individual American goes to a foreign country and lives there?

Mr. RAKER. You have been all over the United States a little bit, and are somewhat familiar with the conditions here?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. You are in the brokerage business now?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. You sell goods here?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. And your idea is that if unrestricted immigration was had from India it would practically swamp the western part of the world?

Mr. BHUTIA. I admit that, because we have a large population—you must understand that all the Indians would not come to this country; only those who could afford it; those who are able to pay their way.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. What restrictions would you impose?

Mr. BHUTIA. I would say the literacy test would be a fair restriction upon a fair majority of the people.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Do you think that ought to be applied to all races and all people?

Mr. BHUTIA. That ought to be a universal law. There is a tendency toward bringing in the educated Brahmins into this country, and the fact is that we will have the better element of the people of India coming in here. We speak 20 languages in India. Which language are you going to choose in applying the test?

The CHAIRMAN. How would it help your country back there if your laborers did not come here and go back there?

Mr. BHUTIA. If they do not come here we can only appeal to their reason by the educated men. The Dhoms would not and could not get in because they are the lowest caste.

The CHAIRMAN. The Dhom is the common laborer?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. You are willing that the Sudra should come in?

Mr. BHUTIA. All the rest of our people could pass a literacy test.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is the class on the Pacific coast now, is it not?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir; on the northern Pacific coast we have the ex-army men of India, the Sikhs. They are the men who have been policemen in China, and they come from Hongkong and Shanghai. You do not have the agricultural laborers of India coming into this country.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is the class that Mr. James J. Hill and other railroad men were about to bring in, was it not? What class was that?

Mr. BHUTIA. I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSON. They did not need any money to come when the steamship companies were going to bring them over here.

Mr. BHUTIA. I do not know. I do not see what Mr. Hill was undertaking to do.

Mr. JOHNSON. Did you not hear of Gen. Caminetti going to Tacoma, Wash., in regard to that matter?

Mr. BHUTIA. Commissioner Caminetti has made a misstatement with reference to our immigration. He said such a laborer is a hindrance. He is not, because he comes and assimilates the conditions over here. Commissioner Caminetti also says the Hindus are able to thrive in any climate. If that is so, that is their privilege, and that is a privilege which the law of the survival of the fittest bestows upon him.

I think if a man is able to take his place, regardless of race, he is a man who ought to be respected.

Mr. RAKER. From your personal observation and knowledge, you know the Hindu can adopt the life and live an existence in America?

Mr. BHUTIA. If he can do that it is because Americans do not live right. My observation is that there is no race of people in the world that is so completely committed to a suicide of their bodies as the Americans.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. In what way do you think or do you say they are committing suicide?

Mr. BHUTIA. Their business keeps their nervous energy at a total expenditure. They have no poise; they do not give any time to concentration; and even on Sundays, when you ought to be at your home and carrying on contemplative thought, that is the most busy day of the whole week, and when the Americans go on their vacations, they do not have a real vacation. There is no nation in the world that is expending its energy so quickly, due to this commercial age, as the American, and as a natural consequence the American does not live as good as the Hindu.

Mr. RAKER. Take the methods of living—the cheap method of life of the Hindus.

Mr. BHUTIA. My dear sir, their method of dressing, for instance, is far superior to that of the Americans; far more hygienic than that of the Americans. From an economical point of view, the Hindu spends three times as much money for his clothes. In order to equip one of the men, to dress him properly, it would cost about \$300.

Mr. JOHNSON. What does it cost in India to clothe a woman?

Mr. BHUTIA. All you can earn and all you have in the bank, like you have it in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not a fact that a great many of those coming over here are anarchists and teaching the principle of the overthrow of government?

Mr. BHUTIA. The principles of anarchism are very far from India, because Buddhism prevents the shedding of blood. We are socialists.

Mr. JOHNSON. Are you a socialist?

Mr. BHUTIA. I am a Democrat.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know a man by the name of ———? Is he a member of your association?

Mr. BHUTIA. He is an indirect member. He is more in the labor organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not true that in making speeches in San Francisco he advocated the overthrow of government and wanted to get rid of policemen and judges?

Mr. BHUTIA. I do not think he meant any such statements as that to refer to the United States. I think if he said that he was referring to the condition in India.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he not make that speech on the evening of October 31, 1913, on the streets of San Francisco, in which he preached that doctrine?

Mr. BHUTIA. I am unable to tell you whether he made that speech or not. If he did make that speech, that was not the sentiment of the people of India in regard to this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Did he not make that speech in which he said:

We find now that anarchism is one of the components of the Russian revolutionary movement. If there were no government, there would be no problem of free speech or free press or anything whatever, and there would be no problem of wages or poverty. Whom have we to fight for free speech? The sheriffs, judges, policemen. Who keeps the workingman from land and the wealth he

has created? Policemen, army, mayor, President. Thus we find the Russian revolutionists finding the extreme of wisdom when they added anarchy to their revolutionary philosophy. They advanced a step further and added feminism to their movement. Almost all the great terrorists in Russia have been women. We find terrorism, which is the middle step between constitutionalism and organized revolution; and no other country has such a rich record of terrorism as Russia has. People in many countries are afraid of terrorism. That is because they are cowards. It is not because terrorism is bad. If a serpent were to throw itself around your neck you would not lose much time by deciding whether you would get rid of it by constitutional means. You would crush it. They have no free press, no free assembly, and even after these few baubles have been secured people will find there is no easy way to freedom. But I have to point out that in Russia we have a regular history of terrorism, which terminated in the execution of a monster Czar. I don't think any liberty-loving man regretted that event. I don't think the world is poorer because Alexander breathes no more. I know of no more glorious incident in history than the killing of Alexander II. Constitutional agitation, terrorism, organized revolution are the only methods open to revolutionists. Let no one imagine there is any fourth way. We may deal with words or phrases, but every true revolutionist who wishes to deprive the rich of their privileges knows that the world moves by inches through terrorism or organized revolution after constitutional agitation has failed, as it always will fail. No other country is so rich in revolutionary movement. The moment you see the Russian revolutionist you know he is the true type. He is earnest; he is an idealist. He will stop at nothing to accomplish his object. The Russian revolutionist welcomes every blow struck at the enemy; for everyone who combats with the pen, the sword, or the bomb is a benefactor of the human race.

Did he not make that kind of a speech?

Mr. BHUTIA. I can not tell you.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he not a member of your association?

Mr. BHUTIA. No; he is an indirect member of our association.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean by that?

Mr. BHUTIA. As far as he may come into our association, and we would say to him, "How do you do." He is not a man who is an active member of our association. He is a member of the laborers' association. That is another thing.

Mr. JOHNSON. What do you call the laborers' association? What do you mean by that statement?

Mr. BHUTIA. They have a labor association, and he is an advocate of admitting all kinds of laborers into this country.

Mr. JOHNSON. What is the name of that association? What is its title?

Mr. BHUTIA. I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is that one with a branch at Portland, Oreg.?

Mr. BHUTIA. I think so.

Mr. JOHNSON. Does Dr. Singh belong to that association? Is he a member of that association?

Mr. BHUTIA. I am unable to say whether he does or not. If he has made that statement, I suppose he does, but I know him to be very far from an anarchist. We have a very drastic rule in India depriving us of free speech. We are not able to voice our sentiments in regard to the Government. That has recently gone into effect.

Now, the question is, if he said that with reference to India he is perfectly justified. But I do not think he has a right to decry the heads of the Government. What he ought to say is if you want to cut off the root and the branches, why not lay the axe at the root?

Mr. RAKER. How would you do that?

Mr. BHUTIA. By the application of the principles of altruism and utilitarianism.

Mr. SABATH. No doubt the witness can explain it to the gentleman from California [Mr. Raker].

Mr. RAKER. What do you mean by cutting it out at the root?

Mr. BHUTIA. If this Government is founded upon a person, then we must lay the axe at the root. I do not think he had reference to the American Government, at least. I am positive he did not have any reference to this Government. That was the time when the question of immigration in South Africa was being very heatedly discussed, and that is the time when the sedition law in India went into effect, depriving the people in India of the right of voicing their sentiments in regard to the Government. We have no voice in our government, and yet it is our country. We have a perfect right to say that, because it is our Government and our country.

The Government in this country is a distinct Government from that of India. This Government is founded upon the principles of free democracy. The Indian Government is founded upon bureaucracy and oppression.

Mr. RAKER. If Government officials, ministers of the gospel, missionaries, lawyers, physicians, chemists, engineers, students, authors, journalists, capitalists, and travelers for curiosity and pleasure from India were admitted into the United States, can you see any reason for admitting any more people from India?

Mr. BHUTIA. I do see another reason, and that is this: There is oppression in India, and this country was founded by people who were oppressed in foreign countries, and you therefore, people who are the progeny of your forefathers, should extend also to foreign countries the hospitality to nations, based upon oppression.

Mr. RAKER. Irrespective as to the result upon this country and upon its labor conditions, upon its various local affairs and governmental affairs, you still believe the Hindu should come to this country because in some way he is oppressed in his own country?

Mr. BHUTIA. I think as far as there is an end of oppression he should be allowed to live under God's free canopy.

Mr. JOHNSON. How many are oppressed in India?

Mr. BHUTIA. My dear sir, I can not say, because I can not say how many are oppressed in this country, and we have a religious oppression—

Mr. JOHNSON (interposing). How many are religiously oppressed, in round numbers?

Mr. BHUTIA. Probably about a million and a half.

Mr. JOHNSON. How many of these do you think we ought to take care of?

Mr. BHUTIA. Probably about a million.

Mr. JOHNSON. That would be of which class?

Mr. BHUTIA. Of all classes except the Dhoms; that is the lowest class.

Mr. JOHNSON. You want the Dhoms to stay in their own country and be oppressed?

Mr. BHUTIA. No; I do not. I want to see this revolution brought about, and when that million of Hindus come to this country, when they come into this country and assimilate the ideas of your democracy and then go back, they will naturally be of influence among the people over there, the oppressed people—they will help them to throw off their oppression and come out and be independent.

Mr. RAKER. You want this million of Hindus to come to this country?

Mr. BHUTIA. I want them to come to this country and assimilate the ideas of democracy which they will find here.

Mr. RAKER. And to make this a hotbed of revolution, and then go back to India and take the Government.

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir; you are taking the most extreme view, that is not even possible. I want to say this, and make this as strong as possible, repeating what I have said before, that the Hindus are a peaceful people, their religion compels them to be a peaceful people.

Mr. RAKER. That is, the Brahmins?

Mr. BHUTIA. All the Hindus do not believe in the shedding of blood. You will never see a murder among the Hindus.

The CHAIRMAN. You just said the Mohammedans would do that.

Mr. BHUTIA. They are not Hindus.

Mr. JOHNSON. We had one of those who was a murderer in our country.

Mr. BHUTIA. Then, if that is so, that is because his head was filled with liquor.

Mr. RAKER. How are you going to take India from England if you are not going to make an attack? How are you going to take it? You say after a number of years, after you have had a million of these people in the United States, you are going back to take India from England.

Mr. BHUTIA. The same way the Chinese took China away from the Manchus. We are not going to resort to a revolution; that is not our principle, we want to bring about a Utopian government by means of passive resistance. We believe such a thing may be accomplished, largely due to the influence of the people, the high-class people who come over here, that the people who come to this country will exert an influence on the people over there when they go back; an indirect influence that will bring all those people together.

Mr. JOHNSON. Are you acquainted with any high caste or independent Chinese students in this country?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes; I am.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do they belong to your association?

Mr. BHUTIA. We have one or two Chinese.

Mr. JOHNSON. One or two? Have you any high-grade Japanese students in your association?

Mr. BHUTIA. No.

Mr. JOHNSON. Are you acquainted with any?

Mr. BHUTIA. I am.

Mr. JOHNSON. Are they all preaching the same propaganda which you are preaching in your country?

Mr. BHUTIA. I am not able to tell you what the Japanese are doing. I suppose they are. They have a right to do that, if they want to, but they are an absolutely distinct race from us. We are the same as you are, and if you read the history of the world well, you will find that we gave the Europeans their language. Sanskrit is the basis of all the languages of the world. We have given you even the principles of government.

Mr. JOHNSON. Certainly.

Mr. BHUTIA. Why then is it impossible to infer that we are not able to accomplish that same result in this first generation? We want to bring about an inevitable result by means of passive resistance.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you know of that speech in San Francisco to which I referred a while ago?

Mr. BHUTIA. I heard it was made.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you hear the speech?

Mr. BHUTIA. I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. You read it in the papers?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. As the man who made it is one of your members—he has not been called down for any of his utterances?

Mr. BHUTIA. He is not a member; he is a member just as you would be one of our members. It is an indirect influence. As far as India is concerned, he may be an anarchist interested in India's uplift. He is an indirect influence.

The CHAIRMAN. In referring to the Russian condition, he used this language. He said: "Do not be misled by the idea that you are so much happier than the Russian revolutionist. The great mass of the American working class, especially in the East, are as famished physically, morally, and intellectually as the Russians. They have only the satisfaction of voting for this or that tyrant for four years."

Is that not a revolutionary utterance?

Mr. BHUTIA. I want to tell you one thing, the Americans are judging us too rashly in this respect. If you were to commit a deed to-day that deed would pass as the act of an individual, but if one of our members says anything you lay it at the feet of our nation. You allow free speech in this country; he has the right to make a free speech, but he is not sanctioned or authorized by any of our organizations to make that speech. We would not allow such a thing, and more especially such a thing from a member of our own society.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that not the sentiment of a large number of those who are opposing the Government?

Mr. BHUTIA. Very far from that, sir. These Hindus come here with the idea of living here, assimilating the conditions here, and then leaving and going back to their own country, and bringing a condition there, a peaceful condition, which will lead to their own happiness. They do not want to overthrow the Government. They do not want to be oppressed. British taxation is so high that there the lands are forfeited. They want to get a piece of land on which they can produce something.

The CHAIRMAN. If a large number of those people of your lower classes in India were to come here, would they not respond to such a sentiment as that?

Mr. BHUTIA. I doubt that, because having had—this brings up another question—having had the influence of the caste system in India they would not follow after the idea of some one in another caste.

Mr. JOHNSON. Did you not say that probably they would have to teach them the use of bullets and bayonets?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes; if we felt, as somebody has said, that the only way India can get the Government back to itself is to beat Great Britain with bullets and bayonets. We do not want to do that. We want to bring about that result by passive resistance.

Mr. RAKER. But you intend to do it that way if it becomes necessary?

Mr. BHUTIA. You did it in this country.

Mr. RAKER. And your purpose is, if you can not do it by these Utopian principles, then you would do it by the use of bullets and bayonets?

Mr. SABATH. That is not a fair question, to ask him what he would do.

Mr. BHUTIA. If you ask me how these people would do it, that is another thing.

Mr. RAKER. If he is the representative of a Hindu association, I think his sentiments are very material to this committee on this subject.

Mr. SABATH. Not what they would do in that case in India.

Mr. BHUTIA. Between now and a hundred or a hundred and fifty years from now there is a difference. I believe in having peace at any expense. If we wanted to do it by bullets and bayonets, we would have done it during the 150 years of oppression by Great Britain.

Mr. JOHNSON. You had uprisings there not so very long ago.

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir; they are not any more than your uprisings in Colorado.

Mr. RAKER. You are teaching the Utopian theory of government?

Mr. BHUTIA. I am not going to discuss the point of government, because I am not sufficiently well advanced in knowledge of that subject to give you anything in regard to the theory of government. My idea is that as far as the labor problem is concerned, the only way we can reach that is to have the people who go back exert influences, and also by developing the minds of the people through the channel of those who come over here and go back.

Mr. RAKER. Then the purpose is to have them come here and stay here and accumulate as much as they can and go back to give their strength, physical, mental, and financial, to the throwing off of the English form of government?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir; you are entirely wrong as far as the accumulation of wealth is concerned. If we come here we are going to stay in this country. Nobody would come to this country without staying here and becoming a factor in this country.

Mr. RAKER. How can you reconcile that statement with the fact that if a million of the Hindu do come here you will utilize them to throw off the conditions that surround them in India when they go back as American citizens?

Mr. BHUTIA. No; as American citizens they stay here.

Mr. RAKER. If they become citizens here—become a part of the country—how would they go back to India?

Mr. BHUTIA. I say they are the people—all through my statement I have said they are the ones who will have an indirect influence upon the communities of India, and they will bring about that same condition in India that they see in this country.

Mr. RAKER. In what way?

Mr. BHUTIA. By correspondence.

Mr. RAKER. While they are here in America as citizens, your theory is that they would be corresponding through letters and newspapers with their brothers in India?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. For the purpose of changing their condition and taking over to themselves the government of India?

Mr. SABATH. Informing them as to the conditions in this country and the democratic form of government?

Mr. BHUTIA. That is exactly my idea.

Mr. JOHNSON. Have you, personally, any thought of going back there?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir. My idea is that—

Mr. RAKER (interposing). You did not quite answer my question. Just how are you going to change your form of government in India if the Hindus come here and become American citizens?

Mr. BHUTIA. In the first place, we will have the Hindus united into a sufficiently strong organization to have an indirect influence by correspondence with the people in India. We will tell them what we are doing in this country, and just exactly our status in this country, and just how we are a contributing factor in this country, and they will assume that condition in India.

Mr. SABATH. A few moments ago you said there are liable to be as many as 1,000,000 people coming here, due to the religious persecution. How long would it take them to come here?

Mr. BHUTIA. About 180 years.

Mr. SABATH. There is no immediate danger that they will do that?

Mr. BHUTIA. No. In the first place, the people of India do not have such a vast amount of money. Our wealth is divided between the very rich and the very poor, and the middle class has been absorbed into either the very rich or the very poor, and the rich people do not want to come to this country. The rich people of every nation do not want to do that, as a rule. It is the poor class who usually want to come to this country. This country has extended its hospitality to the foreign nations.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Entertaining that belief, do you think that if a people be oppressed in their native country, if religious persecution is directed against them, if they be physically and mentally strong and self-supporting, that they ought to be kept out because they happen not to be able to read, educational opportunities being denied them in their own land?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir; I do not think so.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. But you said you were in favor of the literacy test?

Mr. BHUTIA. I think so, as far as the maintenance of the status of the American citizenship is concerned.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Did you not say you would make the literacy test the test for admission into this country?

Mr. BHUTIA. With the provision that it was to preserve the status of the American citizenship.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Never mind the language. I am asking whether you did not make a particular statement in reply to my questions, that you believed the test should be applied upon the entrance of the immigrant to this country?

Mr. BHUTIA. I have said that the literacy test should be applied to the immigrant coming to this country, with one provision, and I will always uphold that provision, that it raises the status, that he immigrant part of this bill is to raise the status of American citizenship; otherwise I do not see the reason why that should be. Otherwise there would be no raising of the status of the American citizenship, the Hindus would come in, and they would inevitably draw the American citizens to their level and not raise themselves up to the level of American citizens.

Mr. SABATH. That is due to the vast number of Hindus?

Mr. BHUTIA. To the vast number of uneducated Hindus that would come to this country.

Mr. SABATH. That is what you fear?

Mr. BHUTIA. The only thing I fear is that the reason why these fellows should be kept out—that is, the Dhoms—is because they will not contribute toward the raising of the status of American citizenship, and that is where the literacy test is absolutely imperative.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Would you apply that test to the Hindus only?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir. The question of the raising of the status of American citizenship must be brought about through all the nations. Making a discrimination does not constitute the application of the literacy test.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You have recognized the distinction between the test for citizenship and the test for admittance to the country?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir.

Mr. SABATH. What do you say to a case where it would be made clear to you that a certain people; not a lower class, but people who had been prevented from securing an education, or learning how to read and write, would you say that in such cases the literacy test should also be applied?

Mr. BHUTIA. That is, as far as—

Mr. SABATH. If it is not due to any fault of their own?

Mr. BHUTIA. If it is not any fault of theirs—

Mr. SABATH (interposing). But it is due to the conditions and to oppression.

Mr. BHUTIA. That is the peculiar situation here.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Irrespective of conditions here, do you mean to say that in the case just instanced by Mr. Sabath you would exclude an individual from entrance into the country?

Mr. BHUTIA. I would not exclude anybody from entering into this country if the man can show he has been without—

Mr. SABATH (interposing). Opportunities of education?

Mr. BHUTIA. Leaving all those aside that becomes an exceptional case.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I would like to ask you now whether you would be understood as desiring a literacy test to be applied in case of persons coming from lands where educational opportunities are denied them, and where, upon coming to our shores they showed that they were physically sound and capable of self-support. Please answer that question yes or no.

Mr. BHUTIA. I have to say yes and no. I have to give my reasons for saying either yes or no.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. It is a question that is capable of a categorical answer.

Mr. BHUTIA. It pins me to one declaration, and it requires two explanations.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I would like to know what your judgment is upon the question; that is, taking only the elements that are included in the inquiry.

Mr. BHUTIA. If it is your idea to bring only the man who is oppressed, I say bring him in, but at the same time you say in this country we are being threatened with not bringing in a good progeny; that we need improvement of our race. If that is the thing you have in mind, I am in favor of applying the literacy test. The judge has reference to southern Europe. In India—we could put into this country 30,000,000 of uneducated people. If you give us the opportunity of coming into this country, these classes come in in proportion to the naturalized citizenship in this country. If you have a thousand men who have been naturalized, bring in 5 per cent of the lower classes who need instruction.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I have already directed your attention to the fact that I wanted you to exclude from consideration the Hindu, and I asked you whether you would apply the test to other peoples?

Mr. BHUTIA. To any nation it ought to be applied.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. That is upon their entrance to this country?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON. You said it would take about 180 years to bring in 1,000,000 people?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON. How did you arrive at that conclusion?

Mr. BHUTIA. Take, for instance, in the last 10 years we have had only 6,000 emigrants, and then you must understand, as the Government is progressing, there is still a larger restriction being placed upon the people, and these people, in order to come to this country, must spend so much money, and taking all these things into consideration, it will take that time.

Mr. JOHNSON. How many do you think should come in in one year?

Mr. BHUTIA. I think a fair idea is 10,000 Indians coming into this country; I think that would be a fair proportion. I think about 20 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty per cent of what?

Mr. BHUTIA. Of the 10,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Who are already here; that they should be admitted each year?

Mr. BHUTIA. No; 20 per cent of all the Hindus that have taken out their naturalization papers.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose not more than a thousand have taken out their papers.

Mr. BHUTIA. Twenty per cent of that.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you not think if Gen. Caminetti had not arranged with the railroad to stop them, we would have had more than 10,000?

Mr. BHUTIA. I doubt whether any railroad would bring in Hindus to do any railroad work.

Mr. RAKER. Where did you get that idea?

Mr. BHUTIA. I know the condition of the Hindus.

Mr. RAKER. In 1908, 1909, and 1910 were they not working by the hundreds on the Western Pacific Railroad, from San Francisco to Utah?

Mr. BHUTIA. My dear sir, I beg your pardon—

Mr. RAKER (interposing). Answer the question.

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir.

Mr. RAKER. I was there trying cases in those counties, and I went up and down through the camps for three years, and they were there by the hundreds in those camps.

Mr. BHUTIA. I was in Salt Lake City one year ago, and I failed to see one Hindu. I spoke before the people there, and I found there were no Hindus there.

Mr. RAKER. Take in through Lawson County.

Mr. BHUTIA. There are some there.

Mr. RAKER. And take it up and down the Feather River Canyon.

Mr. BHUTIA. There are some there.

Mr. RAKER. During the construction of this railroad?

Mr. BHUTIA. I am unable to say about three years ago.

Mr. RAKER. If there were 500 or 3,000 Hindus working on that road, you do not know whether it is a fact?

Mr. BHUTIA. As far as my records are concerned, my records fail to show where Hindus have gone to work within a year past. You can not show an instance where they have gone to work for any railroad in this country within a year past.

Mr. JOHNSON. How long have you been keeping a record?

Mr. BHUTIA. For two years.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you get paid for that?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir; I do it to show to the American Government—

Mr. JOHNSON. Have you kept a record of those working in the sawmills?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir; those that are in British Columbia.

Mr. JOHNSON. How do you make up that record?

Mr. BHUTIA. From what I receive from different people who come in there.

Mr. RAKER. Have you a representative in each State?

Mr. BHUTIA. We do not have a representative. That is, a man who is paid.

Mr. RAKER. Do you have a correspondent in each community in the West reporting to you?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir; we have not got a representative in each community.

Mr. JOHNSON. Who does your writing from the State of Washington?

Mr. BHUTIA. We have had a man by the name of Bauergha. He has since gone to India.

Mr. JOHNSON. Gone after more men?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir; he has gone back to live, because his health failed him.

Mr. JOHNSON. Did that man kill and eat any animal?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir; that is why his health failed him.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Who do you hear from in New York?

Mr. BHUTIA. I am in New York.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Who supplies your information from that State?

Mr. BHUTIA. I get it directly from the people there.

Mr. RAKER. Who furnishes your information from Oregon?

Mr. BHUTIA. I have no definite name. I get it from different sources.

Mr. RAKER. You have correspondence from Oregon?

Mr. BHUTIA. Men are constantly coming from Oregon to New York City.

Mr. RAKER. I understand you to say you are keeping a record of these who are working in different sections?

Mr. BHUTIA. That does not imply that I have an individual representative in each of the localities. I go around to these places a good deal myself. I have spent money on it.

Mr. RAKER. You do not know anything about the Hindus working on the railroads; you personally do not know anything about it?

Mr. BHUTIA. Up to two years ago—

Mr. RAKER (interposing). You have never been over that road?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir. I have been in southern California.

Mr. RAKER. I am talking about this particular railroad with which I am familiar. I have been up and down that road and I am familiar with it.

Mr. BHUTIA. If you will give me the name of the road I will give you a full report.

Mr. RAKER. I saw them in there in camp. You have no record of their working there at all?

Mr. BHUTIA. Not three years ago.

Mr. RAKER. You are keeping a record now?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Who is your representative in California?

Mr. BHUTIA. I am the representative there.

Mr. RAKER. Have you anyone in California who is reporting to you?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Have you received any letters from there?

Mr. BHUTIA. I receive plenty of letters.

Mr. RAKER. From Fresno and other towns in that vicinity?

Mr. BHUTIA. I have visited the towns myself. I travel all over the United States, and I do not remember seeing them there.

The CHAIRMAN. When were you in California?

Mr. BHUTIA. A year ago.

Mr. RAKER. It has been stated by Mr. Caminetti that there were 27,000 Hindus in California, and by Mr. Church that there were 15,000 in his district.

Mr. BHUTIA. We want to know where they come from. Your statistics disprove that. I fail to find as many as 8,000 in the United States.

Mr. RAKER. Have you any correspondence from California?

Mr. BHUTIA. I go there myself.

Mr. RAKER. Answer the question.

Mr. BHUTIA. That is the only correspondence.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Do you go there especially to make an investigation?

Mr. BHUTIA. Especially to make an investigation.

Mr. RAKER. Once in two years?

Mr. BHUTIA. Twice in two years.

Mr. RAKER. Have you anyone in California, is there anyone in California who has corresponded or does correspond with you or with your organization in the East?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir.

Mr. RAKER. No one at all?

Mr. BHUTIA. No one.

Mr. RAKER. Then, you do not get any letters from there?

Mr. BHUTIA. We have plenty of letters. You are speaking of official business. We have frequently letters written to us, from which we can tell how things are going on, and from which we can gauge about what is being done, in those States.

Mr. RAKER. What proportion of the money of those people working in California has been sent to India?

Mr. BHUTIA. I do not know. I think probably 25 per cent of the money.

The CHAIRMAN. How many cities have you visited in California?

Mr. BHUTIA. I visited Los Angeles, San Francisco, and the southern part of California, taking the Santa Fe Railroad to Los Angeles.

Mr. RAKER. What towns did you visit?

Mr. BHUTIA. San Bernardino and Berkeley; there are quite a number of Hindus there.

Mr. RAKER. You just stopped there as the train stopped?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir.

Mr. RAKER. How long were you in San Bernardino?

Mr. BHUTIA. Probably about two days.

Mr. RAKER. Were you in any other town in southern California?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes. If you mention them, I can tell you whether I have been there. And in the lumber camps and railroad construction camps, from Omaha to San Francisco on the Union Pacific Railroad, I know there is not a single Hindu employed there. That is as far as I saw. The people who were working there looked like Japanese.

Mr. RAKER. Up in British Columbia and in Saskatchewan there are a great many Hindus on the railroad?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir; there are hardly any Hindus there. The climate is too rigorous.

Mr. RAKER. No Hindus in the sawmills?

Mr. BHUTIA. In British Columbia—Vancouver.

Mr. RAKER. In California?

Mr. BHUTIA. Not in Washington.

Mr. RAKER. Are there not many in the mountains in the lumber camps in California?

Mr. BHUTIA. There are not very many in this country.

Mr. RAKER. How many do you think there are altogether in the United States?

Mr. BHUTIA. Not more than 8,000, at the most; and these men are distributed all over the United States, in California and Mexico.

Mr. RAKER. What part of the 8,000 do you mean are in Mexico?

Mr. BHUTIA. There are some in the southern part of Mexico who are trying to go to the Argentine Republic.

Mr. RAKER. You have spoken of their aversion to shedding blood. Now, assuming that the Hindu became an American citizen, if there was a call for troops in case of invasion, or a foreign war, would the Hindu to whom you had reference when you made that state-

ment refuse to engage in the war or respond to the call for troops to support the country?

Mr. BHUTIA. Every Hindu, whether he is a United States citizen or not, would defend the mother land in which he is earning his bread.

Mr. RAKER. He might be compelled to shed human blood.

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir; I think that there are 100,000 Hindus who would ask me if I would back the American Government and fight the Mexicans, and not one of them is an American citizen.

Mr. RAKER. If it was their conscientious belief that it was wrong to shed human blood, or even the blood of an animal, or even destroy a fly, why should they volunteer?

Mr. SABATH. They are Americanized now.

Mr. BHUTIA. There must be a differentiation in those two statements. The Hindu does not believe in committing murder, but if the flag of the country is in danger, every man has his obligation to fulfill, and it would not be considered murder to kill another man in the defense of your country.

Mr. RAKER. Our religion in this country is that we are opposed to murder.

Mr. BHUTIA. Your religion and your action are two different things. They have more murders in New York City than in all India.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. We are opposed to murder.

Mr. BHUTIA. So are we.

Mr. RAKER. Your statement was that they were opposed to fighting; that they were opposed to fighting each other, and did not believe in killing people promiscuously?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. When it came to war, you are ready to mow them down to get on and obtain what you want?

Mr. BHUTIA. Not to obtain what you want. That is not the idea. Nobody fought for Great Britain in the Boxer uprising harder than we did. We were the first to get into the gates of Peking.

Mr. RAKER. If it became necessary to put a million soldiers in the field in India, they would all be ready to sacrifice themselves?

Mr. BHUTIA. The fact is, they would defend their country, but now we do not want that. Our idea is to bring about the same result that would be accomplished by bayonets and bullets and by means of altruism and by passive resistance, and that is the thing we want.

Mr. RAKER. Suppose China would attempt to invade India, you could put a million soldiers in the field and you would sacrifice the lives of all those people if necessary?

Mr. BHUTIA. It all depends on whether the Chinamen would invade India. We would have an amicable adjustment.

Mr. SABATH. Get back to Judge Goldfogle's proposition.

Mr. BHUTIA. He said as American citizens; then we would be Americans and not Hindus.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. You make a distinction.

Mr. RAKER. Would you make a distinction as between the citizen of the United States and a citizen of India?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir; I do.

Mr. RAKER. As a citizen of the United States you would be willing to take your place in the Army at any time to protect the American flag.

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. But in India, as Hindus, you would not go out and protect the English Government or the Hindu Government?

Mr. BHUTIA. That is another question.

The CHAIRMAN. Your opposition to the shedding of blood is a religious opposition?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir; it is a religious opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Would this opposition to the shedding of blood apply where there is a call of the country?

Mr. BHUTIA. That becomes a patriotic affair. We have to suspend all that prejudice.

The CHAIRMAN. If a man like this man I referred to would advise anarchy and the killing of police and other officials which he speaks of in this speech which I quoted to you, would you waive your religious views there?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir; we do not believe in mob rule or mob law.

The CHAIRMAN. But you have revolution over there.

Mr. BHUTIA. We have not had for 150 years, outside of 1856, the mutiny of that year, since then you have never found any race of people who have abided so peacefully as the people of India.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought you said there was a revolution going on there now?

Mr. BHUTIA. A peaceful revolution.

The CHAIRMAN. I understood that in localities, in provinces there, you have uprisings now.

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir; we have no strikes in India. You will never find among the laborers of California, a single strike of the Hindus. If they can not get the wages they want they quit. They do not strike.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Are they opposed to strikes?

Mr. BHUTIA. We are opposed to strikes where the strike brings about the shedding of blood.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. But where it does not bring that about?

Mr. BHUTIA. Where it does not bring that about, we still oppose the strike.

The CHAIRMAN. You just quit work?

Mr. BHUTIA. If we can not get our end, if we can not get or demand the salary we are capable of earning, it is our privilege to withdraw the work. We can not become parasites upon the nation. There is no nation in the world which has been given such conclusive evidence of self reliance as that of the Hindus.

Mr. SABATH. You have stated that there are certain restrictive laws in India as to emigration. Do you state that the laws of India prevent people emigrating as they desire?

Mr. BHUTIA. No; we have no law which prevents the Hindu going into any country he desires to. We do not encourage Hindus coming to this country.

Mr. SABATH. You do discourage them?

Mr. BHUTIA. We do.

Mr. JOHNSON. When you say "we," whom do you mean?

Mr. BHUTIA. The Hindus. We do not want the people to fall a prey to society.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean the British Government?

Mr. BHUTIA. No; the India National Congress. We do not say you can not go—that is, we do not prohibit a man from having his moral right to do so—but we say it would not be advisable to go.

Mr. JOHNSON. There is no writing to that effect?

Mr. BHUTIA. No; but you can not buy a ticket unless you say that you will not become a parasite upon society.

Mr. JOHNSON. What do you mean by parasite?

Mr. BHUTIA. Being dependent upon society for your livelihood.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you mean it in the same sense in which the Socialists mean it?

Mr. BHUTIA. No; I am not speaking of it in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. As a public charge upon the community?

Mr. BHUTIA. As a public charge upon the community.

Mr. RAKER. I understand that the tendency of the Hindu himself, as well as the organizations of the Hindus, is opposed to doing what they can to prevent the Hindus from going to other countries?

Mr. BHUTIA. Not to other countries, but to America.

Mr. RAKER. Do you make a distinction between other countries and the United States?

Mr. BHUTIA. We make a distinction. We make a distinction between South Africa and the United States. We have a right to go to South Africa, but we have not a right to come here.

Mr. JOHNSON. And yet you are sending a shipload of people to British Columbia.

Mr. BHUTIA. That is a different question.

Mr. JOHNSON. You know they will come to the United States at the first opportunity?

Mr. BHUTIA. Not necessarily. These men are coming from Shanghai and Canton and from Hongkong.

Mr. SABATH. And they are not coming to the United States?

Mr. BHUTIA. No; they are coming to British Columbia.

Mr. RAKER. The Indian Government is doing what it can to prevent the Hindus from coming to the United States?

Mr. BHUTIA. We are discouraging them as far as we can, because we know you are not favorably inclined toward our immigration.

Mr. RAKER. That being the case, there would be no detrimental effect, there would be no feeling on the part of the Hindu himself for the Indian Government, so far as India is concerned, if a law was enacted prohibiting their coming here at all—that is, the Hindu laborers?

Mr. BHUTIA. That would be detrimental, because the Government looks after the welfare of the individual. If the individual is oppressed, he deserves the right to go to any other country. He simply comes as an individual.

Mr. JOHNSON. You say they are oppressed in India, and your Government discourages their emigration to the United States?

Mr. BHUTIA. Because the United States does not look favorably upon the immigration.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yet you want the laws left so that they can come over here?

Mr. BHUTIA. If this country is going to allow the oppressed nations, then we come under that.

Mr. RAKER. You say the English Government is oppressing the Hindus?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. That oppression consists entirely in religious persecution?

Mr. BHUTIA. Not religious persecution entirely; but to a great extent it is taxation without representation.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. In what respect does the English Government oppress the people there?

Mr. BHUTIA. It plays the Hindu against the Mohammedan.

Mr. RAKER. Just what is it that the oppression consists of so far as the religious persecution is concerned?

Mr. BHUTIA. It is religious persecution in this respect, that the Mohammedans persecute the Hindus.

Mr. RAKER. How do they persecute them? What do they do?

Mr. BHUTIA. By overt acts.

Mr. RAKER. What overt acts?

Mr. BHUTIA. They will go out and shatter temples, and spit in our faces because we are Hindus.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Why do you not spit in their faces?

Mr. BHUTIA. Because if we did that we would draw retaliation upon our shoulders. That is the inevitable result we are looking after, to stop the racial prejudice and to stop the religious oppression.

Mr. RAKER. The dominant thought in the character of the Mohammedan is quite strong that if the other fellow spits in his face he spits back?

Mr. BHUTIA. The Mohammedans usually start the spitting.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do they do any of it in New York City?

Mr. BHUTIA. No; in New York City we are all the same. Everybody sits at the same table and discusses the same thing.

Mr. JOHNSON. Except the poor Dhom.

Mr. BHUTIA. Everybody in this country is alike. Everybody is considered alike.

Mr. JOHNSON. Does the English Government make any distinction between these two classes?

Mr. BHUTIA. The distinction is this: For instance, if the Mohammedan should get rather rambunctious and show a tendency to rebel against the Government, then the English Government comes around and pats us on the back.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you lecture around the United States?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir; I am going to take the stump in California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Did you ever lecture to a Socialist class?

Mr. BHUTIA. I have not addressed any Socialist organization, but I have addressed Socialists.

Mr. JOHNSON. You are going up and down the Pacific coast lecturing?

Mr. BHUTIA. As far as I know now, to show the real condition of the Hindu. We want an organization that will counterbalance this misrepresentation that is being brought about.

Mr. JOHNSON. This man who ate meat in Seattle, will he be well received by his caste when he gets back to India?

Mr. BHUTIA. No, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON. He is down and out?

Mr. BHUTIA. When he comes over here he loses his caste.

Mr. JOHNSON. Have you lost your caste over there?

Mr. BHUTIA. Well, I have; but that is no reason—

Mr. JOHNSON. You still feel that you are a high-caste man?

Mr. BHUTIA. In India.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you eat meat?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, I do. I believe I have eaten hog's meat in this country. In New York City they give it to you in disguise.

Mr. RAKER. You are going to California to make a campaign this fall?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes; I am.

Mr. RAKER. How are you going to talk with California to show they are wrong?

Mr. BHUTIA. If the Californians wish to hear good, common sense, they should be shown.

Mr. JOHNSON. You are going in the universities and schools?

Mr. BHUTIA. That is only a small thing. I want to show the public at large.

Mr. JOHNSON. You want to make the public stop making the Hindus move out overnight?

Mr. BHUTIA. I have nothing to say about that.

Mr. JOHNSON. Have you ever been in the lumber camps of the State of Washington?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir; I have been in lumber camps.

Mr. JOHNSON. You have been in the lumber camps?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir. A lumber camp is a distinct thing from a house. A lumber camp is readily constructed to accommodate a person temporarily.

Mr. JOHNSON. Have you ever seen in a lumber town an old frame house, an unrentable house, taken by Hindus and filled up by Hindus?

Mr. BHUTIA. I have never seen such a thing.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have

Mr. RAKER. Everything you have said about the California condition is just the reverse of California.

Mr. BHUTIA. I am under the impression that Californians, if they will give us an opportunity of showing them the real conditions, that we can prove to them that the condition you lay at our door should not be laid at our door; that it is almost too inconsistent to believe. That may happen in one case, but that is not a universal thing.

Mr. JOHNSON. It is done in my town.

Mr. BHUTIA. What is your town?

Mr. JOHNSON. My town is Hoquaim. I may say that there were 18 or 20 people living in that house, and I know we passed a cubic-air ordinance to prevent that sort of a condition.

Mr. BHUTIA. If they have done that, that is an exceptional instance.

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not blame them; there was no other place to go.

Mr. BHUTIA. Then that ceases to be a criterion. In India we do not have that. The climate prevents that. You will probably find that the Hindus are more hygienic and live more healthily than a good many other races of the world.

Mr. RAKER. I do not suppose you know anything about the conditions in the Sacramento Valley?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir; I do. I have been to a good many places in that valley.

Mr. RAKER. Have you been to Stockton?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Have you been to the farms?

Mr. BHUTIA. Yes, sir; I have, and I have seen some of the Hindus working there.

Mr. RAKER. Have you been down to Fresno?

Mr. BHUTIA. I am not sure.

Mr. RAKER. From your statements made here to-day I am satisfied that you have not seen Hindu life in California.

Mr. BHUTIA. I have seen Hindu life in the leading cities of California.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe that is all, Mr. Bhutia.

Mr. BHUTIA. Mr. Chairman, I have some papers which with your permission I would like to insert in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. You may do so.

(Thereupon, at 1.20 o'clock p. m., the committee adjourned.)