

Indian Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY IN ENGLISH AND GUJARATI

No. 43—VOL. XII. WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 28TH, 1914. Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper
PRICE THREEPENCE

THE MEANING OF 'FREE PEOPLES'

ON this page last week we gave a full report of the Viceroy's speech in which he argued the question of Indian emigration to self-governing Colonies of the Empire. A different aspect of the question is shown by the following extracts from an article by Sir Roland Wilson which appeared recently in the *Asiatic Review* :—

"Free peoples have a right to say whom they will admit into their country, just as free men have a right to say whom they will admit into their house."—*Times*, June 4th, 1914.

This pronouncement of the leading journal reproduces in epigrammatic form the pith of a letter addressed to the same paper some months earlier by Sir West Ridgeway, and as it seems likely in its turn to evoke many echoes, it is perhaps time to ask ourselves what it means.

First, what is meant by "free peoples" and "free men?" The same adjective, used twice in the same sentence, ought to mean the same thing in both places. Does it?

No man living in society is absolutely free from constraint by other human wills; but we commonly call a man free who is subject to no greater constraint than the bulk of his fellow-men, and we include in the rights of an ordinary citizen the right to build, purchase, or otherwise acquire a dwelling-place, from which he may exclude at his pleasure every one except those whom he is bound by law to maintain, and duly authorised officers of justice.

So far, all is plain sailing. The trouble begins when we attempt to assign anything like the same meaning to the epithet "free" when prefixed to "peoples," which must in this connection mean "governments." The essence of government being constraint, the only sense in which we can speak of a "free government" is that of a government which is not controlled, in the exercise of its powers of constraint, by any other government, or which is subject to less control of that kind than some other governments with which it is compared. For the freedom of governments, like the freedom of individuals, is a question of degree. The most powerful government in the world, (whichever that may be), is not entirely free from constraint on the part of other governments; whether we look to the material force that might be brought to bear on it in certain contingencies, or to the moral restraint of the recognized principles of International Law. We speak of a government as "independent," or "sovereign," when it habitually recognizes no other restraints than the last-mentioned; and if the term "free" is to be used at all in this connection (where it is rather unusual and not particularly apt), it is to government of this class that it is primarily applicable. When it is applied to such a government as that of Canada, professedly a member of a larger organization, in which it counts numerically for only about one-fiftieth of the whole, the proper equivalent of "free" translated from the

language of poetry and rhetoric into that of Blue-books, is not "independent," or "sovereign," but "autonomous"—a modern term of designedly vague signification, intended to negative independence, but to affirm some larger measure of freedom from external control than belongs to the component parts of a thoroughly unified State. Hence, the inclusion of Canada in the category of "free peoples" raises the question whether the autonomy conceded to that "Dominion" by the Imperial Parliament (which may be taken to be the same as that conceded to the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand and the Union of South Africa) includes the right to impose whatever restrictions it thinks proper on immigration from other countries or from other parts of the British Empire, without reference to the wishes of the Imperial Government.

Formally the answer to this question is No, the right of veto on all colonial legislation being expressly reserved.

Practically, so far as practice has gone at present, the answer is Yes.

Supposing the Canadian Government to be "free" in the sense of being practically independent, or supposing, on the other hand, that it is *not*, as represented by the Imperial Government, who are the "free people" for this purpose, what ground is there either way for the assertion that "free peoples" or independent governments have the same right to say whom they will admit into their country that a private person has with respect to his house?

The so-called "possessive" pronoun is a particularly tricky part of speech, being used to denote the most various relations, of which some are, and some are not, possessive. For instance, it is a common-place of demagogic oratory to denounce the rich Mr So-and-so because *his* horses and *his* dogs are better cared for than his labourers, ignoring the fact that the animals are his property whereas the labourer is not. And here there are sound ethical reasons why the law should recognize, to the extent above defined, a man's exclusive possession of the house which he has built, bought, or otherwise lawfully acquired, which reasons would by no means support the claim of any people however "free" to own what they call "*their* country" in the sense in which Smith owns his No. 5 John Street, or Paradise Villa. Just as no civilized legislature will again tolerate the pretensions of private landowners to enclose half a country and warn off trespassers, so international public opinion, which is slowly groping its way in a purblind, haphazard fashion towards assimilation of the mutual obligations of States to those already enforced between individuals by national law, looks already with just distavour on attempts to restrict freedom of migration from the more

to the less crowded portions of the globe. If this is not clearly recognized as a principle it is because strong and well ordered governments have not till lately been much tempted to offend in this way, and are difficult subjects to bring to justice when they do offend; while, on the other hand, the governments that are weak enough to be coerced, and yet possessed of large, sparsely-populated territory, are generally also bad governments, and their badness rather than their exclusiveness is made the pretext for foreign aggression and exploitation.

The Old Policy

Down to quite recent times it was generally the policy of the stronger and better-ordered States to welcome immigrants of all kinds, regardless whether they were superior, equal, or inferior to the average of the old inhabitants. If equal or superior, like the French Huguenots, to whom England owes so much, they would be welcomed as adding to the material and moral strength of the nation; if inferior, so long as the direction of affairs lay with the classes rather than with the masses, they would be welcomed by the captains of industry as augmenting the supply of cheap labour. But with the growth of democracy in politics and trade unionism in industry, a new complication was introduced, which affected England only to a slight extent, but the North American Continent and Australasia very seriously. The manual workers began to grasp the truth that one way of raising the wages of labour was to limit the supply, while insufficiently attending to the other truth, that scarcity of labour means diminished production, and therefore a diminished wage-fund; and when they found that their competitors were not of their own race, colour or religion, they were restrained by no sentiment of brotherhood, from resenting to the utmost the intrusion of this new species of blackleg along the Pacific seaboard and in the cities and mining centres of Australia.

Other currents of sentiment have worked in the same direction; and the result is that we are now confronted in all our non-tropical oversea Dominions with a demand that every region in which men of European origin can live and work in comfort shall be preserved as a "white man's country."

The Imperial Responsibility

This would be a tremendous resolve if the peoples who make it were taking upon themselves the entire risk and preparing to defend it with their own forces. But when they do so as constituent members of an Empire which is Asiatic as to three-fourths of its population, and to which it is of the utmost importance to maintain amicable relations with the other Asiatic peoples against whom these measures are directed, it is the Imperial Government that has the greatest cause for anxiety. We of the Mother-country are being told in effect:

1. That we must hold ourselves in readiness to fight China or Japan, or both together, should those Powers take it into their heads to give practical expression to their resentment at the inhospitable treatment of their nationals in Canada or Australia. Even if the mere knowledge that our whole strength is pledged to the backing of these exclusionists should suffice to prevent actual fighting, that same knowledge cannot fail to impair our good name and influence in the Far East, and to place us at a disadvantage in European politics.

2. That we must confess to our Asiatic subjects our inability to secure for them freedom of settlement and equal treatment before the law in the more healthy and thinly populated parts of what we have taught them to call our Empire.

(To be continued.)

Indians and the War

The Transvaal Indian Women's Association has forwarded nine dozen pillow cases to the Johannesburg Branch of the Red Cross Society.

Capetown Relief Fund

Capetown, October 13.—A meeting of British Indians was held on Sunday, when a committee was formed, called the British Indian Widows' and Orphans' Fund Committee, to raise funds for the support of the wives, widows, and children of the British Indian troops who are fighting in the present war for the defence of the British Empire.—Reuter.

Kimberley's Contribution

The Indian Political Association, Kimberley, has contributed thirty guineas towards the Mayor's War Relief Fund. The *Diamond Fields Advertiser*, referring to this contribution writes as follows:—

The contribution forwarded to the Mayor by the Kimberley branch of the Indian Political Association towards the war relief fund, together with the assurances of loyalty and patriotism by which it is accompanied, are pleasing and practical evidences that the sentiment of the British Indian community on the Diamond Fields is that which India itself has so strikingly manifested towards Great Britain in relation to the war. As emphasising what has always been the feeling of the British Indian community in South Africa despite domestic difficulties now happily removed, and as exemplifying the desire of Kimberley Indians to do what lies in their power towards assisting in the solution of local problems, notwithstanding the special calls which have lately been made upon them in their own interests and those of their South African compatriots, the circumstances are gratifying, and worthy of passing note.

Indian Troops in Action

London, October 22. The *Daily Express* correspondent at the front reports the first engagement of the Indian troops, but no mention is made of the district in which they are operating.

The message states that they behaved with the utmost gallantry, the Sowars getting to close quarters with the enemy and driving them from their positions.—*Evening Chronicle*.

"The Key to India's Loyalty"

London, October 22, (Reuter).—A great speech was delivered by the Marquis of Crewe, the Secretary of State for India, at a dinner at the India Office this evening. One of the most striking passages in his Lordship's oration was the following: "The key to India's loyalty is the character and quality of the Indian Services. Very soon the Indians will be taking their place in the firing line beside their British comrades. The enemy makes this a matter of reproach, but with us it is a matter of pride. We fully expect the enemy before the war ends will have learned several lessons from the Indian troops, lessons of chivalry, humanity, respect for persons and the homes of the poor and humble.

Porterville, October 21, (Reuter).—At a large meeting last night of coloured inhabitants of the town and district, fully 350 being present, a resolution was passed condemning Maritz's traitorous conduct, and expressing full confidence in the Government, and offering their services if necessary in defence of the Union.

From the Editor's Chair

THE VICEROY ON INDIAN EMIGRATION

We published in our last issue the text of an important speech delivered in the Imperial Legislative Council at Simla last month by His Excellency the Viceroy on the subject of Indian Emigration. We know, so far as the South African question is concerned, how specially sympathetic the Viceroy was during the troublous times of last year, and how energetically he worked in order to secure a solution of the pressing difficulties that had caused a revival of Passive Resistance. His words must, therefore, carry with all sober-minded people, a more than ordinary amount of weight. We are of opinion, however, that it would have been better to have reserved these remarks for a more appropriate season having regard to the world-crisis existing to-day. Naturally, the question of Indian emigration is to-day of subordinate importance; it is overshadowed by the great happenings on the continent of Europe whose outcome is yet uncertain. We think, therefore, with all respect, that His Excellency's appeal to Indian public opinion in this matter was somewhat premature. The public does not know all the facts, and, in any case, it is hardly fair to expect Indian leaders to adopt the programme mapped out by His Excellency until they have had a full opportunity of examining the situation from all sides, and of hearing at first hand what experts like Mr. Gokhale and Mr. Gandhi have to say on such a thorny problem. We are inclined to fear that the emotion of the times may otherwise commit the leaders of public opinion in India to a course of action that will, no doubt quite unintentionally on their part, tie their hands in some degree. We cordially agree with His Excellency that the closer association on the field of battle, where brave men appreciate each other's bravery at their full value, between Indian and colonial troops, is very likely to bring about a more cordial feeling between them; but we cannot forget readily that here in South Africa we have had an experience showing how short-lived are these memories of comradeship when the strife is over, the crisis past, and the compelling force removed. We recollect, for example, how popular Indians were during the late Boer War amongst the Natal Colonists. The words of the late Mr. Escombe and the late Sir John Robinson are still remembered by Indians here; but when the war was over, it was only too conveniently forgotten that they were members of a common Empire, and that they were entitled to fair and decent treatment. Had this lesson not been so quickly forgotten, it is more than doubtful if the recent unhappy occurrences in Natal would ever have happened. Speaking generally, the virtues of gratitude and generosity are those that are most readily consigned to the limbo of oblivion when economic pressure exerts itself, and we are not so sanguine as to suppose that the present European crisis will alter human nature to the extent that some people suppose. Whilst we also agree with His Excellency, to a large extent that it is not the Dominion Governments that are unimperial so much as the population of the Dominions, we think that it should be admitted that these Governments are very largely influenced by their populations; and whilst no doubt Lord Hardinge is quite justified in asking the people of India to realise the difficulties of the self-governing Dominions, we feel also that a strong word of caution to these Dominions would have been very well in place, for if moderation is to be observed, it must be reciprocal, otherwise there is grave danger that harshness of treatment may also become reciprocal with highly undesirable results. We venture to urge that, before a definite reply is given by the leaders in India to His Excellency's suggestion, the pros and

cons of the situation should be considered with the utmost scrupulousness, and men of experience in these problems should be intimately consulted in order that an authoritative statement of the Indian case may be placed before the Government of India.

DISCHARGE CERTIFICATES

We are officially informed that the new Discharge Certificates, which, under the settlement, were to be granted to Indians who have completed their indentures under Act 17 of 1895 or subsequent laws, are now being issued by the Protector of Indian Immigrants. It is now open to any person, who is entitled to a free pass, to apply for one. This certificate is a permanent document, giving the date on which the last period of indenture terminated and other particulars. It is therefore important that every person so entitled should possess one. Those who have in their possession a temporary pass for a month enabling them to seek work under indenture should exchange this for a permanent certificate enabling them to work as free men anywhere in the Province. Should they enter into any civil contract, or engage themselves as monthly workers they will retain their certificate which is their personal property and not a pass to be handed to their employer. Previous three-pound tax-payers who hold receipts should exchange these for permanent certificates and all others whose indentures have expired should apply either at the Protector's office or at the nearest Magistrate's Court when they will, in due course, receive their certificate from the same place. As these applications, of which there will be several thousands, have each to be dealt with separately, some time may elapse between the application and the receipt of the certificate. This is unavoidable and it will need a little patience before all can be satisfied. We trust that those coming in contact with Indians entitled to these certificates will advise them what to do and so assist their uneducated brethren in this matter.

A HARD CASE

We have before us correspondence between the Natal Indian Association and the Protector of Indian Immigrants regarding a poor man who met with an accident whilst feeding a wattle-bark cutting machine, the property of his employer. One hand was cut-off and he was in hospital for two months. After he was discharged from hospital his employer gave him the work of herding cattle. After a month or so, he was told that he was not wanted and could go to India, notwithstanding the fact that there were eight months of his period of indenture unexpired. The man has a wife and two very young children dependent upon him. The Protector, in his reply to the Association, states that the employer of this unfortunate man is one of those suffering on account of the war, and he is unable to sell his wattle-bark. In a subsequent letter the Protector states: "I am afraid, as regards the employer, there is little chance of obtaining any redress for the man. He was, however, promised by me that when he sailed for India, I would do something for him out of the funds at my disposal. This will not deter me from using every effort possible to secure some amount from his employer." A further letter, dated the 16th instant, states that the man and his family were being kept in the Depot at the expense of the employer. Nothing, however, is said regarding the prospect of any compensation from the employer. We understand that four months elapsed before the Protector heard of the accident, when he immediately took up the case. It was then, probably, too late to claim compensation under the law, and, as the employer appears to be practically bankrupt, there is not much chance of the poor fellow getting anything from him. This appears to be a genuine case of hardship and merits the attention of the Indian community. Anyone wishing to render assistance, financial or otherwise, to this unfortunate man and his family, should send their

contributions to the Secretaries of the Natal Indian Association, 110 Field Street, Durban, who will, we are sure, see that they reach the proper persons.

An Excessive Sentence

In the Native High Court for the Division of Durban on the 21st instant, Mr. Justice Boshoff (Judge-President) presiding, an appeal was made by a native named Macayana, from Inanda, in the Greenwood Park district. On August 10 he was sentenced to three months' hard labour, and 12 strokes with a cane, for an assault upon his wife. The woman was said to have been severely injured as a result of the assault. Mr. Langston appeared for the appellant, and Mr. A. Smithers for the Crown. The line of objection taken was that in the Lower Court there was no evidence taken, and that the sentence was harsh and excessive. The report of the Magistrate (Mr. Matthews, Verulam) was to the effect that the accused pleaded guilty, and consented to summary trial. The judgment was that the accused was guilty, and that he would be sent to prison for three months, with hard labour, and receive 12 strokes with a cane.

The Judge sustained the Magistrate's verdict, but amended the sentence to read "he pay a fine of £5, or be imprisoned for one month."—*Natal Mercury*.

Cape Licensing Case

We publish the following extract from the *Weekly Reporter* report of the judgment given in the appeal case of *Adam Mahomed vs. Rex*, heard in the Cape Provincial Division of the Supreme Court of South Africa, before Justices Kotze and Searle, on the 17th August last. The judgment, which was reserved, was delivered by Justice Kotze, Justice Searle concurring:—

The indictment in this case contained four counts, each charging the accused with a like offence, viz., trading at four different shops in the Municipality of Wynberg without a licence. The first count sets out that Mahomed Adam is "charged with the crime of contravening section 6 of Act 13 of 1870, as amended and read with the Stamps and Licences Act, 1864 to 1908, as amended by Ordinance 19 of 1914, in that he did wrongfully and unlawfully exercise the trade, business or calling of a general dealer as defined by section 3 of Act 35 of 1887 as amended by section 3 (1) of Ordinance 19 of 1914, at premises situated at Lindhurst's Buildings, Douglas Road, Wynberg, within the Municipality, in respect whereof the name of the said Mahomed Adam does not appear upon the list framed under the provisions of section 11 of the said Ordinance by the Town Clerk of the Municipality of Wynberg, and sell to one John Fitzgerald, a constable in the South African Police, one tin of condensed milk for the sum of sixpence sterling, without having previously obtained from the Municipal Council of Wynberg a certificate as required by section 5 of Ordinance 19 of 1914, allowing the issue of a general dealer's licence, and is thereby by virtue of the provisions of section 14 of the said Ordinance deemed to be trading without a licence." The charge in the three other counts is in similar terms, except that the description as to the locality of the other three shops or premises is different. According to the notice of motion, five grounds of appeal are enumerated against the conviction of the accused on each of the four counts, viz. (1) That the indictment discloses no offence, inasmuch as sections 4, 5 and 11 of the Ordinance 19 of 1914 are *ultra vires* and of no effect in law; (2) that the accused is entitled to be placed upon the list framed under section 11 of the Ordinance; (3) that the Crown is estopped by reason of the conduct of its agents from asserting that the accused can be deemed to be trading without a licence in terms of section 14 of Ordinance

19 of 1914; (4) that the indictment discloses no offence inasmuch as it does not allege that the accused is legally required to take out a licence; and (5) that the conviction is not supported by the evidence given before the Magistrate's Court, and is otherwise contrary to law.

It appears that the accused possessed licences as a general dealer for five different shops in the Municipality of Wynberg. On May 22nd, 1914; one Villet, acting as Agent of the accused, applied to the Magistrate for his endorsement on the licences for the four shops mentioned respectively in the four counts in the indictment. The Magistrate was about to sign them when presented to him, but deferred doing so upon a suggestion of Constable Fitzgerald, who desired some inquiry in regard to one Enos, but what Enos had to do with the matter is not clearly disclosed by the record, except that the accused had bought and taken over the shops from him. On June 3rd Villet again made application for the Magistrate's endorsement, but that official was not present in the office, but signed the endorsement of the licences for the four shops on June 5th, 1914. In the meantime the Ordinance No. 19 of 1914 had become law, having been promulgated on May 29th, 1914. The Magistrate, however, in his evidence, stated that when the licences were submitted to him on May 22nd he was satisfied that the accused was exempt from a certificate under section 3 of Act 35 of 1906, and at the close of the proceedings the prosecution admitted that the accused was so exempt. Now, section 3 of Act 35 of 1906 provided that a list shall be framed and kept by every Resident Magistrate of the names of all persons holding existing general dealers' licences in his district, and such persons, so long as they trade in the district shall be exempt from the provisions of the Act requiring the obtaining of a certificate for a new general dealer's licence. So long, therefore, as this Act continued in force, the appellant was exempt from the necessity of obtaining a certificate for a new general dealer's licence. By the 4th section of the Provincial Council Ordinance No. 19 of 1914, it is enacted that, save as in section 11 provided, no general dealer's licence shall be issued to any person unless he shall have obtained a certificate which under section 5 he is to apply for to the Municipal Council, which may refuse or grant such certificate allowing the issue of a licence. Section 11 again of the Ordinance directs that upon its promulgation it shall be the duty of the Town Clerk of every Municipal Council and the Secretary of every Divisional Council or Village Management Board, and, where no such local body exists, of the Magistrate of the District, to frame and keep a list containing the names of all persons then trading as general dealers within the municipal divisional area or magisterial district. By sub-section (3) of section 11, it is provided that every person whose name shall have been placed upon such list shall be exempt from the necessity of obtaining the certificate before-mentioned. And finally section 14 of the Ordinance prescribes that if any person carries on the trade of a general dealer at any premises in respect whereof his name does not appear upon any list framed under the provisions of section 11 (unless he shall prove to the satisfaction of the Court that he is entitled to have his name so placed upon such list, and has made proper application for authority) such person shall be deemed to be trading without a licence.

The Ordinance has repealed Act 35 of 1906, although it has in several of its sections proceeded on the lines laid down in that Act. It is now contended that sections 4, 5, and 11 of the Ordinance are *ultra vires*, and beyond the scope of the authority conferred by the Financial Relation Act No. 10 of 1913, upon the Provincial Council. It was said that section 11 of the Act merely gives power to the Provincial Council to raise revenues by means of general dealer's licences, but not to regulate the trade of a general dealer, and that these are two separate and distinct matters; the

former being within the authority conferred, and the latter without. In support of this contention reference was made to the heading of the first and second schedule respectively of the Act, where a difference of language is apparent; for the first heading relates to "sources of revenue which in terms of section 11 of the Act are transferred from the Union to the several Provinces, together with the power to legislate in respect thereof;" whereas the second heading is wider, and deals with "matters, the control whereof and the power to legislate in respect whereof may be transferred by the Governor-General to the Province in terms of section 12 (1) (a) of this Act. No doubt there is a noticeable difference in the heading of the two schedules, but that is accounted for by the circumstances that they deal with different subjects; and it by no means follows that, because it is possible to draw a distinction between raising revenue, by imposing a licence and regulating the trade to which such licence relates, the Financial Relations Act, under which the Provincial Council has proceeded to pass the Ordinance in question, has merely conferred power on the Provincial Council to legislate in regard to the former, but not also in regard to the latter. We have to consider the aim and object of the Act, and to construe certain of its provisions in order to arrive at the correct conclusion, as to what in reality is the intention of the legislature, and what power it has in effect conferred upon the Provincial Council. Section 11 of the Act, sub-section (1), directs that the revenues derived from fees and licences and other sources, specified in the first schedule, which prior to the commencement of the Act were paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, shall be raised and received by the Province wherein such revenue arise. According to sub-section (2), these revenues shall, for the purposes of sections 81 and 85 of the South Africa Act, be deemed to be matters in respect of which a Provincial Council is competent to make Ordinances, and any existing law in force in any Province providing for the raising and management of any such revenues shall, save as is otherwise provided, be a law which the Provincial Council may repeal or amend by Ordinance, in so far as it relates to such a source of revenue. And sub-section (3) again lays down that "anything to the contrary notwithstanding in this section contained, it shall not be competent for a Provincial Council to make an Ordinance relating to licences to trade if that Ordinance would take away any right existing at the commencement of this Act to appeal to a Court of Law against the refusal to renew any such licence as was in existence at such commencement." It was argued that affirmative power to legislate is not to be inferred from the negation of power to legislate in the particular instance specified here in sub-section (3). But, regard being had to the language of this sub-section, it appears to be a fair question to put that, if the Act had not intended to confer such a power on the Provincial Council, what necessity was there for specially laying down that in one particular instance the Provincial Council shall not be competent to legislate in relation to licences to trade? Surely none at all. And the same remark applies to section 15 of the Ordinance which lays down that nothing in the Act shall be deemed to confer upon any Provincial Council the right to receive revenue or the power to make Ordinances in respect of licences relating to certain twelve matters specifically mentioned in the section. The natural and fair inference to draw from this section is that, except in those instances which are specially mentioned, the intention of the Act as well as its scope and object are to confer power to make Ordinances in respect of licences relating to matters which are not specifically excepted. It is difficult to assume that the Legislature merely intended to give the Provincial Council authority to fix or determine the amount of the licences, and not also to regulate the trade or calling to which such licences refer. The one seems so intimately connected with the other as to form together one matter relating to licences.

It may be conceded that a body like the Provincial Council, having only a delegated authority, cannot exceed the limits of delegation. But on the other hand the Court must give a fair and reasonable and not a strained interpretation to the Financial Relations Act, and if satisfied that the Ordinance has not gone beyond the terms of the mandate as expressed in the Act, so far as the sections of the Ordinance to which objection has been taken are concerned, it should recognise the validity of those sections. Having regard to sections 11 and 15 of the Act, and to its evident aim and object, I do not think that the sections of the Ordinance to which objection has been raised can be said to be *ultra vires* and invalid. On the contrary, it appears to me that those sections are *intra vires* and valid, and that, therefore, the first question raised in this appeal must be decided against the appellant.

India's Fighting Princes

General Sir Pertab Singh.—Having recently abdicated the rulership of Idar in order to return to the more important State of Jodhpur to be regent during the minority of his nephew, this gallant old Rajput is no longer a ruling chief in the technical sense, but he retains his salute of seventeen guns as a personal honour, and numerous other distinctions testify to the great value of the services he has rendered to the Empire. Sir Pertab Singh was one of the late King Edward's A.D.C.'s. Though seventy years of age he goes with the Expeditionary Force.

The Maharajah of Bikanir.—Sir Ganga Singh Bahadur, of the desert State of Bikanir, is second to no Indian ruler in the enlightenment and efficiency of his administration. A keen soldier, he is well known in the world of sport as a polo player, and he has few equals as a shot both with gun and rifle. He is attached to the Expeditionary Force.

The young Maharajah of Jodhpur, who accompanies his uncle, Sir Pertab Singh to the theatre of war, is only sixteen years of age, and has only recently left Marlborough College. The boy was a notable figure on his white Arab at the head of the Jodhpur contingent at the Delhi Durbar.

The Maharajah of Indore.—Called to the throne of the Mahratta State of Indore in 1903, when he was a boy of thirteen, by his father's abdication, Tukaji Rao Holkar has spent a year or so in Europe, and was invested with full ruling powers four years ago. He is a good horseman and shot, and excels at lawn tennis, having played in the Riviera Championship Tournament. He has given large contributions in cash both to the Indian and Prince of Wales' Funds, and has offered free of charge all the horses in his army suitable for Government purposes.

The Maharajah of Patiala.—Patiala's name is well known in English as in Indian society. He is ruler of the chief Sikh States of the Punjab, and is among the volunteers accepted for the Expeditionary Force.

The Maharajah of Gwalior.—Major-General Sir Madho Rao Sindhia, Maharajah of the great Mahratta State of Gwalior, is the most versatile of the Indian princes. A soldier who was with the international forces in China 15 years ago and a dashing sportsman, he is also a most capable administrator. Of indefatigable energy, he can drive an engine with the best locomotive engineer and a car with the best chauffeur in his State. He has given a large contribution towards the expenses of the Expeditionary Force, and has offered 1,000 horses as remounts.

As masterful a ruler as any in India, the Begum of Bhopal is a Mahomedan Princess of dominating personality and rare attainment. She was a conspicuous figure both at the Coronation and the Delhi Durbar. She is the fourth successive Begum who has ruled Bhopal. She originated the idea of a hospital ship for the Expeditionary Force, and sends her son with it as a volunteer.

The young Maharajah of Mysore, the ruler of six million Hindus of Southern India, has shown himself a capable and progressive ruler, keenly interested in educational questions. He has given £300,000 towards the cost of the Expeditionary Force.

The Maharajah of Kashmir.—A Hindu Rajput and ruler of the beautiful valley of the Himalayas, of which Moore sang in "Lalla Rookh." Sir Pertab Singh, owing to differences with the Resident, abdicated his governing powers in a fit of despondency in 1889, but these were restored to him 15 years later by Lord Curzon. He has rendered substantial help to us in frontier complications and recently held a great loyalist meeting at his capital, Srinagar.—*Cape Times*.

The Russian People

Prof. Paul Vinogradoff, the distinguished Corpus Professor of Jurisprudence at Oxford University, has sent a remarkable letter to the *Times*, in which he contrasts Russian and German culture.

He says that the clash of ideas to-day seems as fierce as the struggle of the hosts.

"There are other standards of culture besides proficiency in research and aptitude for systematic work. The massacre of Louvain, the hideous brutality of the Germans—as regards non-combatants—to mention only one or two of the appalling occurrences of these last weeks—have thrown a lurid light on the real character of twentieth-century German culture.

"By their fruits ye shall know them," said our Lord, and the saying which He aimed at the Scribes and Pharisees of His time is indeed applicable to the proud votaries of German civilisation to-day. Nobody wishes to underestimate the services rendered by the German people to the cause of European progress, but those who have known Germany during the years following on the achievements of 1870 have watched with dismay the growth of its arrogant conceit.

The cold-blooded barbarity advocated by Bernhardt, the cynical view taken of international treaties and of the obligations of honour by the German Chancellor—these things reveal a spirit which it would be difficult indeed to describe as a sign of progress.

Russia's Splendid Peasants

"Read Selma Lagerloef's touching description of Russian pilgrims in Palestine. She, the Protestant, has understood the true significance of the religious impulse which leads these poor men to the Holy Land, and which draws them to the numberless churches of the vast country. These simple people cling to the belief that there is something else in God's world besides toil and greed; they flock towards the light, and find in it the justification of their human craving for peace and mercy.

"For the Russian people have the Christian virtues of patience in suffering; their pity for the poor and oppressed are more than occasional manifestations of individual feeling—they are deeply rooted in national psychology. This frame of mind has been scorned as fit for slaves! It is indeed a case where the learning of philosophers is put to shame by the insight of the simple-minded. Conquerors should remember that the greatest victories in history have been won by the unarmed—by the Christian confessors whom the Emperors sent to the lions, by the 'old believers' of Russia who went to Siberia and to the flames for their unyielding faith, by the Russian serfs who preserved their human dignity and social cohesion in spite of the exactions of their masters, by the Italians, Poles, and Jews, when they were trampled under foot by their rulers.

"It is such a victory of the spirit that Tolstoy had in mind when he preached his gospel of non-resistance, and I do not think even a German on the warpath would be blind enough to suppose that Tolstoy's message came from a craven soul."

Japanese and British Courtesies

London, October 21.—The official Press Bureau states that Mr. Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty, on behalf of the Navy, has telegraphed to the Japanese Minister of Marine expressing a deep sense of the efforts and energy of the Japanese Navy.

The message says that, apart from the great object of the extermination of the main German base in the Pacific, the Japanese squadrons are everywhere giving us invaluable help in protecting trade, searching for the enemy's ships, and convoying troops.

The Minister, in his reply, warmly thanks Mr. Churchill, and, on behalf of the Japanese Navy, says a matter of the utmost satisfaction is the perfect understanding and harmony between the two allied navies, and hopes before long that the ultimate goal will be achieved.—Reuter.

Popularity of Tagore's Works

Mr. George P. Brett, President of the Macmillan publishing house, has something very interesting to say about the sale of Dr. Rabindranath Tagore's works. In a London despatch to the *New York Times* he is quoted as saying:—

For years poetry was almost tabu. The muse had been wandering in the wilderness, and now suddenly we find the poets among the best sellers. 'The Everlasting Mercy' and 'The Dauber' especially attracted attention in America; then there is that remarkable Bengali poet, Tagore, the sale of whose works compares favourably with the best selling novels. The sales of his 'The Gardener' alone in America exceeded 100,000 copies. One bookseller in Los Angeles sold 200 copies in that city alone. Such a thing had not been seen since the heyday of Tennyson, when a new volume of his poems was the talk of both hemispheres.

The wonderful popularity which the Bengali poet seems to enjoy at this moment all over the English-speaking world is a matter of national congratulation (says the *Punjabee*). If things go on at this rate the winning of the Nobel Prize by Mr. Tagore may prove even a more momentous event in the history of his country than it was at first thought to be.

News in Brief

We present with this issue an illustrated supplement giving photographs of the Indian Army.

We regret to record the death of the Right Honourable J. X. Merriman's sister in the Cape Colony last week. The British Indian Association has addressed to him a telegram of sympathy.

Mr. Merriman replied by wire as follows:—"Greatly touched by your message for which sincere thanks."

We have received the first number of a new monthly paper entitled "The Indian Emigrant," which states its intention of being "a monthly record of the status and doings of Indians in British Colonies and foreign countries and an advocate of equal rights of British citizenship within the Empire." This first number is a credit to the editor and publishers. We are indebted to this paper for the article which we print on the front page of this issue. The whole makes an interesting record and the contents fully bear out the claims of the title-page. It is published at 33 Broadway, Madras.

Printed and Published by Albert H. West and Maganlal K. Gandhi at the International Printing Press, Phoenix, Natal.