

THE Servant of India

Editor: S. G. VAZE.

Office: KIBE WADA, BUDHWAR PETH, POONA CITY

VOL. IV, No. 14.]

POONA—THURSDAY, MAY 5, 1921.

[ANNUAL SUBSN. Rs. 6.

CONTENTS.

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| TOPICS OF THE WEEK | 157 |
| ARTICLES — | |
| The Andamans, or a Moral Cesspool | 150 |
| " Voluntary " Segregation | 161 |
| SPECIAL ARTICLES :— | |
| The Right of Religious Conquest. By H. O. E. Zacharias, Ph. D. | 162 |
| The Seva Samiti Boy Scouts Association, Allahabad. By A Boy Scout | 164 |
| CORRESPONDENCE :— | |
| Half-Anna Postage. By Dr. H. S. Gour, M. L. A., D. O. L., LL. D. | 165 |
| The Conscience Clause. By Manilal C. Parekh | 166 |
| SELECTIONS :— | |
| Lord Bryce on Second Chambers | 166 |
| Penal Settlement in the Andamans | 167 |

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

THE prospects of an early settlement of the coal strike in England appear to be as dark as they were a fortnight ago. The negotiations between the parties, have again been wrecked on the rock of the Miners' fundamental demands regarding the establishment of the National Wages Board and the National Pool. From one message received last week it appeared that Government was prepared to grant an amount as subsidy which would mean a uniform reduction in wages by 3s. per day, but the miners would not agree to any proposal of reduction which would entail on them a loss of more than 2s. per day. The miners characterise the Government's offer as bringing the wages considerably below the cost of living, whereas Sir Robert Horne told the miners' delegates on behalf of Government that the National Pool was a political demand and could not be conceded under any circumstances. Thus while the deadlock continues, the losses to the nation's industry and revenues are fast mounting up.

THE details of the tragedy that took place at Malegaon in Nasik District are coming in. There seems to have been a widespread complaint amongst the people of Malegaon against the Foujdar of the place, who it would appear was unnecessarily provocative in his dealings with the Khilafat leaders and the Khilafat volunteers of the place. In a town four-fifths of whose population consists of Mussalmans, deeply agitated over the Khilafat wrong, the police officials must be men imbued with sympathy

for Muslim sentiments, but in Malegaon, we are told, it was otherwise. Whatever may have been the sins of the local officials, however, they were not such as to lend a shadow of justification for the heinous crimes that were perpetrated by the rioters. The non-co-operation leaders have been the first to condemn their outrages, and, in view of this fact, we hope there will be no attempt to establish a connexion between the tragedy and non-co-operators. We particularly deplore the Commissioner's reference to Mr. Gandhi as one who would view anarchy with equanimity in circumstances in which such taunts are singularly misplaced. Nor is Mr. Gandhi's utterance correctly understood. He at least hates violence like poison and will never encourage it either in speech or action. His will always be a restraining influence.

THE Mulshi Peta affair has for the present come to a close, the construction of the dam being suspended till November. This is really no very great concession to the popular agitation, for the works would in any case have had to be stopped during the monsoons, and it is not long before the monsoon is expected to break in Poona. We hope, however, that the intervening period will be turned to good account by the Hydro-Electric Company and the Bombay Government in perfecting their plans of land exchange and colonisation, so that there will be no resurgence of *satyagraha* in November. The peasants of course, for the present, rule out the question of compensation altogether. Those who speak of compensation are considered by them as only injuring their cause. But Mr. Kelkar himself still talks of compensation, in the hope, evidently, that the Mavlas, assured of adequate compensation and facilities of colonisation, will abandon their present position that they will not part with their land on any terms. Every one will sympathise with the following remarks of Mr. Kelkar: " Government must remember that the advisers of the Mavlas, who are probably under a discount already, will feel no power in their elbow if they wish to make headway with their advice to the Mavla if the Government will only speak as in the past, with a vague and muffled voice like the prophet of Khorasan." Mr. Kelkar for the moment stands discredited, and others who counsel moderation, but it should not be difficult to buy off the opposition of the peasants if really liberal terms are offered, and the company can afford to pay generous terms.

It is a pity that Dr. Gour's Civil Marriage Bill, which is a measure of capital importance, had, owing to pressure of time, to be given a first reading without an exposition of its principles by the mover. The Bill is of a wider scope than Mr. Patel's Bill which sought to legalise marriages between different castes of Hindus; the present is cast on the lines of Mr. Basu's Bill. Dr. Gour will bring to the task of piloting his measure through the Assembly great legal gifts and much reforming zeal. One hopes, though one does not feel quite certain, that they will save it from wreckage in the legislature. In one respect Dr. Gour is more fortunate than Mr. Basu, for Government will not use the official *bloc* to reject the measure. The least the Government of India will do is to remain neutral, as Sir James Meston told the Joint Select Committee. Still there is, if anything, greater reason to fear non-official opposition. The widening of franchise not infrequently adds strength to the reactionary forces. Viscount Haldane recently observed, speaking of the increase of voters in England from 8 to 21 millions: "The advantage that such (an enlarged) body (of electors) has is perhaps compensated by its disadvantages. It is very slow to move; it is very difficult to argue; it is permeated with the traditions of the average Englishman. And, on the other hand, it is extremely reluctant to proceed to revolutionary steps." We are not sure that the recent reforms have not contributed to an accession of the strength of the conservative elements, so far at least as social matters are concerned. The legislature may well consider the measure revolutionary and vote it down. It would therefore be desirable for those who wish the Bill to pass into law to carry on vigorous propaganda in its favour.

It will be remembered that at the All-India Congress Committee's meeting at Bezwada Mr. Gandhi moved a resolution which, if passed, would have had the effect of requiring at least the office-bearers of the Congress Committees to carry out the non-co-operation resolution in their own persons. Mr. Gandhi had for the moment to yield because of the deadset made against his proposal by the Nationalist leaders who, opposing non-co-operation at first, have now agreed to pocket their objection. One would have thought that it was unnecessary expressly to forbid persons unwilling to give practical effect to their professed doctrine of non-co-operation to hold any responsible office in a body wedded to that doctrine. But the undesirability of leaving it to the good sense of members and the need of laying down a categorical prohibition like the one contemplated by Mr. Gandhi will be manifest from the fact that Mr. N. C. Kelkar, into whose care the whole of the Deccan has been entrusted for organising the forces of non-co-operation, has himself violated and is continuously violating one of the leading items of the non-co-operation resolution. He is conducting a defence in a law court. This is opposed to the Congress resolution which enjoins boycott of law courts on litigants as well as on

lawyers. Not being a practising pleader, Mr. Kelkar had no legal practice to give up. He could carry out this part of the non-co-operation programme only by refusing to recognise the jurisdiction of the courts as a litigant. There he has failed.

* * *

WE would not be understood to cite this as an instance of backsliding, in the sense that Mr. Kelkar lacks the capacity for self-sacrifice needed to carry out the resolution of the Congress, both in letter and in spirit. On the contrary, we fully credit him with a readiness to sacrifice where he believes sacrifice is conducive to the public good. If he refuses to boycott law courts, it is because he is not convinced that such a boycott is demanded by public interests, or rather because he is convinced that it is *not* demanded by public interests and is opposed to them. We are not left to vague surmises in this matter, for Mr. Kelkar has given a public defence of his position in the *Kesari*. It is nothing short of madness, he says, to maintain that no one should avail himself of the right of self-defence in a law court. The Congress resolution regarding the boycott of law courts can be accepted only in the sense that the time, energy and money wasted is unnecessary and undesirable litigation had better be applied to the public purposes. As releasing a large fund of national resources for national use, and only in so far as it serves that purpose, the boycott can meet with approval; but it is idle to say that the reasons for which, in the preamble of the non-co-operation resolution, boycott is commended are also acceptable. Mr. Kelkar goes further and condemns Mr. Gandhi's reasoning as to the taint which attaches to one on going into the law courts of a Satanic Government as quixotic. It may sound very patriotic or courageous to refuse to recognise the authority of British law courts, but that is not sense. If such a strict boycott of law courts is required by the Congress resolution on non-co-operation, Mr. Kelkar asks, why not also a boycott of the post office?

* * *

IT will thus be seen that Mr. Kelkar does not at all agree with the fundamental principle underlying the non-co-operation resolution of the Congress. If resort to the law courts is forbidden by that resolution, he will carry it out only in so far as, in his opinion, it is desirable; and in judging of the desirability he will take no account of the fact that he is called upon to boycott courts of a Government with whom it is a sin to associate. He will boycott British courts only in circumstances in which it would likewise be desirable to boycott Swadeshi courts; but he declines to follow Mr. Gandhi in boycotting British courts *because* they are British courts. That is to say, Mr. Kelkar does not at all approve of the boycott of law courts as part of a general scheme for withdrawing co-operation from the British Government. We are not concerned here with the logic of Mr. Kelkar's reasoning, but what seems to us most reprehensible is that

one should preach non-co-operation to others, while, the first time one has a chance of practising it oneself, one should unabashedly turn "co-operator." We know that the opinion now expressed by Mr. Kelkar is genuinely held by him, but why should he make a show, till now, of holding other views? If the Director-General of Non-co-operation for the province of Maharashtra is such a hardened "co-operator," one can well imagine what real strength, as opposed to the one got up for demonstrations, the movement possesses. It has failed to satisfy the reason of India, however strong an appeal it may make to her uninstructed emotions.

MUCH reliance cannot be placed by the message sent by the Burma Government to England that the system of Government in Burma cannot now be very different from that which has recently been adopted for Indian provinces. For in the speech which Sir Reginald Craddock made in winding up the last session of the Burma Legislative Council, he was as hostile to the application of dyarchy to Burma as ever before. Of course he talks of endowing Burma with an equal measure of power, but he is possessed by the idea that his scheme would confer even more power than the M.-C. Reforms have conferred upon India. He remarked in his address to the Legislative Council: "My scheme introduced Burmese ministers, not merely into those departments of Government which in Indian provinces are described as 'transferred,' but into every phase of administration, excluding only subjects which are now declared to be central and the administration of areas which are outside the sphere of the reforms scheme altogether." How foolish are the Burmese that they should actually insist that the reforms which Sir Reginald in his excessive generosity thrusts upon Burma should be brought down to the modest level of that with which Mr. Montagu has dismissed Indian provinces! Their perversity will become understandable when it is remembered that not only the scheme of Sir Reginald but the amended version of the Government of India refused even Executive Councils to Burma, not to speak of a responsible ministry in regard to certain departments. The Burma Government's attitude being what it is, we cannot be said to have seen the end of the strife.

THE Lieutenant-Governor's speech ranged over a wide variety of subjects, among which the university boycott was not the least important. The propriety of such a step may be impugned, and we have never supported it ourselves, but it illustrates the mistrust which the educated Burmans feel for the local Government. It is widely believed that the main purpose with which the constitution of the Rangoon University has been devised is to throw back the educational progress of the province. But why does not the Lieutenant-Governor promise to amend the university's constitution so as to bring it into line, say, with the Lucknow University? We have pointed out several respects in which the

Rangoon University falls short of the Lucknow University. The former is indeed an official university except only in the name, and it is an abuse of language to say that it is modelled on the lines recommended by the Calcutta University Commission. The Commission insist on the academic freedom of universities, and what amount of freedom the Rangoon University enjoys may be best exemplified by the resentment expressed by Sir Reginald against some men in the service of Government whose children have with or without their consent boycotted the University and hurled the following threat against them: "If the movement which they have supported by their action is tainted with suspicion of disloyalty to the Government which they serve, they will bring themselves under the suspicion of being unprofitable servants."

IT was a most interesting discussion that took place in the House of Lords on the question of the mandates for Palestine and Mesopotamia on the motion of Lord Islington. England is called upon to bear an expenditure of £28 million or 1s. 3d. in the £1, and Lord Islington bluntly asked if this expenditure was incurred merely for humanitarian purposes or "for the more material reason of preparing for the acquisition of oil." If the latter element had at all entered into the question, he reminded them of the almost insuperable difficulties that would supervene in the way of securing oil as a marketable asset. A most enormous difficulty would be as regards labour. The only available source was India, but Indian labour, Lord Islington told the Upper House from his experience as president of the Inter-Departmental Committee which recommended state-aided emigration, was out of the question. He said: "We abolished the old system of indenture, and offered the most favourable conditions of settlement and return if the coolie desired it; yet India would not look at it." Lord Islington deserves the thanks of India for making her position clear in regard to another matter connected with mandates. He remarked:

We see that they can only be maintained upon large military garrisons, and large military garrisons, especially one drawn from India, cannot be maintained indefinitely. India cannot be expected, in time of peace, to continue outside her borders large masses of troops, especially in countries where the Indian and the native of that country are not compatible. *If Indian troops are to be employed outside the borders of India, I think they should be employed by the free will of India, and in accordance with those foreign service conditions which are applied by us in this country when we send British troops to serve abroad.*

IN our issue of April 28 we had occasion to point out that Mr. Gandhi's Non-Co-operation is in practice not based on remorseless logic. To-day we are publishing an article which investigates from a purely philosophical point of view the "logic," which refuses to see any incompatibility between the principle of the Khilafat and that of Ahimsa.

THE ANDAMANS, OR A MORAL CESSPOOL.

THE Jails Committee's revelations in regard to the state of things which is existing, and has been existing for an unbroken period of sixty years, will send a wave of indignation throughout the country. To speak the truth, we need not pretend to find in the Committee's report any disclosure, for the invariable experience of all penal settlements of convicts outside their country ought to have taught us to encounter in the Andamans a hell on earth, as Colonel Wedgwood well described it. Norfolk Island which was originally a veritable paradise was converted by the penal settlement into what has also been described as a hell on earth. Nothing gives a truer idea of the low state of public life in India than the fact that we have allowed this cesspool of immorality to continue for more than half a century without any effective protest. We could have easily anticipated what the Jails Committee has elaborately described as to the "wholesale immorality," which exists in the convict colony. The Committee say that the original conception of opening such a penal settlement was 'one of great potentialities.' It was, to use the words of Merivale, "that the best mode of punishing offenders was that which removed them from the scene of offence and temptation, cut them off by a great gulf of space from all their former connections, and gave them the opportunity of redeeming past crime by becoming useful members of society." This theory has been worked out in various countries and nowhere has it proved anything like a success. Everywhere it has produced a fearful condition of obscenity and corruption. In India also it has had that inevitable consequence. The greatest difficulty in the Andamans as elsewhere was the overwhelming preponderance of the male sex and a paucity of women. The wives of criminals would not go to live with their husbands in the colony and there were not enough local women among convicts to go round, to imitate for one moment the style of the report. There was only one woman to every six men and the result may be well imagined. Again there was an orgie of unnatural practices when convicts went out to work in association. The colony was absolutely devoid of any reformatory influence, consisting as it did only of criminals and Government officers. The Committee have rightly come to the conclusion that the conditions could by no possibility be now improved and they therefore recommend the abandonment of the settlement so far as the majority of criminals are concerned. These criminals, the Committee say, should henceforward be detained in India and only a specially dangerous class of criminals should be deported to the Andamans under improved conditions. The punishment of transportation is to be abolished from the Indian law and is to be replaced by rigorous imprisonment. The Government have the power under the Prisons Act to deport any criminals sentenced to rigorous imprisonment to a foreign country and under that Act the Government is to

select, such is the Committee's recommendation, specially dangerous criminals who require in their opinion to be transported to the Andamans for safe custody. In the case of women, however, transportation is totally abolished and even such women as are serving their sentences in the Andamans are to be brought back to India and kept in jails here. This, however, the Committee think, will not be possible in the case of men, there not being sufficient accommodation in Indian jails to provide for all the convicts who are now in the Andamans. Nor will all the provinces be able to provide accommodation immediately to the increased number of criminals who, if transportation were stopped forthwith, would have to be provided for in India. For an intermediate period, therefore, the Committee recommend that transportation should continue, though the numbers would decline in a progressively increasing proportion every year.

The country will cordially welcome the Committee's conclusion in so far as an early abandonment of the settlement in the Andamans is concerned. The Committee seem to think, however, that if the original idea of the settlement had been carried out under better conditions it would not have proved such a miserable failure as it has proved in practice. If free passages were granted to the wives and other relatives of the convicts, if vigorous official propaganda had been carried on, if liberal terms were offered for the immigration of free settlers, if prisoners were classified, the settlement would possibly have fulfilled, the Committee imagine, its original purpose. However in other countries all these things have been tried, and yet things there were as bad as they are in the Andamans. In Australia a Governor "secured gratuitous passage from England of the families of convicts and sending of young girls who professed penitence from female reformatories at home to be married in Australia." Another Governor actually founded "an orphan asylum for girls who were to be trained for wives, married off and provided with homesteads at the public expense." Yet in Australia they were faced with a disproportion of the sexes just as much as in the Andamans. In Australia again the classification of the convicts was carried out in a scientific manner. Everything was done there which the Committee say should have been done in the Andamans. In fact the English system started with an immense advantage over the Indian system; for in Australia after cellular confinement there was a short probation to be served, after which the ticket-of-leave was granted to the criminal, but in India the term of probationary punishment which was to be followed by the attainment of semi-freedom under a ticket-of-leave was as long as ten years, so that it became impossible for one steeped in vice and immorality for ten long years to be redeemed afterwards. Thus the Indian system was from the first doomed to failure. Another reform was subsequently introduced into the English system by which the probation term was to be served in England instead

of in Australia. Even so the conditions in Australia became so disgraceful that the British Government were forced in 1857 to formally abolish the punishment of transportation. By a curious irony of fate transportation to the Andamans commenced a year after it was put a stop to in England, and for over sixty years, owing to the supineness characteristic of our people, we have let the thing go on after it was discarded by England as radically bad. At last it is to be stopped here also. But we must say that we are not satisfied either that transportation is still necessary for the worst class of criminals or that any intermediate period is necessary before the evil is completely abolished. The Committee's report seems to us to be particularly weak in that portion where it maintains that it is desirable to retain transportation for habitual criminals. The only reasons it gives are that it is best to provide for the safe custody of such criminals outside the country and that it would tighten the administration of Indian prisons in general if the latter were to give shelter to particularly dangerous convicts. Neither of these arguments is convincing. As the Rajah of Pudukottah has observed in his minute of dissent, if separate prisons are maintained for the confinement of such criminals the same purpose would be served at a smaller cost. The Committee say that in order to carry on the growing industries in the islands free labour should be introduced. That would give rise to another complication from which the island is till now free. It has been the universal experience of penal settlements in all countries that deported criminals and free settlers cannot live happily together. The latter either merge themselves in the former or find it impossible to tolerate their contaminating influence. It is the free settlers of Australia who demanded and obtained abolition of transportation in England. If the free settlers in the Andamans are not powerful enough to prevent the transportation of Indians to that Colony, they will themselves succumb to the influences from which we seek to extricate the convicts.

"VOLUNTARY" SEGREGATION.

ONE of the principal recommendations of the South African Commission's report is that in the Transvaal and Natal separate areas should be established for Asiatics both for residential and trading purposes, and that the Asiatics who live and trade outside of these areas should be persuaded to move into Asiatic areas. This, the Committee claim, is a scheme of voluntary segregation, devised in the interest of Asiatics as well as Europeans. When examined, however, it is found that it partakes much of the character of compulsory segregation, which the Commission reject as unjust to the Asiatics. Indeed, the segregation here contemplated is not at all voluntary except only in the name. As regards residential areas, the Commission recommend that municipalities should be empowered to set apart certain quarters of the town for the use of Asiatics alone; if any Indian is found to stray out-

side he is to be induced to go back to his proper pen. Let us suppose that, by the use of strictly moral suasion and nothing else, all these Indians who happen to live in the European quarter at present consent to shift to the Indian quarter. Will they not thereafter be compulsorily confined to the Indian quarter and prevented by force from going into the European quarter? If then this is a plan of voluntary separation, it will mean, at its best, that the separation will at first be effected by voluntary methods but will be maintained subsequently by compulsion. The same is the case with race segregation contemplated by the Commission for trading purposes. They recommend that a system of separate areas should be gradually introduced by allocating particular streets in townships for Asiatics. Persuasion is to be used in inducing Indians who are now trading in other streets to remove their shops to Asiatic streets. The separation of areas is thus to be effected by persuasion, but to be maintained later on by compulsion, for it is provided that "new licenses should only be granted for businesses to be carried on in that street or quarter" which may be allocated to them. One can well imagine in what manner the principle of voluntaryism will work in actual practice in the initial stage, but in subsequent stages it is to be replaced by naked compulsion.

The allocation of separate areas is to be entrusted to special boards consisting of men "of independent judgment" "in order to avoid any possible suspicion that trade rivalry might in some instances influence the selection of those areas." When almost the whole European population is interpenetrated with deep racial prejudice it is futile to expect that the separation will not be governed by trade jealousies, several respectable witnesses having frankly deposed to the Committee that the end they have in view is "to drive Asiatics out of the country." The Committee also provide, evidently as a valuable safeguard, that "no steps should be taken for the allocation of such separate areas in any town, except upon the special request of the Municipal Council or other local authority." The Municipal Councils being composed practically of the trade rivals of Indians, we know that they will not let the grass grow under their feet in demanding that Asiatics be relegated to the worst part of the town. The segregation which the Committee recommend is compulsory segregation, and no Indian is likely to be deluded into the easy belief that the will of the Indian occupiers is going to play any part in this business. The Committee know what the condition of the Indian quarter will be. Of one such quarter the Committee themselves describe their personal experience in the following terms: "It is difficult to conceive of a worse slum existing in any part of the world. We found the inhabitants crowded and huddled together in small hovels amidst indescribable filth, and leading a most insanitary life. And this was the state of things existing within the Municipality of Johannesburg, the wealthiest and most populous town in South Africa, and within a little more than a mile of its

magnificent Town Hall!" The Committee know also that there are several grades amongst Indians and that the standard of living of some of them is "quite equal to that of the ordinary well-to-do classes among Europeans." And yet the Committee suggest race separation, which no doubt they call voluntary but will in effect be compulsory. And what is the reason for the recommendation? Nothing else than that the Europeans cannot tolerate the presence of Asiatics in their immediate neighbourhood—or even at a distance. The intermingling of races "is repugnant to the feelings and instincts of even the poorer class of whites in this country." Thus the Indians are to be unabashedly sacrificed on the altar of race prejudice of the Europeans. We have not referred above to the compact the Union Government has entered into with the Indians, which will be violated if these recommendations are carried into effect, but, even apart from the sanctity of pledges given, was it right for the Committee to so far yield to the unreasoning and intolerable prejudices of the white people as to recommend that the Indians should have pens of their own? The Government of India have already protested against these recommendations, and we hope that the Imperial authorities will do justice to India where the Commission have failed.

THE RIGHT OF RELIGIOUS CONQUEST.

IF there is one proposition more than any other on which, in the abstract, all men of good will throughout the whole world to-day are agreed, it surely is that Might and Right are not synonyms; that the success of an enterprise does not proclaim it to have been just; that force, in short, proves nothing.

These are almost truisms; and surely nowhere more so than in India, where material force has always been despised as a phenomenal illusion and contrasted with the only true reality of spiritual values. It is in India, too, and in India alone, that a religion is found which does not, either in theory or in practice, countenance force as a method of propaganda. The concurrence of a religion, based on an absolutist philosophy, with a practical system of caste, explains this uniqueness of Hinduism amongst the religions of mankind: a uniqueness, the glory of which one must gladly acknowledge, though one may hold the theory of absolutism to be false and the practice of caste to be wrong.

If in the case of Hinduism one may see right conclusions drawn from wrong premisses, one certainly must admit that in the case of Christianity—even if true—wrong conclusions have only too often been drawn from right premisses. Only a couple of months ago Sir John Simon could address to a large meeting of Anglicans in London a "challenge" which has been reprinted in the April number of our contemporary, the *Pilgrim*, just to hand. The gist of this "challenge" to the Church of England was the searching question, whether its leaders were going to show "equal devotion and

self-sacrifice as a host of 'chaplains to the League of Nations,' as had been found amongst the many 'chaplains in the Army of War.' In this address the speaker himself quotes largely from Lecky's "History of European Morals," "tracing the transition from the almost Quaker tenets of primitive Christians to the full-blown militarism of the Crusaders," "looking in vain for any period since Constantine in which the Christian clergy as a body exerted themselves to repress the military spirit," and concluding that, "with the exception of Mohammedanism, no other religion has done so much to produce war as was done by the religious teachers of Christendom during several centuries."

As a Christian one can but hang one's head in shame, on reading such passages; blushing at the perversion of the very principles on which one's faith is based—a perversion, not, alas! on the part of a few, or of the ignorant masses, but on the part of the very masters and pastors of the flocks entrusted to them by Him, who again and again declared that "My Kingdom is not of this world:" One who not only devoted his life to uproot the current nationalist, militarist, imperialist notions amongst his fellow-countrymen, as to what was meant by "Messiahship"—but Who actually died for that the shameful death of One who was hated on the one part as void of all patriotism and a traitor to the national faith, whilst on the other He was feared as a dangerous visionary, an extremist and a seditionist.

Not of course as if Christians had always and everywhere taught in this respect the very opposite to what, I hold, Christ taught. Nobody really can get away from the fact that at the very core of Christianity there stands not Success, but the Cross of failure; the Passion, not action. I well remember, when the war was at its fever-heat, a Good Friday sermon preached on much these lines, culminating in the—then very bold—question: "And if you ask me whether I mean to say that Christ, had He lived in our days, would have been a conscientious objector: I can but return the question and ask *you* whether you can imagine Him to be anything else, but a conscientious objector."

Now, opposed to this line of thought, runs that taken by thousands and millions in that same great war, who, at its beginning at least, were eager to fling themselves into the battle line, to dedicate their own physical force, along with so much else, so that there might be stopped the onslaught of what they conceived as essentially evil powers which sought to enslave the whole world and subject it to an anti-moral Kultur based on naked force and issuing in the enthronement of Prussia as the ultimate standard of good and evil.

What they felt as paramount was the sacrifice that such conduct entailed on them: that surely was and is the justification of all war, that the combatant is willing to sacrifice his very life for the good of others. And what about the unwilling sacrifice it entails on the adversary? What about the sufferings of the great multitudes of third par-

'ties, the starving of the old, the stunting of the young, the agonies of mothers, the unleashing of ferocity, the introduction of a universal reign of suspicion and mutual deception?

The combatant—and remember, he is probably as conscientious as his objector—will regret these consequences, but explain them as secondary results, and will return to the primary object of his enlistment, viz to stop a wrong. It is that wrong which leads naturally to further wrongs. If the scream of a woman attracts the help of a policeman who, closing with a perhaps desperate ruffian, has only the choice of killing or being killed, it cannot be argued that, because the death of a man ensues, therefore it was wrong for the policeman to come to the rescue of the imperilled woman. The moment a man does wrong, he on his part exposes himself to every kind of wrong—just like a man getting within the firing line of a shooting range: he has only got to keep out of that line, to be safe, and no business to get within—whence he has only himself to thank if he gets hurt through his own trespass.

This is not the place to pursue any further this argument or to assess its truth value. But what is pertinent is to recognise that war, in these days at least and on a large scale, cannot be waged without any conviction on the part of the combatant that he is striving for the right. The old petty wars, in which a sovereign hired mercenaries to take revenge on some enemy or to rob a neighbour of his land and valuables: these wars, if not altogether past, yet can no longer be waged on the large scale on which big modern wars are waged, when a whole nation is ranged against another, and not even one or two nations only, but humanity as a whole is drawn into a gigantic world conflict. Such wars, I say, cannot be so waged, because men will not take the risks and undergo the sacrifices entailed for mere hope of plunder or out of sheer blood lust. The inducements necessary to get whole nations under arms and to make them enter the battle line, are of a higher order. "To defend the sanctity of the home" even is insufficient as a slogan; it is a necessary, negative ingredient, to goad on the reluctant, to clinch all doubtful considerations by an appeal to practical consequences: but self-defence alone is not enough. For a nation-wide war there is needed a deep call to all that man holds highest—a beckoning of noblest ideals, a vindication of Justice and of Truth. The contest must appear as one between Beauty and a Beast, it must be one in which the individual is called to fight on the side of all the Angels against all the devils of Hell. Thus and thus alone can there be produced that prime necessity of all modern warfare: *Morale*; for "*morale*" in the end decides all wars, "*morale*" is the one commodity which is irreplaceable, and far above the value of the stoutest battalions, the heaviest artillery, the deadliest gas.

In fact, under the guise of "*morale*," all modern wars have become crusades, religious wars. And it

is perhaps as well that one should fully realise the significance of it. For hitherto it has been thought that Islam alone was the religion that countenanced religious wars. But when we try to disentangle the mixture of motives whereby peoples are swayed, as we have endeavoured to do, it appears that in the end men either believe in the "Right of Religious Conquest" or else in "Non-Violence." Apart from all religious labels, that is really how mankind can be divided on this question. Islam of course in its teaching is simple, consistent, clear. It is a religion of Success; God is Omnipotent and Just; therefore He uses His power to bring about justice. Hence the rightness of an appeal to Power, military power included. Hence the representation of His Prophet on earth as a Khalifa, wielding the sword for the defence of Justice and for the spreading of Truth. Essentially all war on such a theory is an ordeal by battle.

Though very far from considering himself a Moslem, Marshal Foch yet could but be thought of by his armies as just that—as a Sword of God, as God's Khalifa. As such, as an upholder of the Justice of God, he came to restore the robbed twin provinces of Alsace and Lorraine to their motherland France; as an avenger of God's majesty he shattered the mad pretensions of William of Hohenzollern to be the instrument of a tribal deity. We have travelled so very far from the War to end all war to the Peace which has ended all peace, that we have perhaps difficulty in reconstructing for us the war psychology by which most of us were impelled at the time. Yet who can deny that it is under such categories as that of an eternal Nemesis that the late (?) war was fought and won? It is for the sake of ideals of a high order that men and nations consented to bleed and agonize.

And not in Europe only. The anguish of Armenia, the enslavement of the Arabs, the utter immorality of the whole Turkish imperial sway led the armies invading Palestine and Mesopotamia to victory, just as the misdeeds and ambitions of Prussia steeled the men on the Western Front to hold until such tyranny was overpast. Again let me interpose by saying, that I am here not concerned with the objective truth at the back of such considerations: whether Prussia and Turkey were in fact powers for evil in the world, is irrelevant here. The point to be made is that people fought against both powers because they thought that thereby they could right wrongs: that, in the last instance, they were fighting, as the Sword of God to vindicate His Justice. A religious war pure and simple, even though, in a most curious medley, adherents of Islam, of Christianity, of Hinduism were found on either side of the battle line.

Opposed to both sides of that swaying line, in a higher dimension altogether, namely that of thought, are the adherents of Non-Violence. To them Jehadis, whether Moslem or Christian or Hindu, appear singularly misinformed and misdirected in their enthusiasms. To them force appears as stupid and hopelessly useless in a con-

test of good and evil ideas. Action aiming at homicide and deception seems to them indefensible. They cannot agree to do evil—in order that good may ensue. They take their stand on Satyagraha, standing up for Truth at all costs to oneself, but without injury to one's neighbour—Ahimsa. "Satyagraha"—the positive command, to stick to one's principles and at nothing else, *coûte que coûte*; "Ahimsa"—the negative command, not to use force to bolster up the spiritual force, inherent in that which is right.

Underlying all injunctions to Non-Violence of course is the conviction that justice is not really furthered by bashing in another man's face; that truth is not apprehended any quicker when it is presented impaled on bayonets. These men, who conscientiously object to all violence, do so out of deference to man's free will; realizing that on that rock all merely physical force must split in the end. And, if they are consistent, they must go further, and recognize that the obverse of non-violence is suffering and that if anything can right a wrong and make Truth to triumph over falsehood, it is by suffering; willing, conscious, loving suffering; and by such suffering alone.

To the philosophy of Satyagraha and Ahimsa God's Omnipotence is not displayed by the anthropomorphism of super-Herculean feats of strength but by the quiet overruling of God, Who always in the end brings good out of evil; not by circus-stunts of power or by running amuck amongst enemies, but by Love. To annihilate His enemies would not really prove God's omnipotence, but rather His impotence to get the better of them and so would be His reducing them to the level of machines, by suspending their free will through a display of titanic "frightfulness." Only love will really gain an enemy; and love entails suffering. To suffer, that is the weapon of the Satyagrahi, not to grasp the sword of the Khalifa; and therefore to the Satyagrahi there can be no other religious conquests than those of Love.

Are these mere platitudes and self-evident truisms? I hope they are. Yet are the necessary conclusions always drawn and applied in this India of ours to-day? I would not be so sure. For if they were, how could one find an apostle of the principle of Ahimsa, upholding its very contradiction, the principle of the Khilafat? How can one promote the interests of fire by pouring water over it? Yet that would be high sense compared with the endeavour of promoting violence by non-violence. Or is it rather an attempt of promoting non-violence by violence?

Again, I say, I am not concerned with the truth value of either the Khilafat or the Ahimsa principle. But I do say, that the one excludes the other; the one thing I do plead for, and most earnestly, is clear thinking on the part of either side to this problem. It is muddled thinking and the consequent slide into compromise that is responsible for

more disaster in the recent history of mankind than any other factor. Let India at least escape from a danger the consequences of which are staring at her from all sides. What more in consonance with the genius of India than Satyagraha; a noble resolve to abide by principle and to suffer rather than do wrong?

Only a short two years ago the greatest figure in the West was the man who dared to lay down fourteen points of principle along which he appealed to all mankind to come together under a new Covenant. Alas for Mr. Wilson! The exponents of the Right of Religious Conquest were too much for this noble Satyagrahi, who in the end was left, defeated on all points, carrying away nothing but the empty shell of his fondest hopes.

This was the end of so great an enterprize; wrecked, because its champion would stoop to compromise.

Will the great Satyagrahi of the East heed the warning? Will he be faithful to his whole life; to his sacrifices and sufferings as a conscientious objector; to his ancestral ideals of Non-Violence; to all that makes him to be what he is: the convinced believer of truth for truth's sake, the noble martyr who would suffer wrong always, but do wrong never?

Will he not remain true to himself rather than compromise himself, for the sake even of so precious a thing as Hindu-Moslem friendship is, with this antithesis of his, the principle of Khilafat? What if only a mockery of that friendship in the end should remain as the sole result of so much noble thought and endeavour—emptied of all meaning, a monument of derision, standing on the ruins of Satyagraha and Ahimsa; a result of that fatal compromise between the True and the Expedient, which constitutes the tragedy of Mr. Woodrow Wilson. . . .

Religious Conquest? Perhaps.

The Right? Certainly.

But the Right of Religious Conquest???

H. C. E. ZACHARIAS.

THE SEVA SAMITI BOY SCOUTS ASSOCIATION, ALLAHABAD.

ONE of the most prominent amongst the various useful activities of the Seva Samiti, Prayag (Allahabad), is the Boy Scouts organization. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya is the Chief Scout and Pandit Hirdaynath Kunzru, member of the Servants of India Society, is the Chief Scout Commissioner of this Association. The Chief Organiser is Pandit Shri Ram Bajpai, another member of the Servants of India Society, who for the first time in India formed a troop of Indian boy scouts at Shahjahanpur in 1913. At that time Indian boys were not allowed to be members of the Baden-Powell boy scouts' brotherhood. It will not be out of place to mention here that the other two troops of boy scouts started after Shahjahanpur were in the Theosophical Schools at Benares and Cawnpore in the year 1914.

The Seva Samiti Boy Scouts Association has, at present, under its flag, which consists of the Swastika and the Crescent, over two thousand boys scattered over the United Provinces, the Punjab, Bihar and Orissa and Indore. There is another scouts movement in the United Provinces under the title of the "Indian Boy Scouts of Agra and Oudh." It was proposed to amalgamate both these bodies, but this could not be achieved owing to certain differences in the constitution of the Associations, the chief objection, one hears it said, being that the Indian Boy Scouts of Agra and Oudh are more or less under Government control—an objection which even Sir Robert Baden-Powell, the founder of the movement, respects.

The scouts movement stands for four objects—character, health, citizenship and handicrafts. The movement develops these qualities and the children do not feel scouting as a burden over and above their school work and home duties. Scouting is taught by means of games and other interesting methods that appeal to boys' mind and imagination. Some people have the erroneous notion that scouting takes much of the boys' valuable time. The boys have to meet for parade on two or three days a week for only an hour or so, but the result is wonderful. After a month's training the boys' bearing and movements show a distinct change for the better.

There is a uniform prescribed for scouts and also a number of badges for which they have to qualify themselves. But the uniform and the number of badges won, the knowledge of First Aid, flag-signalling, and efficiency in drill, etc., etc. do not alone qualify a boy to become a true scout. A true scout is one who honestly follows at all times his scout law and promise. The scout law is summed up in the following lines:—

Trusty, loyal and helpful,
Brotherly, courteous, kind,
Obedient, smiling and thrifty,
Pure as the rustling wind.

The scout promise, which every scout has to take at the time of his investiture, is as below:—

"On my honour I promise that I will do my best
1. to do my duty to God, Country and Crown,
2. to help other people at all times, and
3. to obey the scout law."

Lord Chelmsford, our ex-Viceroy, invited to India Sir Robert Baden-Powell, the founder of the scout movement, with a view to combining into one body all the scout organizations started in many parts of this land. Sir Robert came to India and visited the Head-Quarters of the principal scout associations in the months of January, February and March. His efforts to amalgamate the different bodies have met with a certain measure of success. But some independent associations such as the Seva Samiti Boy Scouts are still keeping aloof, the cause of which is, besides other minor points, the elimination of the word "Country" from the Scout promise by Sir Robert for the future Indian boy scouts, to which Mrs. Besant has unfortunately agreed. This omis-

sion has naturally caused discontent and resentment amongst Indian boy scouts and their officers. When Sir Robert was at Allahabad Messrs. Kunzru and Pearce impressed on him the necessity of retaining "Country" in the Scout promise and pointed out to him the evil consequences attendant on its elimination. Sir Robert admitted the necessity, but when he was at Madras what was feared actually happened. Mrs. Besant agreed to adopt the universal scout promise, in which the word "Country" is not included.

When Sir Robert reviewed the scouts and guides troops at Allahabad which numbered about a thousand on the 5th February, he was much impressed with their efficiency. He spoke to the Minister of Education to depute scout officers to England for training and promised that he would afford every facility for such men. The U. P. Government have accordingly decided to send one man every year for training in the Gillwell Park, London. In the fitness of things the first choice has fallen on the most deserving man, Pandit Shri Ram Bajpai, on which both the Governor and the Minister of Education are to be congratulated. Pandit Bajpai sails on the 7th May by the S. S. *Mandala*. Mr. Bajpai's work will be carried on by the stalwart scout-worker Mr. Mohan Singh Mehta, M. A., LL. B., Head Quarters Commissioner. It is hoped that other Governments will also follow the example set by the United Provinces Government.

A BOY SCOUT.

CORRESPONDENCE.

HALF-ANNA POSTAGE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—What makes you say, in your editorial pendant to Mr. Price's letter on the subject of half-anna postage, that you "cannot acquit Dr. Gour and others who voted against the proposal for a half-tola half-anna letter of their share in the muddle that was created," when the fact is that half-tola half-anna postage was my proposal, and I voted for it, and when I was outvoted I tried to reform the "muddle" by inducing the Government to accept my proposal, which it eventually did?—Yours, etc.

H. S. GOUR.

Nagpur, April 29.

[Our authority for the statement that Dr. Gour was among those who voted against the proposal for a half-tola half-anna letter is to be found on page-1289 of the official report of the Legislative Assembly Debates. Dr. Gour figures among the Nocs in the division list given there; the division was taken on Mr. Jatkar's resolution that a letter weighing not more than half a tola be charged at the rate of half an anna. We are quite prepared to believe that, while some of the members must have voted against the resolution because they were impressed by the executive difficulties pleaded by the Finance Member, some others must have registered their votes against the proposal because they desired that the half-anna postage should carry a one-tola letter instead of a half-tola one; and it might be that in their case better proved to be the enemy of good. We are not sure that an adverse vote given on that ground was not a tactical error, for Mr. Price, who had sent in a resolution for a half-anna one-tola letter declared, after Mr. Jatkar's proposition for a half-tola half-anna letter was defeated, that he was perfectly satisfied that the motion of which he had given notice had been fully discussed and dealt with. Thus those of the Assembly

members who had voted against Mr. Jatkar's resolution in the hope that, after defeating it, they would be able to carry a still better resolution had absolutely no chance of recording their votes on the resolution for a one-tola half-anna postage. That is to say, as events transpired, those who voted against the more modest proposal of Mr. Jatkar deprived the Assembly in effect of passing the more ambitious one, and thus helped in defeating both the proposals. That is why we say that those members who went into the lobby against Mr. Jatkar contributed to the creation of the Postage Muddle. Be this as it may, Dr. Gour cannot plead the excuse which may be available to some other members for voting against the proposal for half-tola half-anna postage, for he was in favour of it, as the letter published above shows. He also spoke in support of it. The divergence between his speech and vote is all the more inexplicable if the proposal also originated from him, as he says in this letter. The proceedings of the Assembly do not bear out his statement that he voted in favour of the half-tola half-anna proposal.—Ed.]

THE CONSCIENCE CLAUSE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SERVANT OF INDIA.

SIR,—While the agitation in connection with the compulsory Bible-teaching was going on in Bombay some time back, I asked the students in a letter to the *Chronicle* to respect the Bible as an Asiatic Book at least and to cease from agitation against it. That, I believe, is the duty of Hindus as Hindus who have always shown great respect to all religious teaching whatsoever. But now that the question before us is as to what the duty of the Missionaries is in this matter of compulsory Bible-teaching, I as a disciple of Christ have not the least hesitation in saying that the whole policy is entirely wrong and violates all the canons of true Christian Evangelization. If I am not much mistaken, education in England has to be secularized for want of agreement between the Anglicans, the Roman Catholics and the Non-Conformists, who are all Christians. May I ask those who advocate such compulsory teaching if they will receive it at the hands of Roman Catholics? If not (and the Protestants will never take it, and that too from those who after all believe in the same faith), then why do they do the same to the Hindus and how can they expect them to take it? Again, I should like to know very much what policy is adopted by Missionary Societies in a country like Japan. Do they get such big grants and follow the same policy of teaching Bible compulsorily? If not, then why do they do this in India? Is it because India is not politically free and that even the Missionaries in the very act of teaching Christianity should make it conscious of the fact? Again may I ask these advocates of compulsory Bible-teaching whether if they were put in the same position as the Indians, and if such compulsory teaching were given to them by, say, the Moslems or the Hindus, they will receive it? "Do unto others as you would be done by" is one of the greatest precepts of Christ, and I am afraid it is violated all along in this matter as in so many others by Christians who can commend Christianity only by acting according to it and in no other way.

The only consistent and honourable course for the Missionary Societies under the present circumstances is to give up all grants if they are so keen upon keeping their ideal of education intact.—Yours, etc.

MANJILAL C. PAREKH.

Karla, May 1.

SELECTION.

LORD BRYCE ON SECOND CHAMBERS.

In view of the discussion that took place in the Legislative Assembly on the place which should properly be assigned to the Council of State in the Indian constitution, the following extracts from the speech which Viscount Bryce made in the House of Lords on March 21 will be found very interesting. It may be added that Lord Bryce was Chairman of the conference

which has considered and reported on the question of the Reform of the Second Chamber.

"Really the question that is before us now is not whether we shall have a perfect Second Chamber, but whether an imperfect Second Chamber is not much better than no Second Chamber at all. It is partly because there is now so much dissatisfaction with representative Legislatures that the Second Chamber is needed to supply and compensate for some of their defects. I am not speaking now with special reference to our own Parliament, which, on the whole, has retained the confidence of the people probably more than any elected Parliament in any other country. But, I think, even we in this favoured country must feel that the tasks we throw upon our House of Commons are too heavy, and that if we can find the means of relieving it of some of those tasks by creating an effective Second Chamber we shall have done a good thing for the Constitution. It may safely be said—those of you who have read the proceedings of any of these Committees will agree with this view—that the great body of opinion is every Parliamentary country favours the existence of a Second Chamber. I do not know of any case in which any substantial body of opinion thinks it would be better without a Second Chamber. I do not make that proposition absolutely universal. I am aware that there are some cases in which the defects of a Second Chamber are more felt and more dwelt upon than in other countries; but, broadly speaking, I don't think I am going too far in what I have said.

One case only I will venture to take. It is that of a country which many of us know best and whose Constitutional Government, although in form a Republic, on the whole in its working, resembles our system more than that of any other great country. It is modelled essentially upon our own system. It is the case of France. I have never found any French statesman, or any French publicist, except, of course, among those extremists who aim at carrying revolutionary measures and desire to carry those measures with the utmost speed, who did not think that the French Second Chamber was valuable and, indeed, an indispensable part of their Constitution. They dwelt constantly upon the useful check the Senate exercises upon measures passed in haste, or at the bidding of some temporary wave of feeling, by the popular Chamber and they say, "We are grateful indeed to think that we have two anchors at which to ride. If the anchor of the Second Chamber were to go, we could not answer for the consequences."

But, perhaps, I may be permitted to indicate, with great deference to the Committee, some considerations which forced themselves upon the mind of many of us, and which will indicate the lines upon which the creation of a Second Chamber should proceed. In the first place, let me say that I agree with my noble friend Lord Selborne in thinking that the Chamber should have substantial powers. If it has not, it will not fulfil the purpose for which it is mainly created,—namely, to see that the considered opinion of the country is properly ascertained—nor will it attract the class of men whom we desire to have in it. People will not care to belong to a Second Chamber of which they will not feel that it has an active work and is useful in the machinery of Government. You must give it some powers if you are to attract capacity and experience to it. What I mean by saying that it must possess substantial powers is, that it must not be a mere body of revision, a mere body which, taking a Bill that comes up from the other House, dot's the i's, crosses the t's, makes-drafting Amendments here and there and puts things in a little better form. It must have power to address itself to the substance of the matter, to submit and send back Amendments to the other House which will include matters of policy as well as mere matters of wording.

I know that there is a school—I believe my noble friend Lord Haldane belongs to it—that thinks nothing is wanted beyond a mere Chamber which can subject the proposals coming from the other House to a careful examination from the technical point of view. But that will not meet the exigencies of the case. That is not what the country expects, and it does not, I think, fulfil the meaning of the pledges

which were given, as my noble friend has stated, by both Parties, as to the kind of Second Chamber whose creation they contemplated. I do not for a moment mean that those pledges contemplated that it is generally desired to have any Second Chamber which would not respect the declared will of the people. That conception was long ago abandoned, when your Lordships declared the principle that you would leave it to the other House to initiate a General Election. I think that principle goes back in our Constitutional doctrines, if not so far as the Reform Act of 1832, perhaps as far as the lives of any of us here present. What I feel is that we want, not a Second Chamber which will resist the declared will of the people, but one which will see that the people have proper time in which to consider a matter of gravity and to express their opinions. We do not want to have constant General Elections; and there are great difficulties about referenda, though that is a matter which deserves to be considered.

But there is such a thing as public opinion. We all know, in point of fact, what the public opinion is on most questions. We cannot measure or determine it with exactitude as the chemist is able to weigh substances, but broadly speaking we know when every Bill comes into the House of Commons whether it is a general expression of the sentiment of the nation or not. We know in this House whether the country has had time to consider; we know whether it is a matter in which the country has made up its mind, or to which it is still addressing its mind. I suggest that the kind of Second Chamber we have in our mind is one which will secure time for consideration, which will conform to public opinion, but which will never venture to resist the declared and evidenced will of the people.

I need not repeat what has been stated by my noble friend Lord Selborne as to the cases that may very well arise, nor the extreme case which he put as to the way in which, under the Parliament Act, a new question might be dealt with by the House of Commons and most vital changes carried through under the provisions of the present law. All of us realise the kind of difficulty in relation to the Parliament Act which was sufficiently shown in the case of the Government of Ireland Act of 1914, which was not amended and which, therefore, required a supplementary Act which was passing through your Lordships' House at the time that war broke out.

I would submit that a Second Chamber which is to be successful and is to win the confidence of the country must not be a Party body. It should not be a body composed in such a way as to contain a permanent majority governed by party feeling or subservient to Party organisation. It must be a body in which every Party can have representation and every type of view can be safely and fairly stated. Lastly, a Second Chamber ought to possess, if possible, the largest measure of moral authority. By moral authority I mean not merely the legal authority which may be vested in it, be that greater or smaller, but authority which exercises on the mind of the nation that influence which comes from the intellectual authority of the persons who compose it, from their experience, from their record in public life and from the respect which their characters and their experience inspire. If an Assembly possesses that moral authority in large measure, its legal powers need not to be quite so extensive as they might otherwise have to be.

Such a Chamber ought to have for one of its chief duties the formation of an enlightened and reasonable opinion which would react upon the popular Chamber, and which would mitigate the conflict of Party. This House has a moral authority as well as the prestige, the unequalled prestige, of its long antiquity. There is no assembly in the world which can look back over so long and glorious a career as the great Council of the Nation, the *Magnum Consilium* of early Norman times, the form of which remains in this as its oldest member. That prestige of antiquity, that moral influence which we possess, would tell still more upon people if the reports of our debates were more widely read and known. I cannot help hoping that, whatever new Chamber is constructed, every effort will be made to preserve for it both prestige of antiquity and the moral authority which this House inherits.

I may add, perhaps, that I believe that we shall find the other House grateful to us if we can suggest some ways in which the reconstituted Second Chamber, whether through a system of Committees or otherwise, should be able to relieve the other House of some of those duties with which it is so heavily burdened. I join sincerely in the hope expressed by my noble friend that His Majesty's Government will realise the urgency of the matter. So favourable an opportunity as this Government now possesses of dealing with the question may not soon recur. It is one of the most urgent of all our problems, for upon its solution the safe and smooth working of the British Constitution and administrative as well as its legislative liberty must in these anxious times depend."

PENAL SETTLEMENT IN THE ANDAMANS.

The following description of the penal system in force in the Andamans is taken from the "Imperial Gazetteer of India":—

The full penal system, as at present worked, is as follows. Life-convicts are confined in cellular jail for six months, where the discipline is severe but the work is not hard. They are then put to hard gang labour in out-door work for four years, and are locked up in barracks at night. For his labour during this period the convict receives no reward, but his capabilities are studied. During the next five years he remains a labouring convict, but is eligible for petty posts of supervision, an easier form of labour; he also gets a small allowance for little luxuries or to deposit in special savings bank. He has now completed ten years in transportation, and can receive a ticket-of-leave, being termed a "self-supporter." In this condition he earns his own livings in a village; he can farm, keep cattle, and marry or send his family; but he is not free, he has no civil rights, cannot leave the settlement or be idle. After 20 to 25 years spent in the settlement with approved conduct, he may be released either absolutely or, in certain cases, under conditions as to place of residence or police surveillance. While a self-supporter, he is at first assisted with house, food and tools, and pays no taxes or cesses; but after three or four years, according to certain conditions, he receives no assistance, and is charged with every public payment which will be demanded of him were he a free man.

The women life-convicts are similarly dealt with but less rigorously. But the general principle is to divide them into two main classes: those in, those out of, the female jail. Every woman must remain in the female jail unless in domestic employ by permission, or married and living with her husband. Women are eligible for marriage or domestic employ after five years in the settlement, and if married they may leave the settlement after 15 years with their husbands; but all married couples have to wait till the expiry of both their sentences, and they must leave together. If unmarried, women remain 20 years in the jail. They rise from class to class and can become petty officers on terms similar to those for the man.

Term-convicts are treated on the same general lines except that they cannot become supporters, and are released at once on the expiry of their sentences.

Convict marriages, which are described below under caste are carefully controlled to prevent degeneration into concubinage or irregular alliances; and the special local savings bank has proved of great value in inducing a faith on the part of the convicts in the honesty of the Government, besides its value in causing habits of thrift and diminishing the temptation to violence for the sake of money hoarded privately.

The whole aim of the treatment is to educate for useful citizenship by insistence on continuous practice in self-help and self-restraint, leading to profit. Efforts to behave well and submission to control alone guide the convicts' upwards promotion; every lapse retards it. Where he becomes a self-supporter, the convict can provide money out of his own earnings as a steady member of society, to afford a sufficient competence on release. The incorrigible are kept till death, and the slow till they mend their ways, and only those who are proved to have good in them return to their homes. The argument on which the system is based is that the acts of the convicts spring from constitutional want of self-control.