

## CURRENT MAGAZINES

---

**The July Days, 1830:**—Mr. W. A. J. Archbold, in the *Contemporary*.

**Thiers et Les Journées de Juillet:**—M. Henri Malo, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*.

**The Revolution of 1830:**—Mr. E. L. Woodward, in *The Observer*.

**Zionism and the Jews:**—Mr. Sidney Dark, in the *Quarterly*.

**Lord Rothermere on India:**—Mr. Arnold Ward, in the *Review of Reviews*.

**The Simon Report:**—Sir Walter Willson and Sir Maurice Hayward in the *Nineteenth Century*.

---

TO the mind that rejoices in centenaries the present year, like its predecessor, recalls a good deal. 1829 was marked by Catholic Emancipation in Great Britain and Ireland; 1830 saw the downfall of that House of Bourbon which had reigned for so many centuries in France. In the light of subsequent history, both these events now seem to have been full of meaning. Though men and women then in the vigour of life, and given—as Carlyle lamented—“too much to vaticination”, read their significance very imperfectly, they were not wrong in their belief that one era was closing and another was opening before their eyes. Recent magazines, both British and Continental, are rich in re-discussion of what it was that caused those events of July, 1830, in Paris. Why, they reargue, was Charles X expelled? But of an interest greater than the enquiry into causes is the light cast by subsequent experience upon results.

Fifteen years had passed since Waterloo, so that by the young French manhood of the time the Napoleonic struggle was forgotten in its dazzling glories, but remembered for its burdensome legacy, very much as our own young manhood is at once mindful and oblivious of what happened in the Great War. In truth there is hardly another period of history which our experience of the present enables us to reconstruct with such vividness. In England, trade had shrunk, cost of living had been doubled, taxation had become enormous, the congestion in tenement houses was producing ghastly epidemics, and the politicians in control were acting after their kind. With nervous eye, those who had “a stake in the country” were on the watch for the first signs of revolution. On city street and in rural hamlet was to be seen everywhere the gaunt figure of

the unemployed. The statistics of crime showed a terrifying rise, so that cynics could find no parallel to the crowding of East End jails with war heroes unless it were the crowding of West End palaces with war profiteers. Perhaps the most illuminating picture of those years in England which followed Waterloo is in the journal of William Cobbett—that ever fascinating record he published under the name, *Rural Rides*. The pre-Reform England of Corn Laws and Gagging Acts, in which—as Sydney Smith said—Lord Eldon and the Court of Chancery sat heavily on mankind, while Disraeli remarked that the Ministers in office knew no more of what was going on outside than savages know of an approaching eclipse! What is called “unrest” in the Entente nations of our time, producing here a system of doles and there a system of dictatorship, is our best comment on the Europe of over a century ago.

But if such was the situation in countries which had shared the great crusade against Napoleon, what temper might be expected among his own countrymen, who had been by turns intoxicated with pride in his triumphs and sunk in despair over his exactions? “How much sacrifice is worth while for the sake of *gloire*?” If the French have so often assumed that there is no limit at all to the price worth paying, it is not for want of a practical experience by which most other nations would be deterred. As in England, the conflict of classes, already inevitable because of the industrial revolution, was embittered tenfold by political change. What Bulwer Lytton has called the “glorious ferment in Parisian society”, by which lower levels are constantly being raised and higher levels are being depressed, had its special chance to alter the social balance in the twenty-two troubled years from the rise of Robespierre to the downfall of Napoleon.

Mr. Archbold, in his article in the *Contemporary*, points out that the restored Bourbons had two bitterly antagonistic groups to harmonise, the men for whom the revolutionary principles of 1789 were a sacred inheritance, and the men to whom the same principles were a foul blasphemy. The returning emigrés were resolved to undo all that had been done since Louis XVI. To placate them, the restored Bourbons must recall as many as they dared of the abuses of the old régime. Hence, for example, the vast projects of compensation to the old *noblesse*, the repression of free speech, the restoration of the civil power of the priesthood. On the other hand, the heirs of the great Revolution were by no means destitute of either energy or influence, and it had been a condition of the Bourbon return that government should be ac-

ording to "the Charter". The Charter had provided for citizen rights, somewhat after the fashion of the British limited monarchy, but with a vagueness which encouraged discontent without supplying a suitable means for its expression. In short, whatever prospect of lasting settlement might have been supplied by either a complete monarchic restoration or the establishment of a republic, that compromise was plainly doomed, especially with the mood of the surviving Bonapartists always incalculable. Nor were any of the brothers of Louis XVI equal to a delicate piece of manoeuvring. Not altogether unlike the sons of Charles I in England! If Louis XVIII was not without some trace of the *finesse* of Charles, at all events Charles X was conspicuous for what Disraeli would have called the "headstrong timidity" of James. "In some measure," says Mr. Woodward in *The Observer*, "Charles X owed his fall to his own fecklessness. On the evening of July 28, when the sound of firing drifted across the Seine and up the hill to the gardens of St. Cloud, the king was at his cards and the dauphin at a game of chess. This evening was not a time for talk of politics. Twenty-four hours later, the card table and the chess board were again set out for the royal diversion. Only once, in the dull hours of the court, was there any mention of the firing." It is to be remembered that when they came back, after Waterloo, the brothers of Louis XVI had not set foot in France for over twenty years. And so many things, beyond their ken, had happened in that interval!

When Charles X was driven out, the event did not seem either mysterious or regrettable to the leaders of progressive thought in England. At no time had they regarded the Charter of Bourbon restoration as other than a makeshift, or its promise of responsible government as more than a counterfeit of British free institutions. When the final fatuous step was taken, in those *Ordonnances* which by royal fiat dissolved the newly-elected Chamber, re-established a press censorship, and altered the Law of Elections, this seemed to observers in England just what was to be expected of a weakling, subservient to the revengeful spirit of the Faubourg St. Germain. Something like the "White Terror" that might be looked for if a Romanoff restoration should occur in Russia! In the throes of the struggle for the Reform Bill, the leaders of the British Whigs found tremendous ammunition in the news from France. British intransigent Toryism was warned of the fate of Polignac, and the appeal for concessions *in time* to the popular demand was pointed by hints of the alternative. Charles X, like so many other deposed sovereigns before and after, had just landed on British soil, and Macaulay, in a glowing peroration, made as much use of this incident as a loyal Edinburgh Review man dared:

Now then, while everything at home and abroad forebodes ruin to those who persist in a hopeless struggle against the spirit of the age, *now while the crash of the proudest throne on the continent is still resounding in our ears, now while the roof of a British palace affords ignominious shelter to the exiled heir of forty kings*.....

Though so eloquent, was he not right—more nearly right, by far, than the *Church Times* in its recent article about “The July Days”, which attributes the scandals of the Third Republic to this abolition of the old French monarchy? As if, forsooth, the scandals of the monarchy had not been incomparably greater! And even yet, in every issue of *L’Action Francaise*, there is a headline about the contemporary royalist pretender, described as heir of those forty kings who “made France”. But a heedless country does not reward the *Action Francaise* with even the honour of a prosecution.

---

THE League of Nations report on the disturbances in Palestine in August, 1929, imputing some degree of blame to Great Britain as the Mandatory Power for negligence in safeguarding order, has recalled the whole matter of the Balfour Note and the policy it initiated. The death of Lord Balfour, too, naturally brought back to the public mind the share he had taken in the Palestinian enterprise, and a reappraisal of the “National Home for the Jews” has been part of the discussion of his career.

A recent article in the *Review of Reviews* can hardly be freed from the suspicion of bias. The Jewish writer seeks to show that it was his own countrymen who in the riots of August, 1929, were always and everywhere the aggrieved party, that the Arab attack was unprovoked, and that herein is just another episode in the long tale of Jewish grievance. The case he makes out is a strong one, and he has much support from the review of the disturbances issued by that committee of the League of Nations, which ought to be impartial. Yet one feels that there is much more in the problem than to settle the rights and wrongs of those outbreaks at Jerusalem and Hebron, or of that tragic spectacle at the “wailing wall” a year ago. One is driven back on the whole issue of what is called “Zionism”, and with this in mind I revert to the impressive article by Mr. Sidney Dark in an earlier number of the *Quarterly Review*. It casts light upon discussions which are more recent.

Mr. Dark is impressed by the fact that for two thousand years the Jews, though dispersed as a small minority among the other races of the earth, have retained their racial and national

and religious consciousness. They are far indeed from having preserved their stock unmixed. Though often thought of as Asiatic, they have been in Europe from the beginning of European civilisation, and it is well known that they saved Greek learning and Greek culture which would otherwise have perished in Europe after the fall of the Roman Empire. In the fourteenth century the Jew in Cordova, for example, might well have said that the lines had fallen to him in pleasant places, because under the Moslem Caliphates in Spain the Jewish scholar was an honoured custodian and carrier of erudition. But outside Spain things were very different. The Jew had no place in the feudal system, and having been made an outcast from other activities, he developed by constraint those faculties which are now imputed to him as a reproach—the faculties for trade and usury.

In brief but lurid summary Mr. Dark recounts again the tale of Jewish suffering from the time when, in 1215, the Fourth Lateran Conference enacted that Jews should be distinguished from Christians by wearing a recognisable badge to mark them as a pariah caste. But for such persecution, whose consolidating effect on a race is so well known, they might have been fast assimilated with the peoples among whom they lived. It was the French Revolution which definitely readmitted them to general European society.

But, although formally readmitted, they had many a practical handicap still to overcome. The traditional sentiments which have taken generations to build up do not fade away even at the bidding of a *philosophe* of the Encyclopédie. "Anti-Semitism", says Mr. Dark, "may be said to have been invented by Heinrich von Treitschke, the apostle of German supernationalism, who denounced Catholics and Jews with the fervour of the leaders of the Ku Klux Klan in Tennessee." But though the German variety of anti-Semitism may have had Treitschke as its originator, the spirit was strong in other forms elsewhere. For example, the many Russian pogroms against the Jew in Tsarist days, and the wild excesses of hatred during the Dreyfus time in France!

It seems, then, intelligible enough, that certain leaders of the race should have become tired of the long waiting, should even have feared that the assimilative process would mean the destruction of their whole national character, and should have conceived an idea of rescuing the *ethos* of their people by the enterprise now called "Zionism". Its beginnings are in 1896, with the publication of Herzl's *Judenstaat*. In the words of the Psalmist, the dispersed of Israel were to be gathered into one, not necessarily back to Palestine, though that plan had a tremendous emotional

and historical appeal, but to a territory and a self-government of their own. It was hoped at first that the Sultan of Turkey might be persuaded to grant them a charter in the Holy Land; and when this was found impracticable, there was talk of East Africa, at the instance of Joseph Chamberlain, who enlisted the support of Israel Zangwill. But it quickly appeared—though this is not a point on which Mr. Dark chooses to dwell—that only a very modest proportion of the scattered race had any enthusiasm for the project of their intellectuals. Of those willing to be repatriated—even with the aid of large funds from their prosperous countrymen who would by no means return themselves—it seemed as if quite a large proportion were of the least desirable class from Southern Europe. The more desirable had formed attachments abroad which they were by no means willing to break. Zionism as a movement was thus languishing, when it was stirred to new life by the rearrangement of the map of the East at the close of the Great War. In the disposition of territories formerly subject to Turkey, it was decided by the Allied Powers that Palestine should be made a National Home for the Jews, with Great Britain as the Mandatory Power to see that justice was done to other races already in the territory, and that peace and order were preserved. What has happened since then, is a matter of familiar and disappointing record. Stimulated by this better prospect, Zionism was soon able to boast that the 100,000 Jews in Palestine before the war had increased to 162,000. But the stubborn fact remained that this constituted no more than one-sixth of the population of the country, and that religious feud between Arab resident and Jewish immigrant over the Holy Places of their respective religions could be kept under control only by the intervention of the police and soldiery of a Power foreign to both. No wonder that Lord Balfour, and others very favorable to the project at first, had to report with sorrow that “the work which Great Britain started in Palestine is not proceeding satisfactorily.”

Among the causes of failure may be suggested some that are quite apart from racial temperament. The Palestine of to-day is a bleak and rocky area, with no manufactures or even the possibility of future manufactures, since neither coal nor iron is to be had. The absence of a good water supply is a further drawback, and those millions of Jews established so comfortably in other lands will respond with very little energy to a patriotic appeal that they should thus change so much for the worse. They have not now the driving motive of the centuries of persecution. And of those who did come back, one is not surprised to hear that they

have not made friendly terms with the Arabs. They are not the best examples of their race, for they are so largely South-European Jews, without the ancient piety and with more than the ancient self-assertion. Tales of their adventures in Palestine, as they have made outrageous assumptions of importance on the strength of the League's support, will yet belong to literature. And it may be doubted whether, even at their best, the Jews ever had the gift for international amity. Distinct and apart from all other nations, yet penetrating them all, they have shown ethical genius when they thought individually, but to a great extent no more than a capacity for mistake when they acted collectively. The idea of being a "Chosen" people is hard to introduce with success into international dealings. It has lately been pointed out that in the Great War Jewish soldiers served to the extent of some 55 per cent. with the Russians, 35 per cent. with the Austrians, 7 per cent. with the Germans, and 3 per cent. with the British! That hardly suggests the homogeneous spirit on which a nation is built. So Zionism as a project of nationality is meeting with stern treatment in the journals, though there is a unanimous enthusiasm, among all those who matter, for preserving the shrine of Israel's literature and religion, now at length rescued from the Power that so long abused its sacred memories.

---

THE publication of the Simon Report has stimulated again a general interest in the Indian problem, and the more recent news about the progress of the Gandhi campaign of civil disobedience has driven us all back to consider again what that remarkable document contains. It has, of course, been the subject of many articles, and in the main these have been marked by that spirit of generosity which the situation so urgently requires. Many writers who have been in the past fierce opponents of Sir John Simon's policies have been eager to do justice to these proposals for India which such long and close study has led him to put forward.

Most arresting of all in his Report is his notion of a federal arrangement which might bring together the differing Indian interests under a central control, while establishing local autonomy in matters of purely local concern. A sort of "United States of India"! Canadians at all events will not find it difficult to understand the merits of such a scheme, for they have seen its value in dealing with racial and religious and sectional differences far less acute than those which separate Hindu from Moslem, and they can readily believe that what has succeeded on the small scale is

worth trying on the great. It is indeed an original suggestion, whose promise—and, still more, whose detailed working—it is not for those so far away from the scene to conjecture with any confidence. But it is reassuring to know that so many keen observers on the spot have heard of it with delight.

The situation has called forth, however, criticism of a very different sort. In the midst of calm and considerate discussion on these vital matters, there appeared some time ago an article of very different quality from the pen of Lord Rothermere. It assailed the very idea of Dominion status for India, and called for a cancelling of those pledges which the British representative had incautiously given. According to Lord Rothermere, even the Montague-Chelmsford Reforms were a piece of sentimental weakness, their effect had been to degrade the previously high standard of Indian administration, and the truth about the whole affair was that the huge majority of native Indians desire no sort of self-government, but rather a continuance of the British control to which they owe so much. It was only an insignificant Hindu minority, "a few foolish native babblers," "400,000 semi-educated Babus", that were making all the trouble! Dominion status for India, Lord Rothermere warned the readers of the *Daily Mail*, would mean the ruin of British trade, no more pensions, and no more doles for the unemployed. These are the salient features of the article upon which Mr. Arnold Ward, formerly a Conservative member of parliament, has contributed his comments to the *Review of Reviews*. Mr. Ward has been studying Indian problems on the spot.

Lord Rothermere's article he describes as "an ignorant diatribe". Whence, he asks, was the figure "400,000" obtained? The last census of India gave the number of literates as between 17 and 18 millions, and even the "Diehards" on Indian policy concede that the bulk of these are in favour of the Nationalist movement. The opposition to it, according to Lord Rothermere, comes from Indian Princes who may be supposed to speak for 72 millions; Moslems, 70 millions; and Untouchables, 60 millions. But the resolution adopted by the Chamber of Princes last year declared sympathy with the demand for self-government; all of the Moslems present except four at the Assembly on March 12, 1929, voted approval of Dominion status, while M. C. Rajah, who was spokesman for the Untouchables at the same Assembly, took a like view. It seems rather idle to pursue the argument that some vast body of people is not in real accord with the opinions of those whom they have commissioned to speak on their behalf, and since Lord Rothermere's article was written we have surely had more than enough



proof that this Indian demand—be it reasonable or unreasonable—is not that of a mere voluble handful, with negligible support from those they profess to represent. Mr. Ward assures his readers that this violent style of writing, and the reactionary proposals it advocates, have much embittered feeling in India. One can well believe it. And one would be driven to despair on this matter if one had to accept the view that not only the present projects of Lord Irwin, but the opinions of the Simon Commission, and the Montague-Chelmsford Reforms which preceded, have been the work of sheer simpletons. Nor are things improved by the broad hint in Lord Rothermere's article that the important thing for Englishmen to consider about India is how that country can be kept valuable for British trade, so that there may be loose money at home for doles and pensions! This is a view regarding the determining factors of British policy which is not generally avowed on the lips of a friend. The Hindu Nationalists have reason for gratitude to the *Daily Mail*. Their publicity department can use Lord Rothermere's article with great effect. But one is thankful to remember that the Conference is to proceed just as if that article had never been written.

One is glad, too, to observe, in so great an organ of Conservative opinion as the *Nineteenth Century*, that a tone very far removed from Lord Rothermere's is adopted by the most patriotic Englishmen in India. Two articles, by Sir Walter Willson and Sir Maurice Hayward, in the September number, have recalled this high debate to a level worthy of it. Sir Walter Willson writes as a representative of the non-official Europeans in India, a class that has borne a very important share in discussing what should be done. He has a good many detailed criticisms to offer on the Simon scheme, notably in regard to the need for proper central control of the police force, and for the prevention of discriminatory taxes imposed by an Indian legislature against British trade. In like manner Sir Maurice Hayward has sharp things to say about the qualities of the Indian Congress, and the impossible character of its demands for immediate autonomy. But these two writers alike dissociate themselves altogether from the idea that the remedy is a reversion to the old régime. Speaking for the non-official Europeans, Sir Walter Willson declares that they now regard it as impossible to "put back the hands of the clock", that their desire is to meet legitimate Indian aspirations in more than a liberal spirit, and that they recommended to the Simon Commission "the grant of full responsibility in the provinces, subject to certain safeguards." In short, this writer's enthusiasm is all for Dominion status eventually,

favoring—as he himself says—slowness in development only because he is sure that premature advance would mean a breakdown. And what he says of the Viceroy is this:

We regarded His Excellency's pronouncement as merely clarifying an issue already clear to us as being implied in the Declaration of 1917 and the Act of 1919. We have only doubted the wisdom of expressing it at a time when it was specially likely to be misunderstood or misrepresented as meaning more than it did, and so bringing about an increase in lawlessness.

There is nothing there, surely, that the most ardent patriot—British or Indian—could blame. And yet, how far it is from the temper of Lord Rothermere! A valuable feature in Sir Maurice Hayward's article is the light it casts on the common view that the bulk of native opinion, if it could express itself, is hostile to the Nationalist demand. Sir Maurice shows how it is indeed hostile to the demand for independence, but by no means against those proposals of cautious and limited advance to greater Indian autonomy which the Simon Commission recommends. Sir John's effort to do what is at once best for India and best for the Empire has rallied a support on all important sides which ought to reduce the extremist resistance, whether of a Rothermere or of a Gandhi, to feebleness.

H. L. S.