

CURRENT MAGAZINES

British India and the Indian States:—Mr. L. F. Rushbrook-Williams, in the *Yale Review*.

The Destiny of India:—Mr. C. Johnston, in the *Atlantic*.

Lambeth, 1930:—The Bishop of Worcester, in the *Nineteenth Century*.

Anglicanism in Evolution:—The Bishop of Ripon, in the *Contemporary*.

A Tourist in Russia:—Mr. Owen Tweedy, in the *Fortnightly*.

THE first volume of the Simon Report, says Mr. Rushbrook-Williams, excited tremendous interest in England, but curiously little in India, and herein is an example of "difference in mental outlook between the East and the West". Surely there is an explanation more obvious, if less profound. The first volume of the Report contained a Survey of conditions, while the second set forth recommendations for change. What Sir John Simon and his colleagues had to propose was novel, and was awaited with tense concern; their report of what they found was a summing up of facts painfully familiar, and was scanned only as a doubtful forecast of the remedies they had in mind. In this attitude the Oriental temperament does not seem singular.

But though the Hindu may be impatient of these hundreds of pages of "Survey", they are immensely enlightening to the reader in the West. Mr. Rushbrook-Williams has drawn attention to three outstanding points of emphasis in the Report. (1) One has to remember the multiplicity and diversity of races in the peninsula which the geographies call "India". To keep internal peace, the *pax Britannica*, that recalls the old *pax Romana*, has been a task of great difficulty, and in recent years even the British power has had its times of failure. "In the five years 1923-1927", says the Simon Report, "approximately 450 lives have been lost and 5000 persons injured in communal riots. A statement laid on the table of the Legislative Assembly shows that from September, 1927, to June, 1928, there had been nineteen serious Hindu-Mohammedan riots which had affected every province except Madras." (2) The native states, comprising nine-twentieths of the area and more than one-fifth of the population of the country, have not

so far shared in the Nationalist movement at all, and yet Dominion status for India without the co-operation of the ruling princes would, as Lord Irwin has pointed out, be impossible. (3) What under the proposed régime would safeguard India against invasion of the kind which in pre-British days was so often successful when independent tribes attacked her from the North? It has required constant vigilance, with a force of 60,000 British and 150,000 Indian troops, as well as 34,000 Reservists, to maintain protection against this risk. The Report thus fitly insists that problems of military defence, without parallel elsewhere in Europe, have been in an extraordinary degree ignored by the leaders of Nationalism.

Writing before the Round Table Conference had met, and taking the responsibility of prediction, Mr. Rushbrook-Williams bade his readers expect that the delegates, if they tried to "draft a legislative measure ready for presentation to the British parliament", would not succeed. He foretold that British observers would be surprised by the extent to which representatives of the different Indian groups would agree on a general principle, but that at the same time Hindu Nationalists would be much disappointed by the resistance they would meet from their colleagues on points of practical application. To-day we can see how keenly this critic discerned the governing factors of the case. Mr. Rushbrook-Williams was among the few who foretold that the Indian princes would co-operate with heartiness in furthering "the legitimate aspirations of British Indian Nationalism". And he pointed out with prescience how the Nationalist leaders would balk at the idea of a *federal* scheme. Federalism, he says, is the very essence of the Simon Report, and such provision for local or racial autonomy on certain matters, combined with central control on other matters, is the one possible solution in a country so heterogeneous. The Nationalist, on the contrary, is full of zeal for an All-India development, with the western idea of the nation rather than the eastern idea of the race, and with a strange mania—Oriental though he is—for transplanting the Westminster representative system into a land not yet ready for it. To such a mind, all this cautious Federalism in the Simon proposals seems a method of dodging the true ideal, and indeed a step backward even from the Montague-Chelmsford reforms.

An instructive and suggestive article, for the reader far away from the Indian scene, is this one by Mr. Rushbrook-Williams. Its forecasts, so near to the meeting of the Conference, have been strikingly fulfilled.

MR. Charles Johnston, who writes on the same subject in the *Atlantic Monthly*, is now a member of the staff of the British Museum. His authority on Indian questions comes from his experience on the spot, where he was for years a member of the Civil Service of India. Like Mr. Rushbrook-Williams, he emphasizes the peculiar characteristics of the Indian Congress man. It was the work of Lord Macaulay, we learn, that gave chief stimulus to developing that special type, for it sprang from Macaulay's two celebrated reforms, (a) the establishment of an Indian Penal Code, and (b) the introduction of the study of English for the literate classes. Thus arose the breed of English-speaking Hindu lawyers. And—*hinc illae lacrimae!* These men, so far from being true to the racial ideals of which they speak so much, have in truth travelled far not only from these, but even from that spirit of indulgence towards them in all their varied winsomeness which marked the British administration.

For, according to Mr. Johnston, from the days of the old East India Company, it was the British purpose to "give each of the innumerable elements of this vast mosaic of peoples a government fitting its own nature and tradition". Printing presses for the Brahmans, irrigation canals and railroads for the agricultural and mercantile Vaishyas, an administration and law-courts in its own tongue for every tribal and linguistic division, "so that the members of the Covenanted Civil Service, about a thousand in number, probably know more languages than any equal group on earth"! Recognizing the fundamental distinction of the Four Colours as a permanent thing, with differences of physique easily discernible now as in the days when Manu's Code was drawn up, the British administrators were careful to act according to it, not concentrating thought on the Government of India, with capitals at Calcutta and Simla, but rather considering the dozen provincial Governments, each with a tradition of its own. But for this protecting care, in Mr. Johnston's opinion, those ancient racial contrasts would long ago have been over-ridden and overwhelmed by a conqueror of another type. Warren Hastings once said that the Sanskrit Scriptures would survive when the British dominion in India should have long ceased to exist. This critic would add that it was the British power which most notably sustained the type of civilisation embodied in the Sanskrit Scriptures. He believes, too, that the present peril to that civilisation comes from the Nationalistic Congress men, keen for a dominant central administration, Hindus by birth, but English-speaking lawyers by

training, who have learned much about English usage at home, but little of the spirit which inspires English government abroad.

In a mood of historical reminiscence, Mr. Johnston dwells upon the great achievements of the Indian mind in the past. While it represented essentially the spiritual as contrasted with the material conception of life, it had won glories in the field of science long before the scientific achievements of the West began. Indian in origin, we are told, is that whole system of numbers we have misnamed "Arabic". In the Indian imagination lived, ages ago, that wonderful picture of the stellar universe to which the western mind slowly won its way against the obstacles set by Archbishop Ussher's chronology. To the Indian mind, long before Copernicus, had been revealed the notion of a helio-centric as against a geo-centric system. Evidence is quoted for all this. It is the sort of evidence from fragmentary remains that is available to prove, for example, that Thales of Miletus understood eclipses, that Democritus of Abdera had adopted the doctrine of the specific energies of sensory nerves, and that Heraclitus of Ephesus had bethought himself of cosmic evolution. But what particularly puzzles me is to know how the development of scientific as well as poetical genius has been fostered by the British *Raj*, so that the victory of Nationalist policies might be expected to retard it. Plainly most of what Mr. Johnston cites reached its climax long before British conquerors set foot on the soil of the peninsula; and if there is any inference at all to be drawn from the sequel, it is that under foreign control the fine promise of such a dawn was suddenly overcast.

The writer warns us at the end of his article that there is in truth no such place as political India, that the India Office created for administrative purposes what ethnically had no existence, and that the Congress men in lawyer-like style are thus making play with legal fictions. Now, when did we read something like that before? Was it not in accounts of the unification of Italy, when "Italy" was declared to be no more than "a geographical expression"? An answer was given last century by Cavour, by Garibaldi, by Victor Emmanuel. There were those who thought that answer a mere riotous explosion, to be reversed within a few years, when the nature of the case should reassert itself against frothy politicians and military adventurers. More than half a century of trial has failed to produce the change. It has produced instead—Mussolini!

A MELANCHOLY interest belongs to the article by the Bishop of Worcester, whose sudden death followed so soon upon his attendance at the Lambeth Conference. As he wrote himself about the Bishop of Zanzibar, "the trumpets have sounded for him on the other side". How keenly he was interested in Church affairs until the very end of his life, and how minutely he observed each detail of the changing scene, this vivacious article makes apparent.

Those accustomed to heavy reflectiveness about Lambeth will be relieved to find that the bishop begins his account with one of the lighter sides of the Conference. He is struck by its numerous personnel, and by the problem of entertainment which this presented. It is, of course, a splendid tradition that all the visiting prelates, with their wives, should be for a period the guests of the Archbishop of Canterbury. But when the number has passed three hundred,—well, one wonders whether St. Paul, in enjoining hospitality upon bishops, had in view anything on so large a scale. Certain generous laymen, it seems, undertook that the Primate should not have to draw altogether on his official income, and in two successive years the Budget of the Church has included an appropriation for the purpose. But there is something haphazard about this private generosity. The writer thinks with wistfulness about the Imperial Conference, about the Government's Hospitality Department, and about Mr. Snowden's happier fate in that "he exacts the dues for which he budgets", while the Church Assembly must depend on parochial quotas which at present are "in the doldrums of 75 per cent".

Passing from such externals, the critic had something to say about the intellectual strength shown by Home and Dominion bishops respectively, both in public debate and in committee work. This is a delicate matter, and the too obvious efforts to avoid saying what is unkind give all the deeper sting to the paragraph. The general drift of it is that Indian bishops, especially the Bishop of Madras, shone at the recent Conference, and that ten years ago the Bishop of Zanzibar, "whose peer was not heard in 1930", showed qualities equal to those of bishops at home, but that in general the inferiority of the visitors was clear. This stirs the critic to a speculation about causes, which does not in the least mitigate the severity of what he has said. He recalls how most of the Dominion prelates are "the product of some form of election", how they have a huge burden of work under hard conditions with little time for study and often very inadequate access to books, how their usual audience is of simple folk for whom a very plain talk is all that is

either necessary or desirable, and how despite their "almost pathetic eagerness" to address listeners of different quality at Lambeth, they fail to make much impression because they are "not adequately seized of their own point". This last is, indeed, one might suppose, rather a handicap to any speaker, even those who enjoy the advantage of being "at home". The Bishop of Worcester is, no doubt, quite right, though there is a comic side to his suggestion that Montreal and Toronto—in these days of improved transport—may be too remote from the book market to enable Canadian bishops to keep abreast of the times and fit for a controversy at Lambeth. Nor is the sharpness of this passage relieved, as it was plainly meant to be, by compliments to the character of these "earnest and eager chiefs" whose intellectual inadequacy is deplored. It is hard to say at once what is true and what is tactful. Perhaps bishops have commonly erred rather on the side of finesse, and it is good, once in a while, to see the reverse failing. But the perilous frankness of this writer does make me recall a piece of advice once given to a speaker by Anatole France: "So arrange your subject that in the exposition of it you will have no need of the qualities you lack".

Of the problems which came before the Conference, the one fraught with widest interest was that of birth control, but it is of two others that the present article speaks in detail: (1) the proposals regarding some form of union, or at least of co-operation, between Anglican and non-Anglican Churches in South India; and (2) the question of closer relationship with what the Bishop of Worcester has called "the ancient and hoary Communion of the Orthodox East". He states the South Indian problem tersely and clearly. Native Christians cannot be expected to understand differences of ministerial rank, of liturgical custom, of baptismal system. They want to be free, in the wide spaces of their country, to turn aside to any Christian minister, ordained episcopally, ordained otherwise, or perhaps not even ordained at all, who will impart to them that Message which is surely in its essence the same for everyone. In particular, they want to be at liberty to communicate in any sort of Christian church. The question for the Conference was whether, and how far, without departing from "the rule of our Church that the minister of the Sacrament of Holy Communion should be a priest episcopally ordained", the South Indian bishops should be allowed to encourage this latitude. And must not encouragement of it involve, logically, the setting up in India, as already in Persia, of an ecclesiastical organization that is neither Anglican nor non-Anglican, but a blend of both?

The Bishop of Worcester plainly sympathised with the cautious deliverance of his colleagues, to the effect that Indian bishops should be empowered to use their judgment in such exceptional cases, "where the ministrations of an Anglican Church are not available for long periods of time or without travelling great distances". I much doubt his view that this South India question has roused excitement to which the Colenso case of nearly seventy years ago supplies the only real parallel. Between disputes about apostolic succession and the complete change of attitude to the inerrancy of the Bible there is, for the Reformed Churches, a world of difference. And if one insists on the sheer logic of the situation, it is with the uncompromising protest of the *Church Times*, rather than with the Conference's machinery of qualifying clauses and exceptional cases, that the strength of the argument seems to lie. New wine will burst old bottles, and the time when a liberal change can be vindicated by further reinterpretation of some close veto of the past will not continue indefinitely. But there are interests better worth saving than consistency, and the *Church Times* is welcome to its dialectical triumph if only at such expense can disaster to the Christian cause in South India be prevented.

AS I read the brilliant and impressive article by the Bishop of Ripon, my mind went back a quarter of a century to the days when in Oxford we expected to see the name "E. A. Burroughs, Balliol", in the report of every award of a university prize of the highest order for classical studies. The promise of that undergraduate period has been redeemed many times, and among all the surveys of the seventh Lambeth Conference I should select this one as the outstanding contribution to real thought upon its issues. Moreover, it is marked by the peculiar grace of style, born I think of long practice in classical composition, which one has come to expect in all that proceeds from the Bishop of Ripon's pen.

He feels at once what he has called the thrill and the heart-break of Anglican Churchmanship at present. Never before had such a gathering of bishops been seen on English soil, exhibiting with such force the catholicity, the world-wide appeal, of the Church of England. It seemed the religious counterpart of the British Commonwealth of Nations. But it likewise revealed the faults of that spirit of compromise which made such a catholic gathering possible. Did it not depend on a certain emphasising only of that past in which all alike shared, and the sedulous avoidance of all changes about which groups were sure to differ? Did

not this mean a denial of progress for the sake of stability? The bishop quotes that old description of the National Church as "The Conservative Party at Prayer", and it is plainly not to his mind that the Conservative Party alone should find Anglicanism congenial. He has somewhere unearthed also another suggestive tag:

All our fathers have been Churchmen,
Nineteen hundred years or so,
And to every new suggestion
They have always answered "No."

Again, he is struck by the fact that clergy and laity have now much trouble in concealing the fact that they are facing in different directions. But why, he asks, conceal it? Why not proclaim it, and agree to give one another fair credit? A delightful illustration brings out precisely this point of the supposed need for studious masking of difference. It appears that when a photographer had got all the bishops arranged for his purpose outside Lambeth Palace, he warned them to remain just as they were placed, because "*Any* movement spoils the group". That set the Bishop of Ripon wondering whether in their passion, all through the ages, to remain together, they had not sacrificed something which movement might have brought. Therein lies indeed a parable. North of the Tweed an answer might be forthcoming still, as it has been supplied many times in Scottish history.

One would gather from this article that the overseas bishops did more than their share of the speech-making, and that the special situation in England did not get quite so much thought as it deserved. The writer thinks, too, that the divergence between extreme Right and extreme Left in opinion has increased, as shown in the debate on the South India Scheme, when Anglo-Catholics demanded that their doctrine should be taken as that of Anglicanism as a whole, and Protestants with equal fierceness resisted. With characteristic moderation, the Bishop of Ripon would make room for them both, reminding them that a Lambeth Conference is not a General Council, and that even General Councils, according to the 21st Article, "may err and sometimes have erred".

This is indeed the central idea of the bishop's article, which he illustrates from one point of Lambeth controversy after another, that "the liberal and comprehensive spirit of real Anglicanism" must be made to prevail, and that this in India as at home ought to reveal itself in a sacrifice of points on which earnest and intelligent men may differ, that the common Christian purpose for the world may be the more effectively furthered by their effort

in unison. But this is not to be done through suppression or concealment of the real and serious divergences. It has been the achievement of Anglicanism in the past, as contrasted with some other systems, to keep such rival schools within the folds of a common communion, thus preventing difference from expressing itself in schism. If this is to be achieved still, it will be by resolute refusal to commit the Church as a whole to the special doctrines of any part of it.

The closing words of this article are such as I shall not venture to summarise:

One night I saw the film, *All Quiet on the Western Front*, and somehow that glimpse of just one side of the great world-hunger made Lambeth seem distant and unreal. Must it always be necessary to spend so much time and thought on the shape of the baskets in which we are to carry to the starving multitudes the Bread from Heaven which giveth life unto the world?

MR. Owen Tweedy has been spending three days in Leningrad and Moscow, on a conducted tour, with Soviet officials to show him round, and constantly wondering how much there was to hide in the places he was not allowed to see. To an Englishman, the insistence that he shall remain everywhere under chaperonage is suggestive, and Mr. Tweedy's article in the *Fortnightly Review* may make that Russian tourist department a little distrustful of such a policy.

It seems that unless you go to Russia under chaperonage, you cannot now go there at all. Tourists are welcomed, but only those who take the official tourist excursion. For the rest,—no visa! They must remain at the Soviet "Ellis Island," where their closest approach to Russia is through a bargain-counter at which they can buy souvenirs of the land they never saw. Mr. Tweedy, however, took the Soviet trip, and the Government officials exerted themselves to make him comfortable, within the limits set by the state to which their country has been reduced.

Leningrad seemed to the visitor like Soissons or Armentieres in 1918. Pot-holes, trenches and ruts in the roadway; streets weed-grown and pitted; walls without plaster, wood-work unpainted, windows cracked and dirty,—not even on a conducted tour could such features as these be concealed. The only shops were Government shops, and outside them were drawn up long *queues* of people, badly dressed and melancholy-looking. Specimens of the prices paid thus to the State as the sole dealer are a minimum of two

dollars for a pair of stockings and a minimum of fifteen dollars for a pair of shoes. A mournful sight was a passing funeral. No cortège, no priest, but a coffin carried briskly by horse and cart. Two officials were sufficient, one to dig the grave, the other to drive the cart and afterwards bring back the coffin, for at the rate the Soviet Government charges for coffins it is unusual to bury one with the corpse. The railway-station, with rotting platforms and weed-grown track, was thronged with people who looked like refugees in war time.

Turning to the better aspects of what he saw, Mr. Tweedy remarks that museums, churches and palaces, with historic interest attached to them, are being preserved with skill and care, that the people—though they were ill clothed and melancholy—did not look underfed, that there is a real effort to provide rest and recreation and some of the comforts of life at possible terms for the labouring classes, and that the train accommodation, for Soviet tourists at least, between Leningrad and Moscow was as perfect, even as luxurious, as could be desired. Constantly the official guides, whose instruction for their job must have been both copious and detailed, would speak of the contrast—to the great advantage of the present régime—between republican and Tsarist days. The visitor was told about what a toll in life had been paid by wretched serfs to build St. Isaac's Cathedral; how a pleasure resort which was formerly open only three months in the year for an Imperial General, his wife and his son, is to-day accommodating 270 weary workers for recuperation and is open all the year round; how everybody has a chance to live in reasonable comfort where in other days there was the blackest destitution, and how, in similar contrast with the past, everyone has now to work, except the sick and the superannuated. Questions, of course, were asked about the Soviet policy towards religion, and it was explained that those few people who want to go to church are still at liberty to do so; that only when priests and their congregations fail to keep a church building in repair, does the Government intervene; and that where such a structure is obviously superfluous, it is converted into a warehouse or a factory "of which Russia has far more need." The official would proceed to point out that an anti-religious movement was made inevitable by the part the old Church took in sustaining the autocracy, but that disestablishment and disendowment did not prohibit exercises of devotion so long as worship was not allowed "to clog the machinery of our social and material development."

An excursion to the late Tsar's favourite residence brought from the chattering guide *en route* many an anecdote to show how

Nicholas II was well-meaning but weak and foolish, how the Tsarina with her limitless superstitions and her so questionable friends had her husband under her thumb, and how the whole opulent surroundings of a royal family's useless life are now turned to proletarian use. Mr. Tweedy recalls that in the Hermitage he saw a peasant group enjoying its garlic and black bread on a silk-covered Empire sofa, and that in the hall of the Winter Palace a long "snack counter" was providing workers with fish and onions at eight cents and twelve cents a plate!

The whole article whets one's appetite for more. Since it appeared, the hideous tale of the treason "trial" in Moscow has shocked the world with its revelation of the depths to which Soviet falsehood and indecency can descend. It is safe to say that none could have surpassed the present Moscow rulers in these respects except themselves, but they actually managed in some features to eclipse even their own record. What Mr. Tweedy reveals, and still more what he suggests, with great care (as I have tried to illustrate) that the brighter sides of the picture shall not be forgotten, must cast lurid light on the optimism of our pro-Russians. But it will be some time before the real truth is known. Meanwhile, is it not obvious that for a country whose international character is lost, and which desires to recover repute, the sooner there can be free access without "chaperonage" for foreign travellers, the better? That is, unless the horrors to be concealed are bad enough to make the suspicions aroused by concealment a still preferable risk.

H. L. S.