

Servant of India

Editor : S. G. VAZE.

Office : SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY, POONA.

VOL. XIX, NO. 44

POONA—THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1936.

INDIAN SUBSN. Rs. 6.
FOREIGN 15s.

CONTENTS.

	Page
TOPICS OF THE WEEK	517
ARTICLES :—	
The Princely Ideal—And Manoeuvre.	520
Currency And Tariffs.	523
REVIEWS :—	
Anglo-Japanese Relations.	
By Prof. M. V. Subrahmanyam, M. A., L. T.	524
Swaminarayanism. By K. G. Mashruwala.	525
SHORT NOTICES.	526
MISCELLANEA :—	
The Spanish Church	526
The Church's Dereliction of Duty.	528

Topics of the Week.

Democratic Swaraj Party.

THE differences between the Congress and Democratic Swaraj Party are being both widened and deepened. The Party held a very successful Conference at Nasik in the week-end, at which the President, Mr. Bhopatkar, launched a vigorous attack on Congress policy in his speech. The main point of difference between the Democratic Swaraj Party and the Congress is on the question of the communal decision. The Congress has modified somewhat its former attitude of neutrality to the decision, but since it forbids any organised opposition to the decision, the Democratic Swaraj Party has still much to quarrel with in the Congress attitude. With all its tenderness towards the Mahomedans, the Congress is not able to enlist more than a handful of Muslims in its ranks. The prohibition of active propaganda against the communal decision in these circumstances is, in the Democratic Swaraj Party's opinion, as impolitic as it is unjust. The Party is not anti-Muslim by any means, but it sees no reason why, only for fear of offending Muslim Congressmen whose number is exceedingly small, the legitimate interests of the Hindus should be allowed to be sacrificed with Congress acquiescence.

ANOTHER point of difference which separates the two parties is the dubious position that the Congress holds in the matter of the reforms. The Congress speaks continuously of overturning the constitution. The Democratic Swaraj Party is not friendly to the constitution to any extent, but it insists that whatever little it is possible to achieve in the way of constructive work within the framework of the constitution

should be achieved in the interests of the masses, and the futility of the constitution should be demonstrated by the paucity of results that attend honest efforts to work the constitution. A third point of difference is the predominance which the Democratic Swaraj Party sees the communistically-minded people have attained in the Congress and the Party is determined to carry on strong propaganda against communism. Resolutions were passed on all these matters, and it was decided to put up candidates at the next provincial elections against the Congress candidates with a view to make the opinions of the Democratic Swaraj Party felt in the legislatures. The relations between the Congress and the Democratic Swaraj Party are now at their worst.

Problem of Detenus.

PUBLIC attention is once more pointedly drawn to the problem of the detenus by another suicide at the Deoli detention camp. We daresay the arrangements in the camp for the provision of creature comforts to their inmates leave little to be desired. In any case in the present case the suicide was due not to any dissatisfaction with the detenu's lot in the camp but to his feeling of helplessness to be of use to his mother in her financial and other difficulties. But the question is not whether the physical needs of the detenus are well attended to in the camps but how long they are to be deprived of their liberty and forced to lead a life of inactivity.

THE young man by name Ganguly whose untimely end in such tragic circumstances is the immediate cause of these reflections was an M. Sc. student of the Dacca University. If he had been left free to go on with his studies he would have in all likelihood given a satisfactory account of himself at the university and later turned out a useful and respectable member of society. But on mere suspicion of his complicity in terrorist activity he was shut up in a detention camp without any limit to the period of his detention being specified. Thus was a promising career not merely damaged but completely destroyed. And for one case that has come prominently into view there may be many others which fail to attract equal notice.

AN important factor that contributed to Ganguly's suicide was, as already stated, the financial difficulties which faced his mother and his powerlessness to afford any relief. Unsympathetic and unimaginative officialdom might point to the allowance sanctioned for the benefit of the family of each detenu as a salve to its conscience and try to make out that Ganguly's anxiety on his mother's behalf was foolish and unwarranted. But is it not a fact that loud complaints are oftentimes heard as to the inadequacy of the allowance? We have no means of judging how far

it was the meagreness of the allowance that brought about the ruination of Ganguly's family, but would press on Government the desirability of going into the matter so as to ensure adequate provision for the comfort of the dependents of the detenus. Public opinion has repeatedly asked for an opportunity being given to the detenus to prove their innocence in a court of law or for the termination of this agony of their indefinite detention.

Ill-Advised Prohibition.

BEFORE the echoes of the public protests against the action of Government in externing Dr. Satyapal from the Frontier Province which he was desirous of visiting for helping organise Congress activity there had time to die down, news comes from South India of a ban on Congress election meetings in Mudukulathore taluka of Madura district. It appears from press reports that a public meeting expressly in furtherance of the Congress election campaign was to have been held at a village by name Kamuthi on the 28th ult. The audience had collected at the appointed time and place and as the proceedings were about to commence after the singing of songs etc., a notice prohibiting the meeting under section 144 Cr. P. C. was served on the organisers. As the Congress is no longer actively wedded to civil disobedience, the meeting was abandoned in obedience to the notice.

THE notice anticipated the public complaint about official interference in elections involved in this action by declaring in advance that though avowedly an election meeting, it was "in reality designed to disseminate matters of a seditious nature," which was likely to result in a breach of the peace. As in all such cases, the only material which the magistrate had before him in coming to this conclusion was the report of the Sub-Inspector of Police. Why should he care to verify the police allegations by independent inquiries? He accepted the police report as gospel truth and straightaway forbade not only this particular meeting but all meetings and conferences in the taluka for an unspecified period which would presumably be two months unless extended by the Government.

FROM the wording of the order it is clear that the Magistrate took his cue from Sir Henry Craik's recent speech in the Assembly reaffirming the Government's policy of neutrality in regard to elections except for stopping the spread of sedition. As recent events have shown, the reservation invests very wide discretionary powers in subordinate officers of Government which the overzealous among them like the author of this prohibitory order will more often than not be tempted to misuse. The Government ought, therefore, to issue instructions designed to prevent such abuses. It is actions such as these that are calculated to strengthen the cause of the Congress and should be scrupulously avoided. Will not the Civil Liberties Unions recently started in different parts of the country interest themselves in such cases of invasions on civil rights in the name of law and order?

Coal Committee.

SO the all too heavy loss of life due to fires and other accidents in coal-mines has at last served to impress the authorities with the urgency of the problem of devising measures both for the prevention of the loss of human life and the conservation of coal assets. Following upon the disastrous fire in the Jharia mines of January last, certain emergency steps

for the protection of miners were taken by Government in consultation with the legislature. But the measures were necessarily of a temporary character and in no way rendered the threshing out of permanent measures to that end unnecessary.

THE Committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Burrows, Commissioner, Burdwan Division, which consists of three Indians and an equal number of Europeans, is expected to grapple with this two-fold task. Its inquiry will be limited to Bengal, Bihar and the C. P. which alone have any coal mines. Some coal fields are to be met with in Hyderabad and Rewa States. Though these States have not been approached for their co-operation in the proposed inquiry, it is hoped that owners of coal mines there will not be behind-hand in acquainting the Burrows Committee with their ideas on the important problems referred to it for consideration.

Consolidation of Holdings in Punjab.

ONE of the last acts of the Punjab Legislative Council before it goes out of existence was the passage at one sitting of legislation designed to promote the consolidation of agricultural holdings. This is unquestionably a step in the right direction by taking which the Punjab legislature has earned the thanks of the people of the province. It may be noted in passing that the law encountered hardly any opposition in Council or from public opinion in general and was in fact described as "non-controversial" by the Revenue Member whose good fortune it was to pilot it successfully through the Council. His good fortune in this respect will be a matter for envy in Bombay where a similar attempt a few years ago met with such determined opposition that a similar Bill had to be withdrawn by Government to the dismay of all those having the true interest of the country at heart.

THE process of consolidation on a voluntary basis through the instrumentality of cooperative societies has been in progress in the Punjab for the last fifteen years. This legislation merely puts in legislative garb the rules and practices prevailing on the subject. The total number of co-operative societies devoted to consolidation was 1,167 last year with a membership of more than 89,000 and the area consolidated as a result of their efforts aggregated to nearly 5¾ lakhs of acres at the average cost of approximately Rs. 2½ per acre.

IT was felt that if the consolidation work was to be undertaken on a province-wide and systematic basis it had to be backed by legislative sanction. Past experience has shown that the recalcitrance of a small knot of agriculturists sometimes holds up the progress of consolidation proceedings covering a wide area even though the generality of the people in the area desire it and has acted as a serious impediment in the way of the success of the scheme. In such cases the minority has in the last resort to be coerced into falling into line in the public interest. A two-thirds majority of land-owners in an estate or its sub-division holding not less than three-fourths of the cultivated area has been prescribed for this purpose in the Bill.

IF a scheme of consolidation as a result of joint consultation among the parties concerned emerges nothing better can of course be desired. Such a scheme would be accepted by Government with the minimum of modifications found unavoidably necessary. Where no such mutually agreed scheme is

however, available, one will be prepared by the consolidation officer in consultation with an advisory committee or panchayat. Provision for an appeal to the Collector in the first instance and to the Commissioner in the second instance is made in the Bill as also for payment of compensation in cases where land of superior quality is exchanged for that of inferior quality.

THE only provision of the Bill that gave rise to some criticism in the Council related to the cost of consolidation proceedings. This, it was provided, should be recovered from persons whose holdings are affected by the scheme of consolidation. An amendment designed to throw the burden entirely on the Government was moved when the Bill was being considered clause by clause. It, however, failed to secure a majority with the result that the Bill as introduced by Government was placed on the Statute book in an unamended form.

Mr. Hansraj on the Andamans.

IN a press interview Raizada Hansraj confirms Sir Yamin Khan's impression about the Andamans being a paradise for the ordinary criminal but not for the political prisoner. The incidence of sickness in the latter class was very much higher than in the former. When the Indian delegation visited the hospitals which were on the whole well kept it found that while the political ward had 25 patients out of a total of 316, the non-political had only 3 out of a total of 550. Many political prisoners were in the habit of losing weight and Mr. Hansraj says that as many as 75 were being given special foods in order to arrest this fall in their weight. In some of these cases the loss of weight was also suspected to have been due to incipient tuberculosis. Complaints about tooth trouble and defective eye-sight were also very common, so much so that the services of a dentist had to be specially requisitioned and the employment of an oculist cannot, it is feared, be long delayed.

SO far as the non-politicals are concerned, it is a matter of common knowledge that only such of them are sent to the Andamans as volunteer to go there, and many of them so volunteer because after serving three months in the cellular jail they have, if they behave themselves, an almost assured chance of regaining their freedom. The non-politicals fall in two categories: (1) self-supporters who have independent means of livelihood and (2) non-self-supporters or Talabdars as they are styled. The Talabdars get Rs. 10 per head per month from the Government, which rises to Rs. 34 a month after 15 or 20 years. If in due course they bring their wife or get married, the wife would receive Rs. 5 a month and each child Rs. 2. The proportion of women to men being very low, there was reason to fear that the moral level of the population was not very high.

SPEAKING about the future of the island, Mr. Hansraj expressed the view that no development of the island along constructive lines was possible until and unless the Andamans ceased to be a penal settlement. As it is, there is no civil administration there but pure police raj, everyone being under the control of the police. The total population was 19,000 spread over an inhabited area of 25 square miles. There were no post-boxes though the villages were situated at great distances from each other. All letters, whether incoming or outgoing, had to pass through the hands of the police, and are in fact carefully censored by them.

THE revelations made by these two visitors obviously call for an independent inquiry into the Andamans problem. It is a thousand pities that the Government do not favour the idea, as was made clear by the Home Member in the Assembly only last month. But an inquiry is necessary as much to reassure Indian opinion as the local-borns in the Andamans. From the address presented by the Local-Born Association to the two visitors it is obvious they are filled with vague misgivings as to their future in case the Andamans should be closed as a penal settlement. The Jails Committee's recommendation to this effect was, they think, based on data which have become out of date and unrelated to existing conditions. The address also voiced some of the hardships like the comparatively very high level of the land revenue demand from which they suffer. It goes without saying that all these matters cannot be properly gone into except by an independent committee, which, we hope, Government will see their way to appoint.

Release of Prisoners.

LAST week witnessed an interesting debate in the Punjab Legislative Council on a motion for the release of martial law prisoners and prisoners in the Lahore conspiracy case. The motion was made by Mrs. Lekhawati Jain whose main argument was that the punishment already suffered by the prisoners should be considered adequate to meet the ends of justice. So far as can be seen from press reports, she did not rest her case on any complaints as to the treatment meted out to these prisoners in the jails. But what about their dependents? In some cases they were deprived of their principal bread-winner and were forced to lead a life of misery and want in consequence. They were indirectly penalised along with the convicted offender. This is very inequitable and should be avoided wherever and whenever possible. Mrs. Jain's contention was that the conspiracy prisoners having undergone imprisonment for nearly twenty-two years and the martial law prisoners about seventeen years, they should be looked upon as having sufficiently paid the penalty of the law and should be restored to their relatives.

THE case for the release of the martial law prisoners has an additional argument in its support. During those days the province was ruled by martial law, which is a negation of law, and the accused did not enjoy even the customary facilities for establishing their innocence by being allowed to engage any counsel they liked. They were also faced by extraordinary difficulties in the collection of evidence. Was it any wonder if in these circumstances impartial justice was very difficult of being meted out? And then who can guarantee that the persons now rotting in jail were the real culprits? It is all very well to make an emotional appeal, as the Finance Member did, in the name of the widows and orphans of the persons who fell a prey to mob fury at the time for the purpose of standing in the way of the release of these prisoners. But such an appeal can be of no help to the widows if the culprits were different.

THE Finance Member stated that there were only two conspiracy case prisoners still in jail, while the martial law prisoners numbered twelve, half of whom were in the Andamans and the other half in the Punjab. This only makes the case for release stronger. It is difficult to believe that the release of such a small number, even supposing they are desperadoes of the worst kind, as alleged by the Government spokesman, would in any way create problems beyond the resources of the local Govern-

with the Government of India. In regard to the making of social or economic inquiries or collection of statistics concerning all-India, the Princes' demand is: The federal legislature shall have no power to make laws providing for these things in the States without the rulers' consent. "No State officer shall be compelled to go to give evidence before a committee of the (federal) legislature without the consent of the ruler of the State."

Now what does all this mean? Whatever rights a State has it will retain to the end. Whatever action in regard to a subject agreed to as federal is necessary in a State can be taken only with the consent of the Prince. Whatever laws the federal legislature may pass will be executed in the State by the State's officials. It is possible for those who are given to wishful thinking to say: "These restrictions look very severe on paper; but in practice they will not hamper," as there are some who say: "The Princes' demand for the nomination of the States' representatives may be agreed to, for their nominees will in fact be as good as or better than the elected representatives in the provinces of British India." But is it really possible to hope that in matters in which theoretically the consent of the ruler should not be required it would always be forthcoming if required and that local administration will really be as satisfactory as central administration? Again, even assuming that the ruler's consent can be had for the asking, why should it be necessary to ask for it? What is the purpose of the federation? It is to establish a government which should be able to shape and enforce a common policy in matters of common interest without reference to the constituent units. If every time something is proposed in regard to which the Princes still have some vestige of theoretical control left to them the federal government has to run round to every Prince, big or small, and ask for his consent, then surely federation serves no purpose whatever. The Princes have lost control over most of the matters now included in the federal list. If in regard to the few which they may be supposed to control even now they will insist upon maintaining their real or imagined rights, then their contribution to federation merely consists in their sharing with British India the customs receipts which by rights do not belong to them. The Ministers' memorandum gives documentary proof of what was well known to the observant before, viz., that the States will not, for the sake of federation, surrender any fraction of the very fragmentary internal sovereignty which they possess.

II.

IF this is the position there should be no question about the Princes being willing to join the federation—on the terms outlined in the Ministers' committee's report adopted by the Princes, and there is really no question. No one should run away with the impression that the Princes are divided. They are not, and they will all join the federation. They are intelligent enough to know that they are not called upon to make the least sacrifice, and that all the

sacrifice that is required is exacted from British India. They will join federation, but after a good deal of lugubration. They rent the welkin with cries when the Reforms Bill was being debated in Parliament, but Sir Samuel Hoare knew that they were only manoeuvring for a bargaining position and was not unduly daunted. Similarly, let British India entertain no foolish hope that the Princes will stay away from federation. They will come in sure enough. For some time they pretended that they were entering federation against their own inclinations and only in order to oblige British India. They even challenged British India to say that she did not want them. British India accepted the challenge and told them to keep away for her sake. At once they dropped this pose. Now they are trying the same game with the Viceroy. But he too knows that their reluctance is feigned, and that if the terms outlined in the Ministers' memorandum are accepted even in part they will be only too willing to be in the federation.

Some of the Princes are, it is true, putting up a mock opposition, but they do not need to be converted. Their opposition will be withdrawn at the opportune moment. But if they needed to be convinced, Khan Bahadur Nabi Baksh Mahomed Hussain's arguments would carry conviction to the dullest among them. He invited any of his colleagues to state in which of the 47 subjects included in Schedule 7 their Highnesses had undiluted sovereignty and whether it was not possible by fundamental limitations to safeguard their Highnesses' present rights in these matters. In regard to the scheme of federal finance, he pointed out that there was no direct liability on the States except the corporation tax after ten years and some excise duties. Translated into simple English, this means: "The Indian States are not, like members of other federations, sovereign and independent. In other federations the component parts have to give up their real autonomy in order to form a political organisation which will act like one body on matters of common interest to all of them. In the Indian federation these matters of common interest are not of wide extent. They are deliberately so defined that the jurisdiction of the federation will be very severely limited. Matters which are regarded as of common interest in other federations are of set purpose excluded from the Indian federation, and the matters that are included are such that in regard to them the States have already lost practically all power. They have either surrendered this power to the British Government by treaty or the British Government has deprived them of it by the exercise of its paramountcy rights. Anyway, the States cannot control these matters at their discretion, and it is only such matters that are to be made federal. The result is that by joining federation the States will lose nothing of value; on the contrary they will stand to regain what they have lost if they promise to enter only a nominal partnership with British India. To this partnership the States will contribute nothing; British India will contribute everything. One can understand objection on the part of British India to admit the States to federation. The States"

objection to coming into federation is wholly unintelligible. Nor do the States suffer financially. Here too all the gain is on the side of the States, and the loss on the side of British India. The States will only be liable to corporation tax; all other taxes will be indirect, and they are taxes which British India even now has a right to levy and does in fact levy on them without saying as much as 'by your leave'. Not only this, but the States will share equally with British India in the customs receipts. Till now their right even to a small share in these receipts was challenged. So the dice are loaded in favour of the States. Why should they object? If even in spite of all this federation is likely to affect them prejudicially, safeguards can be provided with the full support of the British Government, and the amendments to the Instrument of Accession that have been drawn up furnish such safeguards in ample measure."

No doubts could survive this reasoning. But if any still remained, the Chancellor of the Princes' Chamber, the Maharaja Rana of Dholpur, said enough to conjure them away. He said:

If we are well organised, I can visualise the possibility of creating a liaison for all-India purposes only with the vested interests outside our States. A large accession of strength to this party later on could be had from the landed aristocracy and the aristocracy of wealth in British India also. We could thus bring into being an all-India conservative party, which would exercise that influence in the future destinies of this country which a party composed of stable elements always does in preserving and enhancing prosperity and healthy growth.

This opens out another vista of bright prospects to the rulers of States. His Highness says: "We are all afraid that British Indian democracy will overrun the States. This is a perfectly legitimate fear. We cannot insulate ourselves from the democratic tendencies of British India even if we shut ourselves up each in his State. We shall only be small autocratic rulers in a sea of democracy, and our subjects are sure to be infected with the frenzy of British Indian democracy. There is no way to protect us if we remain isolated. If, however, we join the federation, we shall preserve our autocracy intact. More, we can make autocracy rule British India too. There is plenty of conservatism in British India. But it is disheartened. By itself it will be too feeble. Let us make common cause with it, and the whole of India—not only our own States, but British India too—will be ours. India will come under the domination of an oligarchic and plutocratic ring, and we can be the predominant partners in this ring. This is a golden opportunity, not merely of self-preservation but of conquest. Let us seize it." Will the British Government be unfriendly to such a combination? The Chancellor had a word on that too. He said: "If India must be saved from political catastrophe, it is necessary that all stable elements in the country should be brought together to influence the future of the country. In doing so we shall be truly serving the Indian Empire, thus rightly fulfilling the generations—old obligations that we owe to the one and only real magnet which binds us together, namely, the House of Windsor—our beloved King-Emperor." (Here we give the Maharaja's exact words and do not

paraphrase them.) After this, will the British Government be indifferent to federation? Will it not rather force it upon the Princes if they should be unwilling to join it, which is unlikely?

All this was known to every thinking person before. For instance, *Great Britain and the East* wrote recently:

One thing alone will save the central legislature from a Congress majority, and this will be the adhesion of the States. The Princes have it in their power to make India one of the most conservative countries in the world. Eliminate the Princes, and the "die-hards" and many others would have a legitimate fear that India is rushing towards a communist dictatorship. Bring in the Princes, and the Radicals have a not altogether unreasonable complaint that progress has been made difficult and slow. Throughout the next phase in Indian history there is bound to be a continued conflict between the democratic ideal and the princely ideal. We do not know when the fusion between the two ideals will occur or how it will be accomplished. But any princely decision to abstain from entering the federation will be disastrous.

It will be disastrous to British imperialism, and the British imperialists, knowing this, will pay any price to avert the disaster by securing the Princes' entry into federation. The only price the Princes require is that paramountcy shall not be exercised against them, and this price will be paid. Result: The Princes will be all-powerful in federal matters, and their autocracy will reign unchecked in internal matters. What more can they want?

III.

HERE we come up against a fundamental problem of policy. The federation is most certainly being devised for the purpose of checkmating the democratic elements in British India. The Princes accept it, as eventually they are certain to do, in that light. They will receive every manner of support from British imperialism. They will gather round themselves all the reactionary forces in British India, and the ultimate conflict will be between the progressive and reactionary groups in Indian society. Only through this conflict will emerge the conflict between Indian democracy and British imperialism. But there is little recognition of this even in the progressive circles in British India, and there is hardly any in the high command of the Congress. Consider, for instance, the attitude that Mahatma Gandhi adopted towards federation in the Round Table Conference. He gave fulsome praise to "the great Princes" for being willing to surrender much of their internal sovereignty in order that a federation should be formed. "I feel, and I know," he said, "that they have the interests of the ryots at heart. (This was quite an unnecessary and indeed irrelevant remark even if it were true, but the great devotee of truth has a knack of persuading himself of the truth of what is sheerly and blatantly untrue.) I know that they claim jealously to guard their interests; but they will, if all goes well, more and more come in contact with popular India, if I may so call British India; and they will want to make common cause with the inhabitants of that India, and the inhabitants of that India would want to make common cause with the

Princes' India. . . . The Princes, be it said to their credit, when they declared themselves frankly and courageously in favour of federation, claimed also to be of the same blood with us—claimed to be our kith and kin."

From this utterance two conclusions stand out. First, that Mahatma Gandhi had not the smallest inkling of the inner motives of those who were pushing on the federal scheme, nor could he anticipate what sinister part the Princes would play or would be made to play in Indian politics. He thought that the Princes would make common cause with British India. Little did he realise that the portion of British India with which they would make common cause is the portion consisting of the privileged and propertied classes, and that they would make common cause not to fight for democracy but to keep democracy down. Second, he always thought of a line-up of political forces in India on a nationalistic basis. The Princes after all are Indians; they would join with progressive elements in British India—against imperialism; and it would be the duty of progressive politicians in British India to join with them. This was his reasoning. It led him to toady to the Princes and to sacrifice the States' people. He thought federation would be a very desirable thing inasmuch as it would enable Indians to present a united front to the British Government. A little reflection, however, would have taught him what is now clear to all who have acquainted themselves with the recent Bombay meeting of the Princes and Ministers, viz. that by federation the British Indian people and the Princes do not offer a united front to the British Government, but the British Government and the Princes offer a united front to the British Indian people. Federation is essentially the formation of a conservative, oligar-

chic and plutocratic bloc against the budding democracy in British India. Mahatma Gandhi did not see it this way at the Round Table Conference; nor is there any evidence to show that he or his Big Three or Four see it this way even now.

There was some hope of a change in this outlook of the Congress leaders when the mantle of Congress presidentship fell upon Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, but Pandit Jawaharlal cannot avoid contacts with Wardha, and after a certain visit of his to Wardha, he too has begun to speak of nationalism as the main plank in the Indian movement for freedom. He knows well enough that, after federation at all events, a reorientation of our political methods must be brought about, and that the old nationalistic attitude will not now serve. But that he has to advocate the views shows that the leadership in the Congress still believes that the future fight will be between Indians and Britishers. The speeches made by the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes and the Maharaja of Panna should give the leaders much food for thought. Now at least they should know that the Princes are on the other side of the barricade, and that the fight will be between the progressives and reactionaries in British India joined to the Princes and the British Government. Nor is it going to be the case that the differences between the various classes in India can be ignored for some time till the British Government is made to cry for mercy. The British Government has sheltered itself behind the Princes and other Indian vested interests, and till these are put in their place the British Government's power cannot be touched. The pronouncements of the Mahatma's "great Princes" at the Bombay meeting should open the eyes of all Congress leaders, but will they?

CURRENCY AND TARIFFS.

THE League of Nations is at present doing far more valuable work in its Second Committee set up to consider economic and financial questions than in the Assembly. Mr. Campbell, New Zealand's delegate, voiced this sentiment in the Committee. He remarked that the present session of the League Assembly was, like its predecessors, a disappointment and that all eyes were directed hopefully on the proceedings of the Second Committee. This remark is fully borne out by the discussions that took place in the Committee after the Three Power declaration concerning the devaluation of the franc regarding the need for the liberation of international trade by the relaxation of import quotas and foreign-exchange controls. The ground for these discussions was well prepared by the report submitted by the Economic Committee to the League Council only a fortnight before the devaluation of the franc was announced. The Committee in its report called attention to the difference in price-levels that prevailed between countries which had maintained their gold parities and those which had depreciated their currencies. It did not presume to advise the gold countries by what method it would be expedient for

them to bring their internal prices into line with external prices, whether by devaluation or deflation, but it broadly hinted that, in the interest of revival in international trade, it would be best for them to lower the artificial rate of their currency than to take restrictive measures by imposing quotas and exchange control. For, it said, "In order to maintain the value of a currency or an excessive price-level in the face of opposing international tendencies (in the dollar and sterling countries which account for more than half the total volume of world trade), a whole series of restrictive measures must, inevitably be applied. Experience shows that such measures aggravate the disparity in prices against which action is directed, increasingly weakening the national economy and preventing it from regaining the impetus which is essential to a sound recovery." But it says that in case monetary devaluation be decided upon, it should be brought about, if maximum of gain is to be derived from it, by the co-operation of other countries, and that it should be accompanied by the suppression of trade barriers.

Currency adjustment has been made by the French Government by arriving at an understanding

with the two other biggest creditor countries in the world. The United Kingdom and the United States have promised not to use counter depreciation in order to meet any adverse effects flowing from the depreciation of the French currency on their commerce. They have on the contrary agreed to use the Exchange Equalisation Funds at their disposal to support the new exchange value of the French currency, a consideration on which the League's Economic Committee laid special stress. This being accomplished, it is necessary that the Committee's recommendation about the free movement of capital and goods be carried into effect. France has taken a long step in this direction. Her monetary law passed Parliament on 1st October and two days afterwards she took steps to lift quotas and lower tariffs. She abolished one-quarter of the import quotas; reduced customs duties on goods not subject to quotas by 15 and 20 per cent.; reduced the cost of the import licence for goods subject to quotas by 20 per cent.; abolished the compensating exchange tax on goods coming from Australia, Egypt, British India, New Zealand and South America; fixed that on goods coming from China and Japan at 10 per cent.; lowered the customs duty on coffee, pepper, tea and mineral oils; drew up a new customs tariff based on the classification adopted by the League's technical experts with the intention of bringing it into force when other countries had removed restrictions on trade and foreign-exchange; and appointed a committee for the substitution of customs duties for the remaining quotas. These are important measures, and though they are primarily adopted with a view to preventing internal price inflation they will be useful in stimulating international trade.

Other countries took similar action or announced their intention to do so if it was imitated elsewhere. Holland abolished quotas on leather, furniture and linoleum and is arranging to abolish others, a third of her imports being subject to quotas. The Swiss Government announced that it would reduce customs duties on foodstuffs and articles of prime necessity, and its delegate on the Economic Committee declared that "steps would be taken to open the frontiers more widely to foreign commodities, both by reducing customs duties and by adjusting quotas, some of which would be abolished and others enlarged." However, he added that "his Government did not intend to extend those benefits to all importing countries." "In the case of countries which had introduced very severe payment restrictions," he said, "Switzerland could not unilaterally abandon the safeguards she had hitherto adopted." Italy abolished the 15 per cent. *ad valorem* import duty on many foodstuffs and raw materials and reduced duties on certain commodities, including flour, wheat (from 75 to 47 lire a quintal), raw and worked cotton, coal (from 10 to 5 lire a ton), coke, vegetable oils, live cattle (a 65 per cent. reduction), and meat (a 60 per cent. reduction). The Czechoslovak Government declared itself in favour of foregoing the policy of exchange control and framed an initial scheme for relaxing, to some extent, previous regulations. These first steps taken by countries which have reduced the gold value of their currency will lead

one may expect, to other longer steps in future, when they find that such tariff walls and exchange restrictions were no longer necessary, but in this general movement the United Kingdom apparently does not intend to take any part. Mr. W. S. Morrison, the British Government's delegate, declared that Great Britain would play a waiting game. "I am aware," he said, "that in some quarters we are urged to take the lead in economic matters, presumably by making some large-scale and dramatic gesture which would in itself herald a new era of prosperity for all the world. We are apt to prefer, as is our British way, a pragmatic and practical approach to economic problems, and we think there are certain moves which must be made by other countries before a general economic recovery can begin." And Mr. Chamberlain, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, made it clear that Great Britain would maintain the "system of very moderate protection which we have established."

But more radical changes must come. To these Mr. Campbell of New Zealand gave forceful expression. "The Second Committee," he said, "should not give the impression of being engrossed exclusively by questions which, after all, were only the outer fringe of the major economic problems. As a safeguard against the repetition of evils they were now trying to combat, tariff adjustments, 'barrier-sweeping' and gradual reductions in import restrictions were not enough. What was needed was to tackle the central problem (of poverty in the midst of plenty) and radically modify the economic structure of the various countries if the material situation of the masses were to be improved. Distribution should be organised on lines that were really for the general advantage. For this purpose the general economic order should be directed towards a system based on really co-operative and collectivist foundations. No tangible results would be obtained till that was done." This is an ideal, but a relaxation of the direct and indirect restrictions on trade would undoubtedly contribute largely to general economic recovery.

Reviews.

ANGLO-JAPANESE RELATIONS.

JAPAN MUST FIGHT BRITAIN. By TOTA ISHIMARU. (Hurst & Blackett.) 1936. 22cm. 288p. 16/-

A NEW approach to a study of Anglo-Japanese relations would doubtless be welcome and the above work is a definite attempt to supply the want. But it is unfortunate that a work displaying a thorough grasp of international politics and much ability should have been undertaken in a spirit of partisanship. We are in perfect agreement with the main thesis of the author that Japan needs territorial possessions and natural resources for her increasing population and that England can do something to find a way out of the difficulty. In fact, on the eve of the Italo-Abyssinian War, Mr. George Lansbury suggested a World Conference of 'Haves' and 'Have-nots' to discuss how best to distribute the colonies among the nations of the world so as to avoid international friction. That Japan is one of the 'malcontents' is a well-known

fact, but the tone adopted by the author is not likely to achieve its purpose. The author is a military and naval expert, who has laid down the sword—probably temporarily—to take up the pen. The author's slogan is that Manchuria alone is not enough for Japan's needs, that Japan must be given facilities in all the markets of the world to dump her goods, that she must be allowed to colonise Australia and that her supremacy in the Western Pacific must be admitted. If these things are not granted, Japan will declare war on England in which, according to the author, Japan has got splendid chances of crushing England.

One may wonder why the author is cocksure of Japan's victory in the event of an Anglo-Japanese war. It is amusing to read his reasons in Chapters IX, X, XI, and XII. According to the author, England's naval primacy is a thing of the past. Japan hopes to rouse Egypt and India against Britain and secure Soviet assistance against England. He also suggests a plan of naval strategy to crush the English fleet. Our only criticism is whether all that the author lays down in his book will materialise. He thinks that India is ripe for revolt against British rule on account of the broken pledges of British statesmen. Anyone who knows Indian political conditions knows that this reading of the Indian situation is entirely wrong. In the Great War of 1914 the Germans hoped that India would revolt, but everyone knows that England's adversity gave India an opportunity to demonstrate her loyalty to the British connection by sending men and money. Again, the author thinks that Egypt would revolt against Britain and that the latter would lose command of the Suez Canal. If the author were to read the Anglo-Egyptian treaty concluded the other day he would revise his opinion. The author is also hopeful of the Japanese navy crushing the British navy, if the Japanese fleet were to invade Australia on the outbreak of the war and if it were to capture Hong-kong and invest Singapore before the British fleet arrived. This is to credit the all-powerful British Fleet with ignorance of the elements of naval warfare. The author himself admits that the Singapore naval base was built to suit the requirements of British naval strategy in the Far Eastern waters and to control the trade route to China. Will the British Admiralty be foolish enough to allow Singapore to be invested by the Japanese fleet immediately on the outbreak of war? We therefore feel that the chapters dealing with the so-called weak points of England need not be taken seriously.

In the section dealing with "Insurrection in India" there are a number of mistakes. To give a few of them. On page 224 the author says, "By the present law, which was promulgated in 1919, Indians have control in one department only of local affairs, to wit, that of education." This is wrong. Education is one of the departments transferred to popular control. Again, on page 227 the author says, "the revised constitution establishes a confederation." It should be read as 'Federation.' Further, on page 228 the author says that in 1932 at the Calcutta University convocation a lady student tried to assassinate the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal. It should be noted that Bengal has a Governor and not a Lieutenant Governor.

Though the author says that he is not a militarist trying to bring about a war between Britain and Japan, we are afraid that his book will be regarded as a war ultimatum to England if the latter did not give Japan some of her colonies, accommodate her sons in Australia and allow free admission of her goods to the Empire markets. It is astonishing with what airy grace the author wafts aside problems, the difficulties of which looked at from the right perspective have confronted those in authority since the British Empire began. It is easy to present

what the author considers a counsel of perfection, but mighty difficult to sway hearts and minds and convince people of the necessity of adopting it.

The whole book is anti-British. The author points out that Britain which once concluded an alliance with Japan is now her enemy. We are not prepared to say that England is an enemy of Japan. We would rather say that England is now suspicious of Japanese designs in Asia. We may point out that Japan's part in the Manchurian episode alienated not only England but world public opinion. The author also says that the Singapore naval base is directed against Japan. On the contrary, it is intended to protect British territorial and commercial interests in the Pacific. It was Japanese imperialism in the Pacific and on the continent of Asia that has made Britain strengthen the naval base at Singapore. Japan's Twenty-One Demands on China during the Great War, her occupation of Manchuria and Jehol, her fortification of the mandated colonies formerly in the possession of Germany, her financing the construction of a canal through the Isthmus of Kra, about 600 miles north of Singapore, and finally her vast expenditure on naval construction have made statesmen all over the world regard Japan as a danger to the peace of the Pacific, and Britain which has been watching these developments has taken steps only to safeguard her interests. The blame should therefore be thrown on Japan and not on Britain.

We are sorry to remark that the author who has an excellent command of world politics should write from a narrow chauvinistic and military point of view. Is war the only method of achieving Japan's purpose and obtaining her vital needs? If Japan were to resort to war, then Germany will follow her example. The result will be another world war and the ruin of modern civilisation. But the book serves to show the vital requirements of Japan, and England and other countries must do something to satisfy Japan.

We cannot help referring to the admirable way in which Capt. G. V. Rayment has translated the book from its original Japanese version.

M. V. SUBRAHMANYAM.

SWAMINARAYANISM.

SRI SWAMI NARAYANA. By MANILAL C. PAREKH. (Harmony House, Rajkot.) 1936. 22cm. 350p. Rs. 5.

SRI SWAMI NARAYAN *alias* Sahajananda was one of the makers of Gujarat. He flourished from 1779 to 1828 A. D., and for nearly twenty-eight years preached his gospel in Gujarat, Kathiawar and Cutch and established a great sect. Between him and Mahatma Gandhi, there has been none who attained in Gujarat a position of extraordinary eminence and influence over men, Swami Dayanand's mission having been largely executed outside the province of his birth. His life is full of interest and his teaching gives one, thirsty of the love and grace of God, a nectar which never becomes too much. As one begins to put seriously his teachings into practice, one experiences within oneself day by day the feeling that one is indeed being 'redeemed' and getting nearer the source of his being.

There was no good biography of the Master in English. 'Bhai' M. C. Parekh has supplied the deficiency very satisfactorily. Though not a follower of the sect, he has studied the sect and the life and teachings of its founder and his principal disciples with the earnestness of a follower, and, out of the enormous literature and traditions of the sect, carefully selected the material for his work. Though there are a few minor inaccuracies here and there, the book as a whole

presents the Master as his followers love to look upon him, and aptly justifies the title 'God in Redemptive Action,' which the author has given to his book as an alternative name.

'Bhai' Parekh sees a great resemblance between Christ and Swami Narayana and between the spirit fostered in the two sects. He is not alone in thinking so, one reason being that Swaminarayanism accepts the Vishishtadwaita philosophy, and of all the philosophical systems of India that of Ramanuja has appealed most to the Christian, as being based on the conception of a personal God and of a sort of Trinity in one. Then there is also a kind of 'conversion' accepted by both. This unhappy word has been abused by religious missionaries by restricting its meaning to 'change from one religious denomination into another'—*Dharmantara* as it is called in the Indian languages. But conversion is a far greater and deeper thing than this 'change of denomination'. The conversion which all the great teachers have preached and brought about in their followers is the conversion or turning round from a life of ungodliness and want of living faith into one of godliness and living faith. The conversion which took place in John Bunyan or in St. Francis of Assisi is one to the point. Some event happens in a man's life, often a live touch with a great and holy spirit, a great Guru, which so thoroughly and deeply impresses itself upon him that quickly thereafter he becomes a transformed man. This is a far different thing from the ugly competition for increasing the number of followers, misnamed 'conversion.' Conversion is not *dharmantara* (change of religion) but *dharma-maya-Jivana* (life of religion). One sure test of the right sort of conversion is that the convert thereafter leads a life of greater purity, self-sacrifice and suffering. Such conversion has a very high place in Swaminarayanism as it has in Christianity proper.

Bhai Parekh has discovered many more parallels between the two religions. To a certain extent it may be due to his equal prepossession for both the Masters. Indeed, in his quest for salvation, Bhai Parekh had once embraced Christianity in some form, though even at that time he was an admirer of Swami Narayana also.

The translation of the 'Shiksha-Patri', which the author has appended to his book is rather inaccurate and unhappy in several places and requires to be recast.

I commend the book to men of the religious temperament, as also to the student of the history of Gujarat. The former will find in it much food for the enrichment of his faith, and the latter will appreciate better how the ground for the present Gandhian movement was slowly prepared during nearly a century past.

K. G. MASHRUWALA.

THE SPANISH CHURCH.

In an article "Back of the Spanish Rebellion" in the October number of *Foreign Affairs*, Laurence A. Fernsworth, for some years correspondent of the Times in Barcelona, describes how the Church joined with other privileged and propertied classes in keeping the people in misery. "With respect to the Church," he says, "many persons inquire in amazement how it can be that in a Catholic country Catholic people can turn with as much vehement fury as was ever recorded of Protestants in the old days of church persecutions." And he answers this inquiry thus :

UP to the advent of the Republic there existed a kind of union of church and state which meant that the clergy and the hierarchy were paid from the public treasury; the Bishops were

SHORT NOTICES.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN. BY D. W. BROGAN.
(Duckworth.) 1935. 20cm. 143p. 2/-.

ANY life of Abraham Lincoln, however ill-written, is an inspiration to students of history and lovers of liberty; and this little volume is one of the best written books on the subject. Lincoln was entirely a self-made man and his romantic career from the logcabin to the 'White House' is narrated here, not in the florid style which is the bane of Indian biographers but in a strikingly sober but eloquent style worthy of a true historian. The author has devoted much attention to the public events of those times and to Lincoln's share in those events. But he has not neglected to do justice to the purely personal traits of Lincoln. Lincoln commenced his political career about a hundred years ago, and as we read his life story we are unconsciously led to compare the present to the past and assess the immeasurable progress achieved since then in every walk of life. The eminently judicial tone of the narrative together with the discriminating delineation of main events have enhanced the value of this book.

A.

THE BRITISH EMPIRE AND COMMONWEALTH. By JAMES A. WILLIAMSON. (Macmillan) 1935. 21cm. 404p. 6/-

THOUGH primarily written for the use of Senior Forms of English Schools, this short history of the British Empire and Commonwealth should not be without interest to the general reader as well. As the author correctly points out, its subject is one whose study is becoming ever more desirable as the world grows smaller and new political combinations take shape. With the rapid increase of responsibilities and obligations of the international system, the democracies of the British Commonwealth need clearer ideas of their own development and mutual relationships. Mr. Williamson's treatment of this difficult subject is clear though concise; his style is simple but dignified. Speaking of India on the eve of the Great War he writes :

Educated India was uneasy and ready for change. Extremists were noisy but few. More numerous were those who desired to attain further reform by orderly methods. But outnumbering all others were those simple folk who had no desire at all but to live and work in the peace that Great Britain had conferred on India.

The book closes with 1914.

S. R. SHARMA.

the nominees of the King, that is to say, were political personages addicted to the regime; certain Bishops were members of the Senate; the church had intervention in the national schools for the purpose of teaching religion. In other words, the church was the ally of the State; but the state was regarded by the people as their oppressor. At least, illiterate and hungering masses saw it that way. Moreover, the church constituted a heavy drain upon the economic resources of the country. It was top-heavy with clergy—sixteen to twenty of them could be seen any day at some modest funeral, each one collecting his fee. And how many times have I walked into some cathedral to find a solemn or a pontifical mass being celebrated in all liturgical pomp with the assistance of the entire-

cathedral chapter and in the presence of only three or four of the faithful!

The people had their chief contacts with the church for funerals, masses and dispensations. They arrived at the conclusion that the church was a *negocio*, a business. Some of the clergy lived scandalous lives. Too many of them were accused of attempting to dominate the households with which they had contact, of setting themselves up as bosses in the villages, and of much more. In consequence the clergy came to lose the respect of great sectors of the population if not, indeed, of a majority of Spanish Catholics. Hundreds of thousands were completely driven away from the church. Others, the anti-clericals, drew a sharp line between clericalism and Catholicism. Of such were the many good practising Catholics who favoured the Republic and who bitterly resented the attempts of the clergy to make them oppose it.

Let *El Socialista* (April 11, 1936) complete the record of the Opposition's complaint against the church:

The monarchy did nothing but deliver itself over to the intrigues of Rome, whose tendency to exercise temporal power and privilege in the affairs of state is irrepressible. Bishops and parish priests shared political control with governors and mayors. The Papal Nuncio was accustomed to have greater influence than the Prime Minister. There existed the anachronistic situation of two systems of law incompatible with the sovereignty of a law and indivisible state: the canonical law and the civil law. Religious indifference was deemed an offence against the fatherland and public functionaries were participants in liturgical services. The consequences of this Byzantinism were that the people reacted in equal degree against the church and the monarchy which appeared in umbilical union. Upon the fall of the monarchy there was severed this morbid juncture. The state proclaimed its absolute power in matters of law and laicism. . . . The church, however, has not resigned itself, and its latest offence is that which is represented by the CEDA. . . . We men of each, respectful of the ecstasies of others, merely ask that the priestly caste do not stir up the rancour of its sheep against our political institutions.

The foregoing sums up the viewpoint of those who sought to bring about the separation of church and state by radical processes. The reference to the respectfulness of the average Spaniard toward religious worship appears true to this writer. It seems improbable that after the initial outburst of church burning in 1931 there would have been further violence against the church if it had had wisdom to let well enough alone. Indeed by prudence and patience, by recourse to what it itself calls "Christian resignation," by showing a disposition to mend its ways, it might very well have gradually recaptured much lost sympathy, have procured an abatement of some of the religious laws and won a full recognition of its legitimate rights. If, for instance, the Republic had been convinced that the clergy would not use the church schools as centres of propaganda against a government which the Supreme Pontiff himself had found not incompatible with the church's interests, it seems fairly certain that in time it would again have had its schools. Unfortunately the church did not see it that way. It went hand-in-glove with a party and a leader who were known to be the Republic's arch-enemies. The people felt that to maintain itself in power the church stood ready to wreck the Republic. And so the church drew destruction upon its own head.

I do not mean to suggest that within the Spanish church organization there were not sincere and self-sacrificing men and women; efficient and altruistic institutions of learning and charity; priests, monks

and nuns dedicated to the service of humanity. I refer particularly to the Franciscan order which was close to the people according to the testimony of many revolutionists themselves. But in actual practice the members of that order were somewhat in the position of ugly ducklings vis-a-vis the church organization. All these sincere and innocent people were the unwitting victims of "the system," of the Spanish church's imprudent procedure, of its absolutism. With it they have fallen.

Let us now examine briefly the "anti-church" measures to which the Republic had recourse. The hierarchy and the clergy were cut off from the public payroll. They were permitted to exercise their sacerdotal functions as they pleased but were forbidden to earn a livelihood as teachers. Cemeteries were laicized; religious burials required that the deceased should have given permission before his death; public religious funerals required the permission of the local authorities (but they were rarely prohibited); religious processions such as were held in the streets on great festivals likewise required permission (they were in the main disallowed, although the Seville Holy Week processions went on as usual). Local authorities sometimes harassed the church by prohibiting the ringing of church bells or putting a tax upon them.

A special law dissolved the Jesuit order and confiscated its property. Another special law, known as the religious congregations law, suppressed religious schools and limited the activities of the religious orders, placing them under strict state supervision although not suppressing them. The third of the trilogy of religious laws provided for the nationalization of church property. This law simply declared all church property, inclusive of treasures, to be the property of the nation, on the ground that it had not been acquired in the way of ordinary property and so did not fall into the same category; it was held to constitute an unearned patrimony of national wealth and therefore to be the patrimony of the people. The nationalization of church property did not mean its confiscation. All such property was left in the possession of the church, down to the last chalice and candlestick, with not the slightest restriction on its use. The only limitation was that it could not be disposed of by the church as though it were private property. Neither could it be disposed of by the state, which was specifically charged with its protection and upkeep. Furthermore, as state property it was exempt from taxation, a fact which would seem to constitute the lifting of a great burden from the church. Finally, diplomatic relations with the Holy See were not severed. The Papal Nuncio remained at Madrid, and during the first biennium there would have been a Spanish Ambassador at the Vatican (as indeed there was during the "black biennium") had not the Vatican declined to accept the appointee.

This is a succinct summing up of the treatment received by the church at the hands of the Spanish Republic. If some of the measures seemed unjustifiably harsh, they were not without a prospect of remedy. It may also be commented that they were not so harsh as the things that were done to the church in countries such as Mexico and Germany.

Nevertheless the church threw all the weight of its clergy, its press and its amenable followers into the political struggle. There was formed, simultaneously with "Accion Popular", a great organization of laymen, women and children, and even clergy known as "Accion Catolica." Every individual owning the name of Catholic was urged to join it. "Accion Catolica" was no more than an adjunct to "Accion Popular", and when the elections of 1936 were preparing it boldly flung itself into the political

campaign against the Popular Front. A single citation is enough—the manifesto of the Archdiocesan Junta of "Accion Catolica" for the Archdiocese of Tarragona, forewarning Catholics of "the dangers of the triumph of the revolution in the forthcoming elections" and enjoining upon them the "duty" of voting "the announced candidacy of order", since by so doing they would be conforming to the desire of the Pontiff recently set forth by His Eminence Cardinal Goma, Archbishop of Toledo and Primate of Spain. This manifesto added: "Abstention in these circumstances would be a desertion and a betrayal of the fatherland and a manifest disobedience to the norms which, in the present situation, have been outlined by the Holy See and the Spanish Episcopacy. Let all then vote as a single man, with a single ticket, for religion and the fatherland."

I can bear personal witness regarding good Catholics of scant Republican sympathies who, shocked by this attempt to tell them how to vote, either abstained or voted for the Republic. The manifesto was widely published in the press, and its appearance is particularly cited in two Barcelona newspapers of non-political and moderate tendencies which maintain church pages for their readers, *El Noticiero*, February 8, and *La Vanguardia*, February 11 and 12.

Attempted church dictation in politics had already showed itself in the national elections of 1931, only a few months after the Republic was proclaimed. This was revealed by various pastoral letters of the Episcopacy at that time, particularly that of Cardinal Segura, the Primate, which merited his expulsion from Spain. By the time of the Catalan regional elections of November 1932 the political intervention of the church was well organized. Voters were deluged with literature (of which I retain some specimens) informing them that "their consciences did not permit" them to vote for a Left candidate. It is a commentary on the disposition of the extremists not to be provoked to further excesses that no campaign of violence against the church ensued. An occasional attack upon a church occurred, particularly during the 1934 uprising, but there was no widespread or systematic attack for five years.

Penitents of the church have been compelled to don sackcloth and ashes. They have gone to Canossa. But the Spanish church never does. It does not look into its own heart, it does not make an examination of conscience or a confession of error. Its defenders abroad, moreover, represent it as the victim of completely unreasoning persecution without practical cause. The gates of hell are simply presumed to have been opened against it.

CHURCH'S DERELICTION OF DUTY.

In the Spanish civil war both sides are guilty of the most inhuman atrocities, but the Catholic newspapers speak of the rebel outrages in a very complacent way and also generally ignore the fact that the Church itself by identifying itself with the reactionary forces that sponsored the rebellion was in no small measure responsible for the blood-bath that is taking place in Spain. For once we come across a catholic journal recently started in Ottawa, the Social Forum, "with permission of the ecclesiastical authorities," which says boldly that the rebellion was due partly to the indifference of the Catholics

in that country to the principles of the Catholic Church. An extract from this article in the August number of the magazine is given below:

FOLLOWING the accounts of the struggle, it is difficult not to take sides. Nor is it to be wondered if the pious Christian who reads of the burning of churches and the machine-gunning of priests and nuns by bands of Reds, should be tempted to cry "Up Spain!" and pray that the rebel troops may win. It is so easy to blame those terrible Communists for all the ills that Spain is heir to and hope that good General Franco may drive them and their fanatical atheism into the middle of the Mediterranean Sea.

When we look at the facts, however, we become rather hesitant to give the Fascist rebels the Crusader's Cross. The revolt was engineered by a military clique who were being shorn of their power and privilege. It was financed by the wealthy landholders and industrialists who saw their economic dictatorship threatened by the first radical government strong enough to attempt any readjustment of Spain's top-heavy economic structure. And this combination of caste and wealth, in their determination to secure by arms what they could not defend with ballots, did not hesitate to plunge the whole country into a civil war which has already cost nearly as many lives as Canada gave during four years of fighting in France. The importing of black Mohammedans from Africa to fight against Spanish workers and farmers does not make the picture any more attractive.

If the government succeeds in crushing the revolt, those who aided and abetted it may expect short shrift from the Leftist regime. One cannot afford the risk of another uprising. And although the restoration of order will put an end to pillage, there is little doubt that the fanatical hatred of religion which inspired the horrors of the last weeks will bring about a systematic persecution of the Church through so-called legal means. Mexico, called "New Spain" by its colonizers, provides an excellent pattern for the mother country. But in the event of a Fascist victory would the outlook be any brighter? Christ on His Cross has a dignity and a moral power which no Marxian hatred can dispel. But Christ, the servant of a Totalitarian State, granted grudging liberty of cult which will take the minds of the poor off their misery, yet forbidden to open His mouth against violence, injustice and the denial of His social teaching, is a sight that must tear the heart of every true Christian.

The tragedy of Spain is that she has to choose between Left and Right, between Christ on the Cross and Christ in Chains. The reason she must now make this choice is that for forty years she turned a deaf ear to Christ in the Forum. Preferring the security of a state religion under the old regime, Spanish Catholics winked at social abuses, abuses that could not be attacked without incurring the disfavour of the government and the class that kept it in power. As a result the Church in Spain has become identified with reaction and the worker has turned for leadership to the bitterest enemies of the faith. Had Leo's encyclical on the Condition of Labor been taken seriously, there would be no civil war in Spain to-day. Nor would Spanish nuns be burned alive because those to whom the people once looked as their leaders preferred to play safe.