

BLACKFRIARS

ethics of revolution and were linked with the twin factors of truth, beauty and adventure." (p. 215.) With the communist he shows a proper hatred of slums and unemployment, the pernicious doctrines of capitalism and its exploitation of "next-worldly" religion. In contrast with his dark references to "certain Fascist quarters," he holds out the hand of gentle under-statement to others. "It is true that the teaching of the modern revolutionary socialist differs in some important particulars from the teaching of Jesus." (p. 194.) "Christianity has a wider outlook than has the Marxist and it takes a more spiritual view of the universe." (p. 195.)

We have no quarrel with the author's desire to restore all things in Christ. But with his subtle betrayal of Christ, we can have no sympathy. He has forgotten to tell the humanists and the communists that while we recognise the legitimacy of many of their human desires there is a condition essential to their recognition by God. The author is troubled by the Cross; a mutilated body is a poor inducement to the humanist, and its denial of a gentle upward slope from the human heart to its spiritual enrichment is likely to antagonise both humanist and communist. So he leaves out the Cross. He therefore entices them into the spiritual world he has evolved by a trick, or shall we say, by tact? St. Paul was a blunt man. Nothing genuinely human was alien to him. "For all things are yours whether it be Paul, or Apollo, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come: for all are yours: and you are Christ's: and Christ is God's." The process of becoming Christ's can be learnt from an attentive reading of the New Testament.

CEOLFRID HERON, O.P.

INDIA TO-DAY AND TO-MORROW. By Margarita Barns. (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d.)

"Do you remember the fate of Erskine Childers?" my friend asked.

"Yes!" I replied. "The Irish shot him in the back."

"Then remember the fate of those who work for countries other than their own." (p. 141).

This passage occurs in the first two parts of Mrs. Barns' book, of which only the third part really treats of "India to-day and to-morrow." The first two-thirds of the book are filled with the author's experiences in connection with an Indian Press Service, independent of the official Reuter and Associated Press. Started in 1929, this service was kept going until 1935 by the

REVIEWS

selfless devotion of Mr. and Mrs. Barns to India as an "under-dog" doped by official propaganda, by their professional competence and by an almost heroic sacrifice of their health, money and time. In the end the unequal struggle against overwhelming odds had to be given up: unfortunately only after some very tortuous business deals on the part of some of the Indian capitalists financing the service. It is these latter incidents which prompted the dialogue above quoted: but it should be added that her experiences have left Mrs. Barns unsoured and unembittered. The quotation, however, gives a hint of the note of tragedy inseparable from such selfless work "for countries other than one's own": and it raises the question whether in the long run general humanitarian principles are a sufficient motive force to sustain those engaged in that sort of work.

The writing down of these experiences must have brought great personal relief to the author: but one doubts, whether her book has gained by the inclusion of these parts, at least at such length. The last part, the real "India to-day and to-morrow," consists of a dozen chapters dealing with as many aspects of modern India, depicted for the general reader in a lively manner and with much shrewd insight. Of course there are such quick changes in India, that already this book has been rendered in one respect out of date by the Congress forming Ministries in the Provinces. There is no greater quick-change artist than Mr. Gandhi and little blame attaches to Mrs. Barns for not having foreseen his latest *volte face*. But "our little Mickey Mouse" (as Mrs. Naidu once laughingly, if a trifle irreverently, referred to the Mahatma) survives even the most daring *salti mortali* and seems positively to thrive on them.

Mrs. Barns sees clearly that from the machiavellian Constitution, with which Sir Samuel Hoare has saddled India, neither Dominion status nor independence can be evolved, but only a Fascism run by the linked vested interests of Indians and British. Apparently she has not given thought to the possibility that the Congress might take office in the Provinces, to render Federation at the centre impossible: nor to the fact that such a Fascist regime could not last, but would necessarily lead to a revolutionary explosion of the exploited masses of India, driven to desperation.

With the author one can but hope that "while the bridge is rapidly being built between the representatives of the vested interests in both countries," there will be called into being once more "a corresponding movement on the part of those in India and in Britain, who might be called progressives," but whom I would prefer to call believers in international and social justice.

H. C. E. ZACHARIAS.