

international repute, is also banished to the Appendix, presumably for similar reasons.

Dr Nicholas Zernov is best known in England for his ecumenical work as a populariser of Russian Orthodoxy. It is fair to say that few Anglican and Free Church Christians in this country who know something about Orthodoxy, and particularly about the Russian Church, have not at some time been indebted to his enthusiasm and talent as a speaker. His place as a writer, however, whether as historian, biographer or theologian, has been more equivocal and Dr Zernov's books have attracted a good deal of adverse criticism from Orthodox scholars. The grand vision, the clear-cut simplifications, the fervour of a partisan, which help the orator, wear thin in print. The written word is subject to tests of accuracy and logic which are little influenced by personal persuasiveness.

HELLE GEORGIADIS

CHRISTIANITY AND REVOLUTION, *The lesson of Cuba*, by Leslie Dewart; Herder and Herder; \$5.50

If Leslie Dewart is right, the story of the Church in Cuba is a tragedy of wasted heroism and lost opportunity. The twenty-six-year-old Catholic actionist who died in front of a firing-squad after the Pigs' Bay invasion, shouting 'Long live Christ the King!', died, not for Christ, but for a false religion, a Manichean creed which confuses logic and reality, and arrives at the conclusion that Rome is God and Moscow is the Devil; the religion of Anticommunism.

The unique value of this book lies in its combination of philosophical insight and a very thorough knowledge of Cuban affairs. Himself of Spanish origin and educated in Cuba, Professor Dewart has scrutinised every diplomatic document which throws light on Cuban-American-Russian relations from 1959 to 1962, and leaves us with little doubt that America was squarely responsible for the steady deterioration of her relations with Cuba in the first years of Castro's regime. Her initial unwillingness to negotiate over difficulties gradually deteriorated into economic aggression, and then into armed violence at Pigs' Bay.

How then did Castro provoke this aggressive response? Not by his communism, for this was the result, not the cause; but by his neutralism; by his assertion of Cuban independence, and of her right to trade with Russia. In Mr Dulles' view, neutralism was already wicked; but trade with Russia was a sure sign of damnation. This is Anti-communism.

Inside Cuba, American attitudes were echoed by the Catholic Church. When he had first come to power, Castro had proclaimed that 'the Catholics of Cuba had lent their most decided co-operation to the cause of liberty'; and this was no idle flattery, since great heroism had been shown by Catholics, priests and laymen, put to death and tortured under the corrupt Battista regime, and Castro's forces had worked in close collaboration with the 'Catholics of Cuba' (though not with the hierarchy). As soon as he was in power, however, relation-

ships began to deteriorate. Why? Not because of Castro's admittedly just and long overdue land reforms, or because he was a communist, because he wasn't, but because he refused openly to repudiate the Cuban communist party—which would have been an absurd thing to do in any case. But in the Anti-communist religion, not to be anti-communist is already to be in league with the devil; and when Mikoyan arrived in Cuba and agreed to buy the sugar which America had rejected, and to advance the loans which America had blocked from every other source, the issue was decided for good—after all, this was a visit from Mephistopheles in person! The forces of light were drawn up against the forces of darkness. The attitude of the Catholic majority degenerated from an unco-operative silence to a battle of words, and eventually to abortive physical violence. The C.I.A. forces which attempted to invade Cuba had two main contingents: the Battistianos, and the Catholics.

What of Castro? Dewart does not mince his words. Here is no plaster saint—though here without doubt is a fervent and single-minded reformer. He responded to provocation with provocation, to violence with violence, to subversion with tyranny; and, eventually, he embraced communism, sincerely, whole-heartedly, even retrospectively, saying that the whole history of the revolution made sense in communist terms. After all, he had been told it often enough; increasingly the tensions had been built up, and he had been placed by circumstances and propaganda before an ultimate choice, communism or anti-communism, where only one choice was possible; and he made it. It's the familiar technique of brain-washing. The inquisitorial alliance of the U.S.A., the Cuban church, and the communist party proved irresistible.

There are shafts of light in this darkness. First, the vocal and intelligent minority of priests and laymen who have taken their stand firmly for justice, who deplore anti-communism and urge commitment to the justice of the revolution as the one thing that can redeem the church *and* the revolution. Secondly, the greatest hope of all, not only for the little world of Cuba, but for the great world of which it is a pattern, the graceful and unobtrusive diplomacy of Pope John, the exchange of gifts and messages of goodwill, the gradual emergence of the apostolic delegate as the representative of a new Rome. The anti-communist creed crumbles when its God falls into heresy.

We cannot afford to neglect the challenge of this book.

STANLEY WINDASS

UNHOLY WEDLOCK, by Harry Franklin; Allen & Unwin; 32s.

'Unholy Wedlock' is a topical book. The Federation of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland is to be broken up and it is still unclear what will be the result. Especially worrying is the future of Southern Rhodesia which can hardly be denied its independence when Nyasaland has been promised its freedom from British control in August 1964. Mr Frankland's book is a gloomy one. He writes