

# THE INTERNATIONAL REVIEW OF MISSIONS

---

## MISSIONS AND THE NEW SITUATION IN ASIA<sup>1</sup>

By EDWYN BEVAN

THE kingdom which Christian missions aim at extending is not of this world. The rise and fall of earthly states and empires does not invalidate one whit its claim upon the allegiance of mankind. No considerations of national politics can override the duty incumbent upon the Christian Church to proclaim the everlasting Gospel. Yet, while this is true, it is also true that the course actually taken by the preaching of the Gospel, the facilities in one direction and the obstacles in another, the data with which the Christian Church has to deal in the temper and the circumstances of those to whom it utters its message, are all immensely affected by the political and economic conditions of the day. At the very outset it was the Roman Peace, the union of all the countries around the Mediterranean under one *imperium*, which made it possible for the

<sup>1</sup> It was intended to conclude the Survey of the Effect of the War upon Missions which has been appearing in recent issues of the Review with a section on National and International Movements, so that the work and present position of Christian missions might be seen in their wider setting. In view of the vastness of the subject, however, and the variety of standpoints from which it may be approached, it has seemed impossible to make any presentation of it which would be sufficiently complete and objective in treatment for inclusion in the Survey. It has been judged better, therefore, to deal with it in separate signed articles, one of which on the New Situation in Asia appears in this issue.—EDITOR.

Christian Church to spread just in the way it did. The great missionary movement of the nineteenth century coincided in time with the extension of European rule or European influence over the globe, a truth underlying the common grotesque misstatement that the same Europeans assaulted the backward peoples of the earth materially with the gun and spiritually with the Bible. It is therefore inevitable that the developments of recent years, including the Great War, in changing conditions upon the planet, should change the situation with which Christian missions have to deal.

JAPAN.—When we look to the Far East the mystery of the future seems to centre in the problematic figure of Japan. No other nation outside the sphere of Christendom has risen from weakness to power since the establishment of the Ottoman Empire in the fifteenth century. The transformation of Japan into a strong state, armed with all the resources of modern science, has affected in two main ways the situation before Christian missions. Firstly, in so far as new developments in Japanese thought and feeling have taken place under the stimulus, on the one hand, of national self-consciousness and aspiration and, on the other hand, of all the influences reaching Japan from the West, these must very much affect the mode in which the Japanese people themselves react to the Christian gospel. Secondly, in so far as the action of Japan in the world must largely determine future conditions in all the other lands washed by the Pacific, whether to produce a web of international hatreds, suspicions and fears or a neighbourly adjustment and goodwill all round—that again has direct bearing upon the growth and character of the Christian Church in those countries.

With regard to the internal developments in Japan, it would seem that a national egoism, not unencouraged by the Government, hinders the extension of real Christianity. The Japanese, we are told, even when they profess Christianity, are apt to feel themselves Japanese first and

Christians second: they are apt to value Christianity primarily because they think it will further the advancement of Japan. To acknowledge and preserve what is admirable and heroic in the prevalent worship of Japan, and at the same time to correct what is excessive and one-sided in it, ought to be the line of that Japanese Christianity which missions desire to call into being. But it must be recognized that the excessive worship of Japan is a factor in the Japanese mind which at present makes the whole-hearted acceptance of a supernatural allegiance difficult. It must also be recognized that a similar national egoism prevents the growth of real Christianity in Europe.

The Great War does not seem to have left such immediate visible results in Japan as in the countries of Europe. It has caused a rise in the cost of living which naturally affects all missionary work on the financial side. The collapse of Germany has disconcerted expectations. The Japanese military element had an admiration for the German military machine quite natural in the circumstances. Their own prestige in Japan was to some extent bound up with the credit of the German system on which they had been modelled. The break-down of Germany may thus affect Japan by weakening the hold of the militarist idea upon the popular mind and as the shock of unexpected events often does bring about a reconsideration of accepted values. At the same time the rise of Bolshevism in Russia and the general unrest affecting the less privileged classes all over the world has not left Japan unshaken. Under the forms of a democracy the real power in the country has hitherto been in the hands of a small class. There are signs that the Japanese people will before long insist on having a larger share in the direction of the government. It is likely that Japan will make a considerable move in the direction of Liberalism.

This may affect the question which for missionaries is perhaps the most thorny of all those connected with Japan—the question of Korea. Here they have before them one

of those states of conflict between a foreign government and an inflamed nationalism in which any missionary may well find it hard to show unconcern, if he desires to be a human friend to the people among whom he lives, whilst it is impossible for him to side with the Japanese Government without seeming to set Christianity against liberty, or to side with the Korean nationalists without abusing the confidence of the Japanese Government. If in recent years the Japanese Government has borne hardly upon the Korean Christians that is not because the Japanese Government has any religious objection to Christianity; it is because Christianity in Korea has seemed to the Japanese Government to go with disloyalty to the imperial state. (It is curious to find in one part of the world Christianity accused of being 'denationalizing' and in another part of encouraging nationalism.) It was for a similar reason that Christians were persecuted in the first days of the Roman Empire. Even in details the parallel is close. It was because the early Christians refused to offer incense to the Genius of the Roman Emperor that they were regarded as enemies of the State; it is a stumbling-block for the Korean Christians that they are required to do obeisance to the picture of the Japanese Emperor as divine. All missionary educational work in Korea must obviously find its task seriously complicated by the government policy of making education a means of changing Korean children into Japanese. Whether there is any solution of the difficulty this is not the place to inquire. Before leaving Korea one may note that there too the war has had the effect of sending up prices and confronting missions and churches with many financial difficulties.

With regard to the external action of Japan in the world, the prospect is already clouded by resentments and suspicions. China is embittered by the Japanese refusal to let go their hold upon Kiao-Chao and the Shantung peninsula. In America and Australia large circles are possessed with the idea that the Japanese attempt to expand must sooner

or later bring about a sanguinary conflict between Japan and their own countries. The Japanese, on the other hand, feel bitterly the racial discrimination against all peoples but those of European stock. A world of national antagonisms is not one favourable to the growth of a society whose essential principle is that of a super-national brotherhood. If Japanese Christians on the one side and Chinese and American Christians on the other side are at enmity, there is a schism in the Body, which must necessarily to some extent stultify the Christian appeal. The blame may be thrown upon Japan as grasping and ambitious, but if Japan's real needs, arising from the pressure of population upon the area of the Japanese Empire, are not considered in the spirit which desires a fair distribution of what the earth affords, the Japanese may have some excuse for thinking that it is only by craft and strength of hand that they can secure their due share in such a world.

**CHINA.**—The process of change and innovation which has characterized modern history in the West has now, spreading to Asia, plunged the ancient Chinese nation into something like temporary chaos. A few years ago China exhibited the impressive picture of a state in which traditions belonging to a world as old as Rome were still in force. The violent break with those traditions which accompanied the conversion of China into a republic has for the time being thrown government out of gear. The South openly refuses to acknowledge the authority of Peking. The power throughout the country is largely held by military chiefs who act each for his own hand. In many districts bands of brigands loot and kill. Corruption in high places reduces the forms of constitutional government to an ineffectual pretence. The morale of the people is further impaired by drugs, the sale of which is said to be promoted by the Japanese from their vantage-ground in Shantung. The younger generation of educated men, educated in large numbers not only under western influences but in America and Europe, feel intensely the humiliation of their

country, which they are powerless to remedy, and their resentment is directed against the militarists who dominate at home and the foreign enemy, Japan, which uses the weakness of China to press its own advantage.

Such a state of things must no doubt create difficulties for all missionary enterprise. The insecurity of present conditions and the uncertainty of the future must make it hard to embark on plans in China which imply the sinking of money. If indeed in this crisis of its long history China throws up leaders of strength and probity one may hope to see stability restored. In the general confusion there are some encouraging signs.

Whilst, however, the hour is a dark one in China politically, religiously it is full of hope. The sense of weakness and the shaking of confidence in old traditions has disposed the Chinese, as never before, to listen to the gospel of Jesus as possibly revealing a way of moral salvation. The numbers who at the present moment are drawn to the Christian Church are remarkable. Facts in recent years have singularly contradicted the suppositions of those who used to assert years ago, like Mr Hyndman, that Christian missionaries were taking to China something to which Chinese could attach no value. In the political progressive movement in China, Chinese Christians have played a prominent part. One of the delegates of China to the Peace Conference was a Christian. And now in larger and larger circles men are feeling that in Christianity is the secret of that moral regeneration which may lift the Chinese people from weakness and disintegration into new and noble life.

INDIA.—In India things are moving so fast that it is difficult to determine their significance. The war profoundly affected the attitude of the British people to Indian nationalism. On the one hand, it was felt that the people who had fought in such numbers side by side with British soldiers at a moment of great national peril deserved to be treated as more than a subject race; on the other hand, since the British, in their fight against the Central Empires, had pro-

claimed as something sacred the principle of national self-determination, they came, by a common psychological process, to be very much influenced inwardly by their own professions, and, instead of feeling that the concession of autonomy to the Indians was something which might be wrung from England piecemeal by circumstances, but which would be a disagreeable renunciation, they now felt on the contrary that it would be a splendid thing to give self-determination as rapidly as possible and were only checked by a fear of the consequences which a too rapid introduction of the forms of popular government amongst a people as primitive as the unlettered millions of India still are might entail. Impelled forward by its new idealist zeal, and at the same time restrained by a cautious realism, the British Government expressed its policy in the epoch-making declaration of August 20, 1917—a beginning to be made at once with the process of transferring the administration in India to Indian hands, but the administration to be transferred only gradually, by successive departments, as capacity developed by practice. The declaration was followed in 1918 by the Montagu-Chelmsford Report and finally in 1919 by a scheme of reforms, which in the main followed the Report, becoming law.

It is unquestionable that the reforms will bring about a state of things in India very different from that with which missionary work in the past had to deal. Some look forward to the result of the experiment with apprehension, some with hope; in any case the position of the missionary must be affected by the transference of power to Indian hands. The change will at first perhaps most be felt in the department of education. Whilst under the old régime the Government showed no favour to Christianity—one might even say that occasionally there was an almost anti-Christian bias to be detected in government education—nevertheless the missionary educational institutions have in certain places owing to circumstances enjoyed a kind of monopoly. Within their institutions the missionary

bodies have had a free hand unchecked by any conscience clause. Some missionaries, accustomed to the old state of things, look forward not without nervousness to the control of education by a body composed in large part of Indian politicians. But if the working of representative government in India does bring to the top enough men of honesty, common sense and unselfish patriotism to make Indian democracy on the whole a success—there are certainly some men of this type already amongst India's public men—then it ought not to be hard for missionaries to win the confidence of such men and work with them for the good of India.

But the change in India is not only a change in the forms of government; it is a change of spirit. The war made masses of men realize, as they had never done before, that India was only part of a larger world, whilst the fact that Indians were taking their share in a world struggle quickened their sense of dignity and their idea of what India might be, if its powers were developed or were allowed free play. The volume of feeling behind the demand for self-government has grown; larger circles than before have awoken to question why the Indians should consent to be a subject people. It would be a mistake to suppose that this movement has necessarily meant any enthusiasm for democracy as such. Some of those most urgent in publicly demanding that the foreigner shall give place to the Indian in the government of the country have no particular desire to see a real Indian democracy, in which the lower strata of the population have a share in the control proportionate to their numbers. The principal motive impelling those who urge the nationalist demand is a sense that their dignity as men is wronged by their being treated as political and social inferiors—it is in the last resort a sense of human personality, its claim to respect and freedom. The Nationalist Movement in this way offers points of resemblance to the Labour Movement in Europe; in that too, deeper than the demand for more wages and more leisure, is the



vague unrest which springs from the feeling of human personality, its dignity and its claims.

No doubt it is true that those who have this sense of human worth for themselves and their own class should logically be ready to give humanity its rights in the depressed and the out-caste. Some of the leaders of Indian opinion to-day do so—the section, for instance, represented by the Servants of India. If the temper and outlook which animates that admirable society becomes uppermost in the India of the future, then indeed the prospect of free India is a bright one. But even if some other sections of Indian nationalism are open to the charge of inconsistency in claiming respect and freedom for themselves whilst they tolerate the wrongs connected with the caste system in its present form, and other inveterate social evils, a Christian ought to recognize the essential rightness of the feeling which has just been described as a sense of what is due to human personality. For if there is one thing fundamental to the Christian view it is an insistence upon the worth of human personality even in the most insignificant individual. Nor does it seem possible that those who present Christianity to the Indians can do so truly, unless they frankly admit that the racial pride shown by many Europeans in the East is essentially anti-Christian.

A question which confronts Christian missionaries in India is how far they ought to participate publicly and actively in protests and efforts which have a political character. On the one hand, a missionary may consider that where Indian sentiment is inflamed against what it regards as a wrong, especially where the feeling is caused by some action of the Government, it is his business rather to allay and soothe than to intensify the feeling by giving it his approval. In India, as in Korea, though in a different way, the situation makes it hard for the missionaries to take a strong line which might embarrass the Government; this need not be timidity, but may be a genuine conviction that greater harm would be done in India itself by a weakening

of government authority than would be made up for by any advantage secured through missionaries associating themselves with Indian grievances. Or again, the principal aim of missions, it may be argued, is to bear witness to the eternal Realities behind the transitory world, to call out a society of men and women in a right relation to God rather than to engage in setting earthly governments to rights; there are men called to work in the political field; missionaries have a special vocation to work in the religious; and by entangling themselves in political controversy they would bring confusion into their activities and be less able to draw men's attention to the thing of supreme importance, the gospel of Christ.

There is something to be said for this view. If Christianity is true to its principle, its main emphasis must be on the other world, not on this. And in times of political excitement missionaries must be prepared to find that for this very reason their message is unacceptable to many for whom interest in the seen has driven out interest in the unseen. The danger of mixing up politics and the proclamation of the Gospel is a real one. On the other hand, it has to be remembered that all questions of justice and right, even in this transient sphere, concern the eternal kingdom of God, and if the perfect state can be realized only in heaven, the Christian has also to strive that on earth, as in heaven, God's will should be done. If the essence of Christianity is love to *persons*, then the Christian will, it is true, desire chiefly their eternal good; but they will best be persuaded of his desire for their eternal good by seeing that he is not indifferent to their temporal good. The same Christ in the Gospels who says 'Labour not for the meat which perisheth' feeds the multitude lest they should be hungry on their walk home. It is unquestionable that had the missionary bodies and the leaders of the Church spoken out strongly on some of those matters which Indians feel to be burning wrongs, such as the treatment of Indians in South Africa, the indenture system in Fiji, or certain

incidents in the Panjab, they would have done a good deal to convince Indians that they were really and truly their friends. Some missionaries have protested strongly against these things. But as a whole the representatives of European Christianity have maintained with regard to them an attitude of cautious reserve. The British Government, with the agreement of the British people, has by the Montagu Reforms recognized a large measure of justice in the nationalist demand; and the Indians note that this first great success of their cause has been achieved with very little help or encouragement from missionary circles.<sup>1</sup> There is a feeling that it is hopeless to look to those circles for any cordial sympathy or assistance in the troubles through which India is passing. This feeling may be quite unfair, but it exists. It may have been impossible for missionaries to take the line which would have secured them popularity at this moment without deserting their proper functions.

This is not the place to discuss whether the missionaries were right or wrong. It is enough to point out that few questions under the new conditions in India will become more critical for the future history of missions than the question how far missionaries should treat the political interests, in which so much of the heart of India will be engaged, as matters of righteousness and human welfare upon which they cannot be silent or neutral, and how far as matters from which they are compelled by their vocation to stand aloof.

**ASIATIC IMMIGRATION.**—One question in which not only India but all eastern peoples are concerned is that of the immigration of Asiatics into countries inhabited or ruled by 'white men.' The question has become acute both in regard to the desire of the Japanese to settle in America or in the islands of the Pacific and in regard to the Indians in Africa and Fiji.

It is no doubt a somewhat different question where the

<sup>1</sup> One should not forget in such a connexion the warm advocacy of Indian claims by the Bishop of Madras.

country is *inhabited* by a white race—America or South Africa—and where it is only *ruled* by white men—the tropical Pacific Islands or East Africa. In the former case the contention of the white inhabitants of the country is that every community has a right to maintain its homogeneity by refusing to admit elements whose ways of life are very different from its own in such numbers as to affect its own social tradition or standards of living. Economic considerations also come in. If the Asiatic can thrive on a cheaper diet than the European, if he is content with a lower scale of living, if he is more hardworking and abstemious, his competition in the same market prevents the European worker from having the kind of life he wants. The more Asiatics come in, the greater is the danger of the social tradition of the white community being changed, the severer is the competition. We must recognize therefore—and this constitutes the difficulty of the problem—that the motives which cause a society of white men to resist the infiltration of non-Europeans is not a mere ignorant prejudice which a little remonstrance or instruction might remove, but something primary in human nature—the instinct which leads every society to resist an alteration of its tradition and the desire of every individual to have as easy and as rich a life as possible. There seem to be three, and only three, possible courses for a white community to take in regard to Asiatic immigration: to prohibit it altogether; to admit it without restriction, or with only the same restrictions which apply to European immigration; or to admit it with special restrictions. Each of the three courses seems open to grave objection. If Asiatic immigration is altogether prohibited, the resentment of the Asiatic peoples against the white races is likely to be inflamed to a degree which may prevent any peaceable state of the world and the Christian doctrine of human brotherhood may seem a mockery. If it is admitted without restriction, the danger of white communities being swamped by Asiatic elements is a very real one. If it is admitted

with special restrictions applying to Asiatics, then, whatever line is drawn, hard cases will be continually recurring, there will be perpetual friction between the limited number of Asiatics admitted and the white population, and the special disabilities may constitute a grievance almost as exasperating as total exclusion.

These considerations apply equally to America and to states within the British Commonwealth. But in the case of the latter the problem is complicated both by the fact that Japan and England are allies, and, still more, by the fact that India is itself one of the states under the British Crown. The inhabitants of India have legally the privileges of British citizens, and if liberty to settle within other territories under the British Crown is denied them they may naturally complain that, while they have not the advantages of independence, neither do they have the advantages of the British connexion. The injustice seems most flagrant in regard to East Africa. In South Africa the white men have made the country their home and Asiatic immigrants enter upon the facilities of a civilization already there, developed by the labours of others; but in East Africa there is no domiciled white society which needs to protect its tradition and Indian traders were active in the country before white men came there.

But if in such a case it is difficult to see any kind of justification for disabilities imposed upon immigrants from India, even in those cases where Asiatics are excluded from white men's countries, it is impossible to regard such a state of things as corresponding with the Christian ideal. 'In Christ' race barriers are done away, and if Christianity ceases to stand for universal human brotherhood it may as well give up any claim to be taken seriously. This is not to say that, while men are what they are, it may not be the preferable course for different sections of the human family to live apart, just as it may be better for brothers who cannot get on together to live apart rather than to live under the same roof in perpetual friction. But even

if a Christian might consistently advise brothers in such a state of things to live apart, he could only regard the state of things as itself an unhappy one, not as one corresponding with his ideal of family life. In the same way, whilst desiring a state of the world in which men of all races would be one in Christ, he may consider it the preferable course in the present unsatisfactory state of the world for the communities with different traditions and physical characteristics to keep to separate areas on the surface of the globe. To force a community of white men to admit Asiatic immigrants against its will might lead to worse evils than honest separation. And what power *could* force a self-governing state of white men to admit elements from outside against their will? The degree of pressure which His Majesty's Government in London can bring upon South Africa is after all very limited. It is better to admit frankly that there is not and cannot be, as things are, freedom of migration within the Commonwealth for all subjects of the British Crown.

If however one recognizes it as inevitable, in the present state of the world, that there should be this segregation of different races, there seem to be two things upon which Christian opinion should insist. One is that the limited number of Asiatics admitted into any white man's country should not be subjected to ill-treatment whilst there. It is unquestionable that a strong feeling of bitterness as to the treatment of Indians in South Africa exists in India and this is a factor in the situation which has to be faced by those who go to India to proclaim a gospel of human brotherhood. The other thing is that if different areas on the earth's surfaces are to be allocated to different peoples the distribution must be a fair one. For instance, even if Japan is trying to get what it believes to be necessary for its national well-being by means which are reprehensible, it can hardly be satisfactory from the Christian point of view simply to defeat the aims of Japan by superior force; if Japan is to be won to a better mind,

the real needs of the Japanese people must be honestly and sympathetically considered by the other peoples of the earth, and an arrangement sought which shall as far as possible be fair all round.

ISLAM.—The situation in the Mohammedan world has been profoundly modified by the break-up of the Ottoman Empire. The last Mohammedan state which had any claim to be a great Power is gone. If the Persian 'King of Kings' still reigns in Teheran, there is little in the present position of Persia to gratify Mohammedan pride, apart from the fact that Persian Mohammedanism is regarded by only a small number of Moslems outside Persia as the genuine thing. Four hundred years ago Islam and Christendom seemed to confront each other as equals in political and military power; since then the decay and disintegration of the Ottoman Empire in the Nearer East and the Mogul Empire in India has at last led to a state of things in which the countries covered by those empires are either directly ruled by Europeans or are in the hands of Europeans to be disposed of at their discretion. It does not follow that Mohammedanism might not continue, even if its association with worldly power and prestige ceased, to be powerful as a religion. Christian Churches, like those which were included in the old Ottoman Empire, have maintained themselves with extraordinary tenacity as religious communities, century after century, in a condition of political subjection and humiliation. One may ask, however, whether the Christian view of the world is not more compatible with a state of things in which the Christian community is suffering and oppressed than the Mohammedan view of the world is with a state of things in which worldly dominion has passed away from the faithful. Islam went forth at the very beginning, sword in hand, to conquer, and it may be questioned in what form Islam will survive when it has seen that all those conquests and worldly glories were evanescent, a transitory phase in the history of mankind. It is probable that Islam, as a re-

ligion, will continue long to have a very strong hold upon the more primitive communities. One movement which the loss of worldly power may accelerate within Islam is the desire to acquire western education so as to meet Christendom again some day on equal terms. Yet this very movement may as it goes on bring great trouble into Islam. For Islam, in consequence of its rigid traditional dogmas, is far less compatible with western knowledge than, for instance, elastic Hinduism. Hitherto the backwardness of the Mohammedan world, as a whole, in the matter of education has saved it from intellectual troubles. Even in India, the Mohammedans have only recently begun to acquire western knowledge on any large scale and the effects have not had time to show themselves. The reforming movement in the nineteenth century connected with the name of Syed Ahmed, whilst it threw over tradition and made its motto 'Back to the Koran,' did not go so far as to question the Koran's verbal inspiration. Yet the dogmas concerning the Koran are precisely some of those which will be the most impossible to maintain in the face of scientific historical criticism. We may expect in this century to witness new reforming movements in Islam which will present modes of belief combining elements in the old Mohammedan view of the world with modern views. If however any reforming movement in Islam seeks to fall back simply upon these enduring elements, its difficulty will be that there would be little to distinguish such a purified Mohammedanism from any other Theism; the things which give its distinctive character to Mohammedanism as it has existed in history are just those which a reforming movement would tend to give up.

Christians who believe that they have a view of the world to put before the peoples now following Islam in which the eternal truths of Islam are embraced in a completer body of truth cannot but look on with cordial interest at the new developments within Islam. For the moment a serious factor in the situation is the widespread resent-



ment created amongst the Indian Mohammedans at the refusal of the Allies in Europe to reconstitute the Ottoman Empire as it existed before the war. It is impossible in this place to discuss the rights and wrongs of the Caliphate question. The fact stands out that a reconstitution of the Ottoman Empire is under the actual conditions impossible, and that sooner or later the Indian Mohammedans will have to recognize the facts of the world.

At the same time, we on our side should recognize that the pain caused to the Indian Mohammedans by the break-up of the last great Mohammedan Power is perfectly natural. If the exponents of Christianity are to speak to them with any persuasiveness they must be able to convince them that they are utterly free from any desire to see the Mohammedan peoples humiliated; that on the contrary they sincerely desire for these peoples the greatest amount of good and the most honourable standing. If they desire, as they must desire, that these peoples should come to the larger truth of Christianity, Christians cannot desire that they should have, whilst they adhere to Islam anything less than all the good which it is possible for them to have without the rights of other peoples being infringed. Even if it were likely, instead of being extremely unlikely, that the Mohammedan peoples would be attracted to Christianity by seeing that riches and worldly power went with western civilization, no Christian could regard such an attraction as having any spiritual value. If therefore the break-up of the Ottoman Empire meant that the Mohammedan peoples were cut off from any possibility of national dignity and well-being in the future, the Christian Church would need to protest strongly. According to the theory, however, professed by the Allies, the place of the Ottoman dominion is to be taken by a number of independent national states—Turkish Anatolia, Armenia, the Arab country. The English also assert that they are training Egypt for self-government, and real autonomy means that the ultimate relation of Egypt to England would not be

one of subjection. Supposing these states enjoy real liberty, one can hardly deny that the Ottoman dominion will have been replaced by a happier state of things. A group of free national Mohammedan states presents a fairer picture than a Turkish despotism—a picture which need cause no Indian Mohammedan a feeling of shame; indeed, in so far as the Indian Mohammedans have the start in education and in experience of modern government, a sphere of influence in these Mohammedan states of the Nearer East is opened to them which may well efface their regrets for the disappearance of the Ottoman Empire. If at present they cannot see any compensation in this direction it is because they do not believe that the professions of the Allies are sincere, that real liberty will be conceded to these new eastern states. Yet if they directed their zeal to demanding of the British Government that it should be true to its professions, if they exerted themselves to make this ideal of a group of free states a reality, and watched over the progress of their liberties, instead of demanding the impossible reconstitution of the Ottoman dominion, their agitation might achieve some fruitful result. It is at any rate in raising its voice for justice and goodwill to the new national Turkey, to the Arab State and to Egypt, as well as to the Christian Armenia, that the Christian Church may hope to show the Mohammedan peoples that it has their interests at heart.

**ZIONISM.**—A word should perhaps be said as to the creation of a 'national home' in Palestine for the Jewish people. No Christian who knows the ill-usage to which Jews are subjected in many Christian countries can do anything but welcome any measure which offers a refuge to the sufferers and a means by which the rights of the Jewish community can be represented authoritatively in the council of the nations. At the same time it constitutes a grave difficulty in the way of the creation of a Jewish *state* in Palestine that Palestine has already a population mainly non-Jewish (Moslem and Christian) which regards any idea of Jewish

predominance with intense hostility. Jewish Zionists are confident that this difficulty can be got over; perhaps they underrate its magnitude, dazzled by the vision of Palestine regained. If indeed the Jewish Zionists do ultimately discover any way of making Palestine a Jewish country without giving the Moslems and Christians now there any just ground of complaint, then indeed one may welcome whole-heartedly the establishment of a Jewish national state in the ancient land of Israel. It is largely upon the Jews themselves, upon their ingenuity and tact and generosity, that it rests to solve the problem, if it is ever to be solved. Whether from the Jewish point of view Zionism is a wise departure or a mistake is another question. Those Jewish leaders who consider that the establishment of a Jewish political state in Palestine, a state among the states of the world, would prove an embarrassment to Judaism in other countries and turn the community aside from its proper religious vocation are entitled to respect; their followers are more numerous amongst the American than amongst the European Jews. The point which it seems important to emphasize from the point of view of Christian missions is that Judaism cannot well combine the characters of a religious community and of a political nation. If it is a religious community, then indeed no member of it can give up the distinctive Jewish beliefs and practices without forfeiting his right to belong to the community; if, on the other hand, it is a political nation, a Jew might become a Christian or a Buddhist or a Mohammedan without ceasing to be politically and civilly a full Jew; for it would be tyrannous, according to modern conceptions, to make one religion obligatory for all members of a nation. A Jewish state within the British Commonwealth would have to extend religious toleration to its members. Any Jew wishing to become a Christian would have to be free to do so without incurring any civil or political disabilities. The religious character of Judaism might suffer, but one cannot have it both ways.

EDWYN BEVAN