

## EXTRACTS AND COMMENTS

CRISIS AFTERTHOUGHTS. There is much with which we hesitate to agree in Mounier's *Lendemain d'une trahison* in the October ESPRIT. But we gree heartily that,

We should be on our guard against two temptations.

The first is to give way to anti-German resentment. Germany may in her turn experience her heyday without our having the right, on that account alone, to take offence. Her present vitality is a lively witness that a living blood can attain its triumph beneath the long sleep of the nations. A fever of anti-Germanism will not facilitate the solution of the problem of Europe; it will only take our attention from our own faults.

Nor must we give way to the negative form of anti-fascism. We may well detest the inspiration of the Nazi revolution; we may even hold that it involves an absolute evil. But not all its elements are an absolute evil. The crude purifying processes of totalitarianism set fire to much that is degenerate and rotten, to much that we ourselves have attacked in the name of other values . . . We may only hope that the operation, so violent as it is, will not with the remedy introduce still worse diseases. Perhaps the perennial conflict of good and evil demands these super-compensations from history. Failure to understand the judgment which these totalitarianisms pass on a fallen world may lead us to fail to learn from the ardent zeal which they divert from their proper object. To-day, more than ever, a certain idle anti-fascism repeats its stock formulas, and hymns the virtues of a political and economic "orthodoxy" which has, only too clearly, demonstrated its impotence. Let us at least have the courage, since the time is so propitious, to pass an entirely independent and unprejudiced judgment on the past, to sustain all the values, all the realities, which we must oppose to the fascist hurricane. Let us speak rather of a democracy to be created than of a democracy to be defended, of a liberty to be strengthened rather than of a liberty to be saved, of revolution rather than of self-preservation . . .

The more energetic the suppression of liberty, the more rapid must be the creativeness of the free nations. The immediate task is to set Europe on her feet; and that can be done on only one condition, general disarmament. This is our immediate task; a task which combines the spirit of Versailles with the spirit of Nuremburg. It is the key to any lasting solution.

## EXTRACTS AND COMMENTS

We are thankful for peace; but is it for the right reasons, and what are we going to do with the peace we have got?

An ineffectual bourgeoisie which has no enthusiasm for anything except to protect itself against its own terrors, and which is terrified of any adventure for fear of ruining its own privileges—you cannot make me believe that these are men who are unwilling to kill; rather they are simply men who are unwilling to be killed. Though men who are resolved not to kill, who are resolved to establish a society in which all homicide, direct or indirect, would be eliminated, may be an incalculable force of resistance against tyranny, men who are resolved about nothing except not to be struck do nothing except provoke the warlike. Saint Augustine called peace the serenity of order. For them it is the tranquillity of disorder. Some imagine that peace is a blessing that can be preserved by inertia. They say, "What do they want of us? We make no demands beyond the security of our own frontiers. We asked only to be allowed to go on living, to collect our dividends, to go to the cinema, to sleep, and to live on our reputation." They see their country as a sort of dead zone which can "stay put" while civilisations are being turned inside out all around them.

Another contributor, Adrien Miatlev, contributes a *Carnet d'une mobilisation*, which is even more emphatic:

Here is a people that is terrified of losing peace. And when they had it, when this "peace" was not threatened, what did they do with it? Does the word peace mean no more than the negation of war? Is it, as one bitter humourist has put it, the interval between two wars? Since 1918 there have been plenty of wars on this globe of ours. Did we let *them* spoil our sleep? Clearly, or at least apparently, it was because they did not threaten our own lives . . .

It is in peace and in living that we need fighters, in the noble and almost obsolete sense of that word; for it is too late for them in war and in death. It is too late to thump our chests, to develop our biceps, to stiffen our jaws: in war and in death we are now no more than mechanical units which can act only as automatons. That is the chief ignominy of war.

And, in TEMPS PRESENT, François Mauriac:

For several weeks the shadow of war covered not only the joys of men but also their sufferings; the secret drama of individual lives became annihilated in the common horror. Nothing is more strange than the confusion of emotions which awoke in

## BLACKFRIARS

those who abandoned themselves to the fear of war, like sleep-walkers on a roof.

War adds its own infinite horror to all the sufferings of peace; but it also resolves certain problems by abolishing them. Now that the threat has passed, each man returns to his own private problems, to his disease, his vice, his want, his loneliness.

The dictators know what they are doing when they submerge the individual in the collectivity. Germany, broken after the war, cradle of the "mal de la jeunesse," mobilised its youth to save itself: the auto-defence of a great stricken body, poisoned, but which had the will to live.

And this is the drama of the Church to-day: this seizure of baptised souls who belong to her by right, of whom she has the charge, and whom she beholds becoming estranged from her by thousands and by millions. They rush to submit themselves to discipline, to a hard rule of life, but one which tends in the direction of the instincts of power, of pride, of carnal joy. It is a crisis more grave than that of the Reformation which, after all, was a crisis on the supernatural plane.

The madmen who attacked Cardinal Innitzer's palace at Vienna had no idea of "reformation." They gave way to a furious hatred of the only power which condemns their religion of "Joy through Strength"—a human strength which is so feeble and which is crucified on earth with its God.

Finally, from Vienna itself, Dr. Edgar Mühlen in *SCHOENERE ZUKUNFT*:

Europe is now in convulsions because the politics which govern her become more and more Godless. That found its most evident expression in the peace *Diktaten*, but it continues to this hour . . . If European unity then fell to pieces because it was governed, not by the spirit of Christ, but by the spirit of Rousseau and Voltaire, of Machiavelli and Hobbes, of Rothschild and Morgan, so it is to-day all the more necessary to give new resonance to the voice of the spirit of Christ. This means, on the one hand, to give to nationalities what belongs to them, and on the other hand to forward those common human purposes, natural and supernatural, which belong to all men . . .

With the Christians of to-day rests an unprecedented responsibility. Their duty is, on the one hand, to do all possible to assist nationalities to attain the rights of which they have been deprived. On the other hand, with their idea of the universal Christian community, to proclaim the absolute, all-binding values and beliefs, to hinder a new Babel of international misunderstanding which may lead to a war of all against all.

UNIDIVERSITY. In the current GREGORIANUM, the quarterly review of the Gregorian University in Rome, there is a learned and valuable article by Father S. Tyszkiewicz, S.J., with the forbidding title, *Le principe d'Unidiversité et son application en ecclésiologie*. The author begins by enunciating the familiar principle of St. Thomas that the perfection and purpose of all creatures and all creation being the communication and manifestation of the infinite perfections of God, they demand the greatest variety, diversity and inequality. To this principle he gives the "perhaps barbarous" name of the "principle of unidiversity"; and he proceeds to show, by manifold examples, that "unidiversity" is a fact and a universal and all-embracing principle which governs realities of very different kinds. "We discover it on all the levels and in all the categories of being, in the finite and the infinite, in the temporal and in the supra-temporal order," in the works of nature and in the works of art. The more noble the creature, the more perfect its unity and the greater its diversity. He then shows how this principle is realised in the Church as intended by Christ:

The Church is a collectivity instituted by Jesus Christ, not merely to give effect to this or that commandment or programme of her Founder, but to continue, by all her very *being* and in all her *activity*, the entire work of Jesus Christ. Fully divine and fully human, like her Head, she resembles Him in all her constitution, in all her life, in all her action, in all her sufferings.

Our Saviour has a corporal diversity unified by the organs pertaining to the unity of His Body, especially in virtue of their dependence on His physical Head. He has also a natural spiritual diversity of spiritual functions of knowledge and volition, unified by the oneness of His human Soul. Finally, because He is God, He is infinite Diversity identified with the Absolute Unity. In the same way the Church is the "continuation" of Jesus Christ, of Him who unites hypostatically all the unidiversities; so the Church possesses the "plenitude" of unidiversities. She has a complete social "Body," with diversity of external functions—administrative, juridical, artistic, economic, etc.—and corresponding factors of stable visible unity, of which the chief corresponds to the physical Head of the Saviour. For the same reason the Church has a natural, collective and social, "soul," perfectly one in its own genus of social unities, and united in the highest degree in its collective knowledge and volitions—variety of theological schools, multiplicity of good works, etc. Lastly, in

the Church are perpetuated the presence and the variety of activities of God, the infinitely Unidiverse. In virtue, therefore, of the dogma of Christ as the Head of the Church, we find in her, analogically, the intimate unity of all the divine unidiversities together with the perfect and all-embracing plenitude of all the human unidiversities.

After elaborating this thesis in the light especially of the doctrines of the Church's Unity and Catholicity, and showing its applications to the problems of institutionalism, the writer concludes:

A bishop, a religious superior, the visible head of the whole Church, will therefore encourage all healthy originality, duly controlled, and all the particularities of this or that group within Catholicity, co-ordinating them, and subordinating all to the higher unidiversities of the whole Church. They must secure unity, but they know that there can be no unity without variety, as there can be no true variety without unity. To govern the Church is not then merely to unify or merely to diversify, but to *unidiversify*, to secure that equilibrium and that convergence of diverse spontaneity, those spiritual experiments and religious enterprises, which will preserve them from chaos and death. Just because the Church possesses the plenitude of unity on every level, she possesses so prodigious a richness of forms of worship, of good works, of religious families, of supernatural vitality, of apostolic zeal. Outside of her there is always a tendency either to enforce a uniformity which destroys variety, or to a variety which lacks unity and so tends to atomisation. The Catholic hierarchy is sometimes accused of suppressing the free development of individual initiative, of crushing liberty, of paralysing many generous enterprises. Indeed there are always dangers of abuse of liberty (though less so within Catholicism thanks to the unidiversity of her organisation). But as a general rule the Catholic hierarchy does not suppress, hinder or stifle except when it is necessary to secure the good working of a given unidiversity or to ensure the subordination of lesser unidiversities to greater ones.

This principle of unidiversity indicates the path we should tread in the task of reintegrating dissidents into the unity of the Church: to leave to the separated confessions all that they have of "originality," their own particular stamp, their own positive values; to favour, help, love all that, and at the same time to insist unequivocally on the necessity of a perfect unity which admits of no exception. No limit will be put even to the corporate peculiarities of dissident communions which seek reunion

with the *Catholica*, except in so far as these degenerate into separatism, into a deadening congestion, or into a crushing uniformity . . . We shall not hesitate to examine with favour and sympathy the theology, dogmatic and moral, of dissidents, and to adopt all that they contain which is sound and positive. But we shall not leave these partial apprehensions of truth in the isolation in which they risk to become corrupted or to become factors of decomposition. We shall submit them to the influence of the beneficial action of the unity of Catholic theology.

The Catholic spirit is the Spirit of Pentecost, of divine-human unidiversity. It is the Holy Spirit filling the disciples of Jesus with the abundant variety of His gifts in His all-unifying love. It is also the perceptible variety of "tongues," proclaiming the perceptible unity of the apostolic teaching. It is also "Peter with the eleven."

REASON, REVELATION AND SOCIETY. The Anglican CHRISTENDOM continues to be an exceedingly valuable vehicle of first-class work in constructive theology in its sociological reference—thoroughly "thomistic" in inspiration, but sufficiently sure of itself to admit to its pages (not without criticism) the "catastrophism" of Mr. Langmead-Casserley. Two very valuable articles in the current (September) number are concerned with a critical examination of its own fundamental postulates. *Reason and Revelation* by the Rev. W. G. Peck is as good an account of the function of intellect in faith as we have seen; he is particularly happy in ascribing current vitalism and fear of reason and intellect to the "exiled intellect, dismissed from her status as the companion of Faith," due to the confusion introduced into European thinking by the Nominalists and their successors. But,

Intellect exists for the whole concrete being of man. In so far as it is occupied with the discovery of facts, as in science and scholarship, it will not be challenged or forbidden, since it is impossible that the welfare of man in his wholeness can in the long run be served by ignorance or falsification. Man is made for reality, and not for any fool's paradise. But if the intellectual *interpretation* of facts threatens the collapse of a deeply integrated and profoundly satisfying "pattern," it is to be suspected. The interpretation looks like the work of intellect dissociated from the concrete integrity of man's being. It is more likely that this interpretation is wrong, than that such a "pattern" should be

completely false. There have indeed been instances when what seemed to threaten confusion produced eventually the greater perfecting of the pattern of man's life. St. Thomas' introduction of Aristotle into Christian theology was of this nature; and I venture to think that modern biblical scholarship will be found to have provided another instance. But the Catholic need not be timid in seasons of necessary discussion. For his claim that the main Christian "facts" have conveyed supernatural reality capable of giving full completion to the pattern is massively vindicated by the whole human situation, and by the fact that contradictions of the revealed truths of the Faith, destroying the pattern as co-ordinated by Catholicism, have actually destroyed vital human value. Each successive century adds to the mountain of proof that the Catholic Faith is the Way of Life.

The upshot of the argument ought now to be sufficiently clear. The aim of Catholic sociology is the integration of the positive human process with the truths of revelation. But unless those truths can be somehow apprehended by the intellect their relevance in the sphere of political and economic purpose can never be demonstrated. If, however, the intellect is admitted, it must not be in shackles. It must come as a helpmate, but not as a bond-servant. This is not to allow the unfettered rights of what we have called the dissociated secular intellect of our time, but to recognise intellect as a component of concrete personality and as a genuine constituent in the reception of all human experience. And if "thought without root" arrogantly denies the possibility of certain kinds of experience, we shall reply by showing that the thought which deals with the realities of God and Redemption is capable of giving to the mundane experience and action of man a coherence and a satisfying significance which they otherwise lack.

The first instalment of another promising vindication of the function of the intellect, this time from a more purely philosophical standpoint and as a criticism of logical positivism, comes from the pen of Mr. D. M. Mackinnon. Catholic readers will find other and less heavy-going matter of particular interest to themselves in *The Liturgical Movement and Catholic Action in Belgium* by Helen M. Larke, and in Mr. Reckitt's editorial on "Catholic Extremism."

CONGRATULATIONS. We are thankful that THE WEEKLY REVIEW (formerly G.K.'s *Weekly*) has again, and we trust permanently, been saved from extinction by benefactors, though we must share Mr. Michael Derrick's mildly ex-

pressed regret that "a strain of imperialistic power-politics that seems wholly alien to the traditions of the paper is becoming increasingly evident." But the weekly's foreign politics are clothed with a quaint old-world nomenclature which removes them far from present realities, so that even their dogmatism need cause no offence. Thus it has lately been full of some trouble between a wicked *Prussia* and a romantic *Bohemia* which has helped us considerably in drawing our attention from more complicated news in the newspapers. If it will follow up this idea by bidding us admire *Piedmont* and advocating press-gangs for *Mercia* we shall be able to enjoy, without the smallest peril to our equanimity, the excellent distributist matter that still appears. In this class there is always Mr. Benvenisti's *Distributist's Note Book*, which should never be missed. And, though in another category, nor should H. D. C. P.'s *We Are Amused*. The invitation to "(d) Sell the paper outside churches where the congregations would be interested in the RIGHT . . ." seems to have strayed from that refreshing feature.

CONTEMPORANEA. CHRISTIAN DEMOCRAT (Oct.): *Principles of Peace: Conclusions of the Catholic Peace Congress at the Hague*: an important document.

CRITERION (Oct.): *The Bressey Report* criticised by John Betjeman. *Evolution Involved* by K. E. Barlow. T. S. Eliot's *Commentary* begins with some apposite observations on the relevance of Maritain's philosophy to emotional, irresponsible and highly dangerous forms of anti-fascism, and leads (with inspiration from Viscount Lymington) to the subject of the "urbanization of mind": "To have the right frame of mind it is not enough that we should read Wordsworth, tramp the countryside with a book of British Birds and a cake of chocolate in a rucksack, or even own a country estate: it is necessary that the greater part of the population, of all classes (so long as we have classes), should be settled in the country and dependent upon it."

CROSS AND PLOUGH (Michaelmas): "The newspapers are shouting about a bumper world (wheat) crop. Not one has drawn attention to the madness of intensifying in other parts of the world the very methods which have destroyed the Middle West and Canada. Bumper crops now mean bumper famine soon."



BLACKFRIARS

*The End of a Correspondence*: our burdens charitably "carried" for us.

DOWNSIDE REVIEW (Oct.): *The Rejection of Christ*: a suggestive interpretation of the purpose of the Fourth Gospel, by Dom Bernard Orchard. *The Universal Mediation of Mary* by Canon G. D. Smith: accent on merit.

DUBLIN REVIEW (Oct.): Particularly noteworthy in a strong number is Fr. Gosling's *Liberty and Some Modern Theories of the State*. "Voltaire" and the Censors by Denis Gwynn: a Catholic publisher's reflections on some recent events and his misgivings about their possible consequences. *Prehistory and the Fall of Man* by Fr. Humphrey Johnson: Was Adam so "cultured" and "advanced" as the mediæval divines cracked him up to be, and what was his relationship to the most recently discovered fossils?—a valuable article which refuses to evade a very common difficulty, and offers more than one promising hint of genuine solution.

FIDES (Oct.): "Vincenzo McNabb, O.P." on *Il Papa e la Bibbia*.

MONTH (Oct.): Important articles on *Catholics in England To-day* by C. C. Martindale, S.J., and on *The Technique of Confusion* (when communists are not communists) by Arnold Lunn. Fr. Leo O'Hea, S.J., gives his impressions of the Hague Catholic peace congress.

NOUVELLE REVUE THEOLOGIQUE (Sept.-Oct.): *L'Islam et Nous* by J. Abd-el-Jalil, O.F.M. *Politique et Théologie Morale* by Don Sturzo.

SOWER (Oct.): Marguerite Malone on the conspiracy to deprive us of *Fear*.

TEMPS PRESENT (Oct. 14): JAC, JEC, JIC, JOC, JUC, JOCF, JECF, JMC, BEC, LOC, ACJF, CFP, CFTC, USIC—all the bewildering richness of young French Catholicism sorted out and displayed for one franc in a special *Catholic Activities* number, foreworded with a letter from Cardinal Verdier.

VIE SPIRITUELLE (Oct.): *Vie chrétienne selon les Pères* by J.-M. Déchanet, O.S.B.: "patristic revival" in spirituality.

VOLTIGEUR FRANCAIS: a new 75-centimes sheet for popular propaganda of *Esprit* personalism.

YOUNG CHRISTIAN WORKER (Oct.): Full report of the London Y.C.W. congress.

PENGUIN.