

tradition; but in his case the emphasis is upon the Church of England as *Catholic and Reformed*: his book is full of angry (and very amusing) sallies against the 'Catholics' (especially Bishop Weston of Zanzibar) and the 'Tractarians,' whose opinions, here as elsewhere, he supposes to be destructive of, and incompatible with, the official formularies of the Anglican faith. Dr. Henson has the advantages of autobiography and an argumentative prose of great distinction in the presentation of his case—for it is a case: an argument from start to finish. But what is lacking in Dr. Henson's volume, and so notably present in Dr. Cross's, is the scholarly justification for the positions adopted; and this is perhaps the central disadvantage of his method: we are left in no doubt as to what his views are, but we are not given the means of criticising them—a fault noticeable elsewhere in the Bishop's writings.

Where men such as Stone and Bishop Henson differ, the non-Anglican observer may be excused for keeping an open mind; and the need is apparent, for the views which these two books put forward seem to be opposed as contradictories, and their authors to recognise this. Stone, indeed, held that 'it was only the ambiguity of the Church of England formularies which made them patient of Catholic doctrine'; Dr. Henson would not seem to stress their ambiguity, but then, by 'Catholic' he means something different from Stone's position, and does not refuse the title of 'Protestant.' But both recognise that the root of their differences does not lie in the exegesis of documents, but in the theology of the Church as the visible organisation founded by Christ to carry out the work of God. For Stone the episcopate was part of that divine organisation; for Dr. Henson it is not. And it is the existence of such divergences of 'opinion' within the same body, however derivable from deliberate ambiguity in the formulation of doctrine, which constitutes the interest of these two most valuable books for the Catholic reader, who cannot watch the struggle of those incompatible trends without the deepest sympathy and concern. Should either side eventually dominate the Anglican body, the religious situation we know will be wholly changed. It cannot be a matter of indifference to Catholics that the tradition in which Darwell Stone was an important link should prove, in the end, to be the doctrine of the Church of England.

LUKE TURNER, O.P.

SALAZAR, REBUILDER OF PORTUGAL. By F. C. C. Egerton. (Hodder & Stoughton; 16s.)

Mr. Egerton has written an extraordinarily good book, one that is fully worthy of its distinguished subject. In these days of chaos and decay it is a rare pleasure to find a book on current politics in which that noble science has not been utterly debased. This, on the contrary, is a book full of true political wisdom.

The author has planned his book well: it opens with chapters on

Portugal and the Portuguese and on Portuguese history, and there is also an informative chapter on the Portuguese Colonial Empire. Thus the account of Salazar's achievements is properly related to the previous history of his country.

All too little is known by the English of their ancient ally. Those who read Mr. Egerton's book will, if I am not mistaken, acquire a new sense of respect for this people and a keen desire to see Portugal for themselves.

There is much that I would like to quote; but, apart from considerations of space, readers of BLACKFRIARS probably have acquired some knowledge of Dr. Salazar's political philosophy and his practical achievements, both from Mr. Michael Derrick's useful book, *The Portugal of Salazar*, and the volume of Salazar's speeches entitled *Doctrine and Action*.

I should, however, like to quote from a speech made by His Excellency Dr. Arminda Monteiro, now Portuguese Ambassador to this country, to the League of Nations during the Spanish Civil War. This speech is a fine example of that political wisdom of which the Portuguese New State (and not just Dr. Salazar himself) has so much, and as Mr. Egerton remarks, the fact that this speech received little, if any, notice in our Press is a serious reflection on our attitude to international problems.

'We are convinced,' said Dr. Monteiro, 'that those who threaten the unity or tranquility of peoples by urging upon them ideologies which their own genius has not conceived . . . are simply engendering war.'

'Men who can desire, and sometimes encompass, the deliberate and pitiless extermination of those who do not belong to a particular class, do not want peace; they wish to make a desert. They do not want democracy or liberty; they desire the absolute rule of their destructive hate, their will, their interest

'Because the spirit of peace is absent from the internal life of nations it is beginning to make its absence felt in international life also. Little by little, though quite imperceptibly, certain peoples are beginning to regard as enemies other peoples who have ideologies different from their own, not because the ideologies themselves are different—that is of no importance—but because they wish to impose their ideologies on others. . . . A Government which, through a war beyond its own frontiers, imposes a certain political structure upon a foreign people is doing something worthy of condemnation, but, if it descends to the hypocrisy of creating internal dissension, it becomes deserving of general execration. . . .

Every nation has a genius and ideals of its own. Let us admit that what is suited to one people is perhaps not suited to another. Let us, for example, realise that the parliamentary democracy which is a blessing to some may be a curse to others. . . .

'Let us not forget that words change their meaning with latitude,

and that institutions which function in a spirit of tolerance and for the common weal in one place may, in another, be no more than a façade behind which the most cruel tyranny, the greatest extremes of robbery and violence, may lurk. Such institutions may be called by the same name, but the spirit which inspires them is completely different.'

Mr. Egerton describes well the personality of Portugal's unassuming dictator. Salazar may justly claim the noble Roman title which others have used, apparently, as a polite substitute for 'tyrant.'

The equation of 'democracy' with 'parliamentary government' is one of the most unfortunate errors of our times. The Portuguese New State is absolutely opposed to 'democracy' and 'liberalism' based on the disastrous ideas of 1789.

But true democracy—representation of the will of the nation, suppression of vested interests for the interests of the whole people, and provision of equal opportunity for all classes to share in the material and spiritual resources of the nation—this may be obtained under various systems of government—possibly more successfully under monarchy, aristocracy or dictatorship than under parliamentarism.

But *no* system of government can be anything but hurtful to the nation unless it is based (implicitly or explicitly) on Christian principles.

Salazar is a Christian: Portugal is a Christian State—a thing almost unique in the modern world. Hence the importance of this book.

MICHAEL SEWELL.

SO FAR. By W. J. Brown, M.P. (Geo. Allen & Unwin, Ltd.; 12s. 6d.)

It is a habit among politicians to crown their careers with an autobiographical justification; usually of a strongly defensive character. This is precisely the type of book that Mr. Brown has not written.

The son of a plumber, he overcame great difficulties to reach his present pinnacle, and relates these early struggles with a frankness and sincerity which cannot fail to enlist the full sympathy of the reader. His early efforts on behalf of the lower grade civil servants brought great benefits to that body, which a less astute or aggressive representative would have failed to wrest from a soulless Treasury. Later, his arrival in the House of Commons as Labour Member for Wolverhampton, gives rise to reflections on Parliamentary caucuses which form the basis of a well-reasoned condemnation of Party Politics, with their Trade Union and other external influences. After this critical and observant attitude toward the deficiencies of Left Wing political activities, it seems strange that Mr. Brown should contribute to their flights of fancy in Foreign Policy; 'the murder of the Spanish Republic' (this seems to call for a plea of 'justifiable homicide'), and then that classical example of the auto-suggestive power of the Press—the bombing of Guernica.