

first prepared for a popular library of paper-bound books published in the U.S.A. The collection is rounded off with Acton's letter to Mandell Creighton and the latter's reply. While there are far more valuable letters in Acton's correspondence—some of his letters, for example, to Mary Gladstone would have illuminated the other essays—one has the feeling that this letter has been given in full so as to include the famous dictum about the corruption of power in its original context. Not a bad thing, perhaps, because one realizes how often it is incorrectly quoted. The notes are a little too curtailed, and the reader not given to mental arithmetic will hardly realize that the three central essays, including the famous one on nationality, were written by Acton when in his late twenties. The greater part of the introduction by the editor is devoted to Acton's religious difficulties, and does not commend itself because of its tendentious nature and occasional errors. It is certainly not an adequate introduction to Acton's ideas of freedom and power.

J.F.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

House of the Resurrection,
Mirfield,
Yorkshire.

July 18th, 1957.

Sir,

In reviewing my book *Naught for your Comfort* last year (July-August) Father Finbar Synott, O.P., wrote: 'It is a weakness in the book that Father Huddleston does not define clearly what he means by "apartheid". . . . The "apartheid" that the Church can allow to be a legitimate solution is the complete one . . .'; and he concludes that he 'could not give the book' to his people 'for fear it might make them wrong and biased'.

On July 10th this year the South African Catholic Bishops' Conference in Pretoria (attended by twenty-five bishops) issued the following statement:

'To all white South Africans we direct an earnest plea to consider fully what apartheid means—its evil and anti-Christian character, the injustices that flow from it, the resentment and bitterness it

arouses, the harvest of disaster that it must produce in the country we all love so much.'

The conference further used the adjective 'blasphemous' to describe apartheid, and urged an immediate change in the Government's racial policy before the country faces 'a holocaust'.

If I used any stronger language than that, or urged any more fundamental re-thinking or prophesied any greater doom, perhaps Fr Synott would say so. So far as my report of the bishops' statement goes I would agree with every word of it. Would Fr Synott? And if he would, will he perhaps explain the difference between my condemnation of apartheid (which is not mine at all, but that of almost every Christian body in South Africa) and that of the bishops?

TREVOR HUDDLESTON, C.R.

FR FINBAR SYNOTT, O.P., writes:

'With reference to the first part of Fr Huddleston's letter: The word "apartheid" was introduced by the Nationalist Party in South Africa, and for a time used to distinguish their policy from the Smuts-Hertzog policy known as "segregation". Dr Malan translated the word "apartheid" by the English word "separation". It was sometimes used for the plan of partitioning South Africa and forming separate Native states or "Bantustans". This latter was the "complete apartheid" idea referred to in my review as an alternative to "integration", and morally legitimate. Now, however, "apartheid" is more commonly used for the old "segregation" policy. The Catholic Bishops, in their statement this year (paragraph 2, verbatim text in the *Southern Cross* of July 17), distinguish "integration" and "partition" from the thing they are condemning under the name of "apartheid". They say ". . . the old policy of segregation has under the name of apartheid received clearer definition and more precise application". It was lack of such clear definition of the meaning attached to the word of which I complained in Fr Huddleston's book.

'With reference to his last paragraph: he will find if he looks at the review again that I stated that his description of the situation of the non-Europeans under the present system (i.e., segregation) was "factual" and "not exaggerated". He will see also that it was not his prophecy of the direct outcome of the present situation that was criticized, but his interpretation of the duty of the priesthood in speaking of these matters. Otherwise, to show all the differences between his approach and the Catholic Bishops' would take more space than I am here allotted.'