

lighten any who are inclined to think that there may be something in Spiritualism" (p. 15). His book is not a study in Psychical Research but "the presentation of such a case against Spiritualism that all Catholics at least will see for themselves how hollow, how fraudulent, how contradictory a movement it is and thereby be deterred from having anything to do with it". In the attempt to convince possible non-Catholic readers as well, the evidence is provided by quotations from the writings of none-Catholic investigators and of Spiritualists themselves, with Professor Joad as the impartial witness to the sense of the Catholic point of view.

The author has certainly not written 'without the book', as he puts it, but we get the impression that it is a scrap-book. We can sympathise with the general note of irritation, for, as his quotations abundantly show, he has to deal with a pseudo-religion full of contradictions, confusions and crudities. Yet this manner of writing, while showing that much spiritualism is pure fraud, a great deal can be explained by natural causes, and a certain amount is probably diabolic in origin, does not help us to understand the causes which make Spiritualism so attractive to many and how Catholicism can be the true corrective of such a perverse form of religion. This seems to us especially true of the last chapter in which Fr. O'Neill proposes the "Catholic Point of View".

This takes the form of an apologetic presenting Catholicism as a body of coherent truths believed on God's authority but founded in human reason and approached by way of the 'motives of credibility', especially the prophecies and miracles of the Bible. The position taken up is one which by no means emphasises the infused nature of the habit of faith but rather makes it the term of a rational investigation. As Thomists we find this exposition unsatisfactory but we also think it less apt to meet the needs of those attracted to Spiritualism than an apologetic which does emphasise the supernatural character of the act of faith and its motives while not lessening the importance of 'our reasonable service'. For Spiritualism is an attempt to fulfil a human need, though in a perverted manner. S. Thomas tells us that one who presumes to fore-know or foretell the future, without a divine revelation, usurps knowledge proper to God alone. For Catholics true 'divination' must take place under the divine initiative and for divine purposes as is abundantly shown in the Old and New Testaments. But the gift of faith itself, demanding the divine initiative, is an ordered participation in divine knowledge. It is through faith that we can believe with certainty in a future life and leave our war dead in the safe hands of God the Father Almighty. It seems to us more important to point this out than to insist on the reasonableness of our faith in comparison with the fraud and fallaciousness of Spiritualism.

DAMIAN MAGRATH, O.P.

ENJOYING THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Margaret Monro. (Longmans; 8s. 6d.)

Miss Monro's work is an excellent introduction to the New Tes-

tament, particularly for anyone who is approaching the New Testament for the first time. She is aiming at presenting writings in the order in which they were written as far as possible, so that the reader can picture to himself how the whole grew stage by stage. Her book will be doing in a popular manner what Moffatt's famous historical New Testament has done for scientific scholars. But while Moffat could presuppose in his readers, a detailed knowledge of the historical background, Miss Monro is writing specifically for beginners. For this reason, the precise historical order has at times been sacrificed. Thus the Acts of the Apostles have been put towards the beginning of the book since most of the other writings find their place within the historical setting of the Acts.

Various selections for reading are given after each chapter which will prove a great help in finding one's way through the more complex part of the New Testament writings, especially St. Paul's Epistles.

DANIEL WOOLGAR, O.P.

C O R R E S P O N D E N C E

3rd. September, 1945.

To The Editor of Blackfriars:

DEAR SIR,—Two undocumented statements have appeared in your issue which, in my humble opinion require some substantiation, or withdrawal, inasmuch as they detrimentally confuse the affairs of an unfortunate ally:—

Professor Leibholz, on page 327, states that "A big army of . . . non-Germans, including . . . Poles . . . had rallied to the National Socialist flag". Surely we have yet to hear of Polish National Socialists? In fact we have been often very truly informed that Poland is the only nation which failed to produce a Quisling. Perhaps the Professor has confused National Democrats with National Socialists? If so, the confusion is highly regrettable, as there is a vast distinction between them.

Again, in an otherwise excellent review on page 355 "D.A." writes, "a majority (of the inhabitants of the disputed Eastern area of Poland) certainly is culturally closer to the Russians than to the Poles". As one who knows Eastern Poland well and comes of a Polish family of partly Ruthenian descent (and even Muscovite) exiled long ago from areas east, even of the "disputed area", may I ask for some substantiation of this statement? The two main Nationalities in the "disputed area" were Poles 4,010,000 and Ruthenians (proper and White) 4,842,000—or, in the area annexed in 1939 Poles 4,794,000 and Ruthenians (proper and White) 5,132,000. (I give the latter figures, as I have not the Religious denominational figures for the former area. All figures are based on 1931 census). For the latter area there were in principal re-