

BLACKFRIARS

may also seek to create a sort of atmosphere or set of conventions favourable to progress. But as regards social betterment, religion must take care *not to advocate changes for which men are not ready*, but rather "TO SUPPORT HEARTILY ALL MODIFICATIONS OF SOCIAL COMPULSION WHICH ARE WELL-SPONSORED IN A TECHNICAL SENSE," and so consolidate the ground for the next advance.

In other and cruder words, the younger generation of preachers are invited to place themselves at the service of the policy of the Bank of England.

Never for a moment does it seem to enter Sir Josiah Stamp's head that there is such a thing as Justice to be considered in economic arrangements; that right or wrong are as much involved in collective affairs as in individual: and that the laws of a country may be good or bad, just or unjust, and that bad laws ought to be changed into good ones.

Two definite conclusions can fairly be drawn from this book. First, that the Money-lords are becoming a little apprehensive lest the facts about Finance should be realized by organized religion; they have made sure of the Press, the Radio, and the Cinema, but the pulpit disconcertingly reveals itself as a possible source of leakage. Secondly, that the tactical scheme of the Money-Power is going to use the Douglas proposals as a red-herring; it will try to make the public mind identify the cause of Monetary Reform with the eccentric knots into which the Douglas die-hards have been tying themselves ever since the death of Alfred Orage, who, with his dynamic inspiration and his not-too-critical judgment, was of course the real source of their movement.

F. H. DRINKWATER.

EXTRACTS AND COMMENTS

CATHOLICISM AND PEACE. Possible misgivings as to whether the attitude to Peace and War adopted by contributors to the last number of BLACKFRIARS represents authentic Catholicism may be allayed by some remarks of Emmanuel Mounier in LA VIE INTELLECTUELLE (November 25) which we may paraphrase:

EXTRACTS AND COMMENTS

Can we speak of a Catholic doctrine regarding Peace and War? Here you may show me cynically a collection of press-cuttings from Catholic papers, extracts from sermons and the writings of Catholics which would seem, to say the least, hardly consistent. . . . But "Catholicism" is not a congeries of the words and actions of all who profess the name of Catholic. Honesty compels you to distinguish *the Church*—which we say is a supernatural entity, at once spiritual and visible, in direct physical continuity with Jesus Christ—from *Christians* (or the Christian world), lay or clerical, who mix up the doctrine of the Church with a whole heap of passions, prejudices, and stupidities which is the common lot of man. Christians, Catholics not excepted, are accustomed to talk all sorts of nonsense, even about Christianity itself. But how about the priests?—you ask. *Eh bien!* In so far as they rely on the judgment of their own experience, and on that alone, priests, religious, the Popes themselves, when they speak or act with regard to particular concrete matters, are no more infallible *ipso facto* than other Christians. The Vatican which is indirectly—and at one time was still more so—a temporal power, may follow such external temporal policy as did Julius II who careered around Italy on horseback, armed, uniformed and helmeted, shouting *Fuori barbari*. . . . These things should not scandalize me. . . . Still less should the warcries which we have heard from many pulpits during the past four years—the cries which burn still in the memories of Christians—nor should the daily treason of a so-called Catholic press whose Christian ardour seems to find no better outlet than to breathe out nationalistic fervour and to stir up hatred for our *voisin* in the name of love for our *prochain*.

You have, then, no business to attribute to "Catholicism" whatever happens to please you or to shock you—be it this or that assertion of a Catholic, cleric or layman—unless you know by what authority he speaks, and unless you compare his words or actions to that of authentic common Catholic teaching. If you want to know what that teaching is, you will not find it in the discordant voices of those with nationalistic or pacifistic passions, but in the authoritative, universally authorized pronouncements of encyclicals and Pontifical pronouncements.

That is what BLACKFRIARS contributors endeavoured to do; and M. Mounier's admirable articles on *Le point de vue catholique sur la paix* from which the above is quoted should serve as a valuable, well-documented complement to our Peace Number. M. Mounier concludes his exposition with a timely warning against too hasty applications to individual cases of the teaching of contemporary theologians regarding the ethics of modern warfare:

BLACKFRIARS

When all this has been said, it remains to determine who is to be the arbiter of the justice or the injustice of a war: the individual, the State, some international jurisdiction, or the Church? It may further be asked what consequences result from all this with regard to the participation or non-participation of individuals, and to whom belongs the right of deciding such matters. To answer these extremely delicate questions would take us out of the scope of what we set out to discuss; they are matters which theology will have to reconsider *ab ovo* in view of changed situations. In the confusion in which we find ourselves, the bases of bygone solutions collapse, whilst the bases of more recent solutions are themselves unstable. For the moment, aware of the drama of which they treat and which they seek to resolve, we cannot hope to attain more than provisional solutions to keep pace with the development of events. . . .

UNION OF PRAYER FOR PEACE. Following upon Father Strattmann's contribution to our last number, we have great pleasure in publishing the following communication:

The realization of the motto of the Pope—*the peace of Christ in the kingdom of Christ*—must be the hope and ambition of every Catholic; and however we may differ as to the natural means to be employed in working for that end, there can be no room for disagreement, in these days especially, as to the essential importance of the supernatural means, the duty of prayer. It is desirable that this prayer should be, as far as possible, corporate; and to this end it is suggested that Catholics enrol themselves in a Union of Prayer, by promising to say, every day, at least one decade of the Rosary or its equivalent. We shall be praying, not merely for the absence of war, but for the peace of Christ, the unity which comes of justice and charity, both among the different sections of society in our own country and among the nations of the world. Once every month Mass will be offered for this intention, and that all members may share together in it, the register of their names will be placed upon the altar. For this purpose, those who are willing to join in this work are asked, as sole condition of membership, to send their names on a postcard to: Father Gerald Vann, O.P., Blackfriars School, Laxton, Stamford. This appeal has received the full approval of His Grace the Archbishop of Westminster and of His Lordship the Bishop of Northampton.

MYSTICS AND SCHOLASTICS have a way of perplexing, and even of shocking, one another. There are many passages in the *Imitation*, in St. John of the Cross—not to mention Tauler—which to the trained theologian may appear as sheer heresy.

Those who, under the guidance of St. Thomas Aquinas, have learned to appreciate the humanistic implications of Christianity are liable to be particularly shocked at much they will find in "spiritual writers," and even, we may add, in the Scriptures. On the other hand, to the mystically-inclined the cold, abstract language of theologians, with their careful definitions, distinctions and qualifications, is apt to appear wholly unreal and remote from concrete spiritual realities. The fact is not recognized that the theologian and the mystic have, as such, two totally different modes of apprehending the same spiritual realities and, as a result, two totally different languages and terminologies. Those of the latter are speculative and scientific, whereas those of the former are "poetic" in the strict original sense of the word as "practical." The scholastic would be wrong to dismiss the assertions of the *Imitation* on Grace and Nature, or the *Nada* of St. John of the Cross, as pious inexactitudes approximating to heresy: they are as valid and true in their way as are the scientific assertions of St. Thomas in his; and this on the showing of St. Thomas himself. Much harm and misunderstanding arises when poetry is read as prose or prose as poetry, especially when concerned with supernatural realities. The whole matter is lucidly set out and explained by Père Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., in *Le langage des spirituels comparé à celui des théologiens* in LA VIE SPIRITUELLE (December). He concludes:

Each of these two terminologies has its own merits. For the studies to which the theologian devotes himself, it is certain that his more abstract, more precise, more exclusively exact mode of expression is preferable. But the more lively, more alluring, concrete, comprehensive, terse language of the mystics is more effective in fostering generous sacrifice and closer union with God. This arises from the fact that it expresses not only abstract concepts but *experience* and ardent love for God; hence it avoids many circumlocutions and speculative distinctions which hinder the impetus of love; it leads the soul to seek God through and *beyond* the formulas of the Faith. It reminds us that, if the *truth* of our knowledge is in our mind, the *good* to which our souls tend is without: in God Himself . . .

The two languages are complementary and mutually explanatory; as is the teaching of a St. Thomas and of a St. John of the Cross; as is "acquired wisdom," which is the perfect use of reason enlightened by Faith, and "infused wisdom," which is the Gift of Wisdom.

BLACKFRIARS

The language of the Gospels, which is akin to that employed by the mystics, preserves the spirit of faith and of divine love—the spirit of theology itself—regarding the transcendence of God and the lowliness of His creation. From this point of view a theologian who was ‘anti-mystic’ would be a bad theologian.

But on the other hand, the terminology and language of scholasticism is very necessary, if not for the interior life of individuals, at least for the preservation and communication of the revealed truths against inexactitudes which might distort it. Without the correctness and exactitude of theological terms, there would be very considerable liability of falling into error. . . . Hence the great mystics, like St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross, have held great theologians in the highest esteem, whereas false mystics, like Molinos, have regarded them with contempt. A priest who is responsible for the care of souls should be acquainted with *both* languages, and be able to explain one by the other. We cannot grasp the true meaning of spiritual writers if unable to translate them into theological language; and contrariwise we know nothing of the heights of theology if ignorant of its mystical references.

REUNION: CORPORATE AND INDIVIDUAL. The Editor of the Anglican review REUNION makes the following observations in his current number:

Roman Catholics in England constantly blame us for not joining their Church immediately and individually, instead of trying to win over our co-religionists first, so that we may join as a body. If we see the truth of the Church under the Papacy, so they argue, we ought to submit to it for our individual sakes, as salvation is a personal duty.

We quite see the force of this argument; and yet the best Roman Catholic theologians have seen its weakness. The policy of the Roman Church in past ages always was to deal directly with the Patriarchs of dissident Churches, seldom with their individual members, as it was assumed in Catholic theology that the ordinary faithful must follow their spiritual leaders. The paternal efforts of Pope Innocent in 413 to bring back to the dissident Church of Antioch by dealing direct with its Patriarch Alexander has for many centuries been the type of policy followed by the Holy See. It never occurred to anyone in those days to try to convert individual members of dissident Patriarchates. They could not be expected to know the theology on which their leaders split, and in conscience they were perfectly justified in following their Bishops, even when these went astray and severed communion from the Holy See. . . .

To-day it is quite a common practice among Roman Catholic

EXTRACTS AND COMMENTS

theologians on the Continent, in dealing with Russian refugees who consult them in their religious doubts, to advise them to follow their own Bishops, as long as it is not perfectly clear to them that their Bishops are in the wrong. And they are under no obligation to try to clear their doubts, for the principle of following one's Bishop is quite sufficient, in the eyes of God, to satisfy one's conscience and comes before the obligation of finding out if the Bishop is right or not. Roman Catholic theologians of the conservative class prefer to give this direction rather than profit by the affliction of the Russian Church to rob her of her members, and lay themselves open to the suspicion of *souperism*. . . .

It remains our duty as Anglicans to win over our own Bishops to the cause of the only Reunion possible; one faith under the Holy See; so that they may lead their flocks back to the True Fold. The heaviest responsibility lies on the spiritual leaders.

Some of these points are important, though they seem to rest on the inadmissible assumption that the bishops of the Anglican Communion are authentic diocesans as are those of the Eastern Churches. But it is true that ordinary people cling, and often are given no alternative than to cling, to those whom they have been taught to regard as their lawful local religious leaders, and they cannot normally be expected to examine their credentials. It is this that makes prayer and work in preparation for a corporate reunion—however remote and forlorn a cause it may seem—so imperative. But every Catholic theologian will agree that once the schismatic status has been recognized the obligation of healing it rests with the individual when this is possible. REUNION contributors are wont to remind us that they were not responsible for the Anglican schism, which they consider to have been forced by the State on an unwilling *Ecclesia anglicana*. But they have the ability, and, we would add, the duty, of undoing its work for themselves. Praise is however due to REUNION for its indefatigable labours in promoting the Catholic conception of the constitution of the Church and of the Papal primacy among Anglicans. God works in a mysterious way: and it is for Him alone to judge the Anglican Papalist whose personal position astonishes Catholic and Anglican alike.

HUMILITY ON FLEET-STREET may be illustrated by two somewhat inconsistent comments on the recent "crisis":

The attitude of the British Press has been a model to the world.

BLACKFRIARS

. . . The crisis has at least done one good thing. The British democracy has shown that it knows how to use its freedom to write and speak.—*The Church Times*.

The Press was given more than a hint to keep away from a dangerous subject. . . . It is certain that the present crisis could have been averted if the Press had been left alone to deal with the question without delay.—*News Review*.

A Catholic newspaper, treating of a matter of more domestic interest, sets this example:

[Mr. Hutton] apparently follows the example of a few other untypical Catholics who take pains to dissociate themselves from the general feeling of Catholics whenever there is trouble about. . . . Fortunately Catholic common sense recognizes these people's real unimportance. But the fact remains that they may easily mislead the public which does not read our press. . . .—*The Universe*.

And this is what happens when the public *does* read it:

When a Catholic magazine (*Blackfriars*) published an article deprecating incitements to fratricidal strife, *The Universe* called the article deplorable. Such is Catholic Action.—*Rationalist Annual*.

CONTEMPORANEA. AMERICAN REVIEW (November): *The New League* satirized by Hilaire Belloc. *Property and Catholic Morals*: Eric Gill develops the theme he outlined in BLACKFRIARS (October, 1936).

CLERGY REVIEW (December): *Women and Catholic Action* by Barbara Grant Johnson.

COLOSSEUM (December): *Philosophy and Common-Sense* by D. J. B. Hawkins: it can't get away from it. *Henri Bergson* by Georges Cattani: a sympathetic study. *Problems of Pacifism*: "When will there be peace among men?"—Never; if Hegel, Nietzsche, de Maistre—and Mr. Bernard Wall—can help it. *A Comment*: we are found "meaningless and unreal" about Fascism.

ESPRIT (December): Two thought-provoking pleas for political and economic realism, and some fine *Cahiers de littérature prolétarienne*.

NINETEENTH CENTURY (December): *The Cowardice of the Catholic Church*: Father Edward Quinn, "recognizing his own deficiencies and the negligence of many of his fellow Catholics," treats of Mr. Hutton's indictment in the previous issue "by setting out some of the efforts made by the Catholic Church and her members to the solution of the problems" of Abys-

CORRESPONDENCE

sinia, Spain, Fascism, social injustice, etc. *An Irishman in Spain* by Peadar O'Donnell: an Irish Catholic's impressions of some church-sacking.

NOUVELLE REVUE THEOLOGIQUE (November): Canon Brohée, pioneer apostle of the cinema, comments on the Encyclical *Vigilanti Cura*.

THEOLOGY (December): *The Parish Priest and the Life of Prayer*: an admirable lecture by Evelyn Underhill to the Anglican Worcester Clergy Convention; much to be taken to heart by others. *November the Fifth: A cold Plunge into the Bath of History, recommended to brace the Nerves of Whigs and to cleanse the Cant of Prigs*: Guy Fawkes as Fascist, by G. L. Prestige. Also, an inside account of the German Faith movements.

VIE SPIRITUELLE (December): *Une expérience de retraite active*: some account of an entirely new type of retreat in which, so far as possible, the participants give themselves the retreat collectively, which has been found highly successful in meeting the spiritual needs of moderns.

PENGUIN.

CORRESPONDENCE

PROGRESS AND PROCESS

To the Editor of BLACKFRIARS

Sir,—In respect of "Penguin's" note in the November BLACKFRIARS, with its interesting and on the whole helpful comments upon an article of mine which appeared in *The Cross and the Plough*, a word in reply may perhaps be looked for. I might call attention, for example, to the highly honoured name at the head of your contributors and say that I am more than content to be in the same company and condemnation. Another point has escaped you; Father Tindal-Atkinson, after a very beautiful tribute to the old peasant culture, dogmatically denied the possibility of return, even, it would seem, for individuals, and then poured ridicule on those individuals (and even families) who, with eminent courage, and under great hardships, and in the face of heartless ridicule, in spite of his theory, returned, and, not surprisingly, in doing so developed something of the feature and manner of the old peasantry. Why in this world should they not? Why should they obey his (unforeseen) veto?

As to the general question, "running away" is an easy accusa-