

ployers and workers, and, for the workers, not only decent salaries but the maintenance of their dignity and independence through trade unions—so that the sacrifices which to-day they are called upon to make may be their free gift, and not forced labour. It is an ideal of respect for authority, which involves true liberty. It is an ideal of peace, internal and external, which urges us to work for justice at home and abroad, which makes us willing to negotiate even at a sacrifice for the sake of peace—but only once the avalanche of hostile force has been arrested. We must work hard—and quickly: he who does not realize the danger is lost.

The Congress closed on a note of very genuine enthusiasm—and determination.

The NEF appeals for the support of all men of good will, of whatever race or creed or nationality, and its sympathies are naturally inclined towards its fellow democrats in England. Good will: translated into action: that is the ferment—small, indeed, but strong in its source—which can leaven the whole of this sad lump.

MIRA BENENSON.

Paris, 3/12/38.

EXTRACTS AND COMMENTS

LOVE, MARRIAGE AND CHILDREN occupy an important series of articles in the November 25th issue of *La Vie Intellectuelle*. First comes the 'Billet' of Christianus on 'The Sanctity of Marriage.' After reference to the forces, and particularly the economic forces, which are destroying family life and encouraging everything that undermines it, he remarks:

From time to time Christians meet one another elsewhere than in church. Naturally they speak to one another of that which forms the framework of their lives: their work and their families. These Christians, however docile they may be, are accustomed to remark that those who officially have spiritual charge over them too often show little understanding of this

simple yet profound routine of their daily lives, that little is said to them about it from the pulpit, and that what is said is said badly (Canon Cardijn's observations on this score are significant.) . . .

Does this mean that in such matters the theologian has only to ratify the experience of the Christian laity? Our own belief is that it behoves us rather to restore the true meaning and significance to traditional teaching—teaching which over-schematised textbooks and over-hasty presentations have sometimes distorted. Confronted by these all too understandable reactions of our people, we theologians and preachers should all the more energetically defend the rights of these Christian mysteries (and 'this is a great mystery'), though the task be one which earns little esteem even from the best of men . . .

The ground is thus prepared for the very important article that follows, 'L'Amour et l'Enfant' by Père J.-A. Robilliard, O.P. Those who can overlook its occasional unctuousness and its (in our opinion) sometimes unjust strictures on another writer (Dr. Herbert Doms) will find in it a valuable contribution to the solution of many practical problems of 'marital maladjustment,' as well as of more theoretic problems regarding the interrelation and subordination of the 'meaning' and 'ends' of marriage. After a salutary warning regarding the dangers attending intellectual analysis and philosophisation of so complex and nicely-balanced a reality as marriage should be, Père Robilliard gets to grips with the prevalent (if sometimes unconscious) belief that married and parental love are antipathetic, and that 'having children' means the end, or at least the diminution, of the solitary intimacy of 'two-in-oneness.' He argues vigorously and lucidly in the contrary sense to the conclusion that

the inherent beauty of marriage is in no wise tarnished because it entails a task to be fulfilled, a work to be achieved. That seems incontestable; but that says little. We must perceive that there is a far more intimate connection than appears at first sight between married love and the purposes of marriage. True love of husband and wife is of its very essence a creative, a fecund, love. We do not deny that any ethic based on the dignity of human personality should rightly regard as immoral the union of man and woman which is nothing but a utility subserving reproduction. But it would be the opposite extreme

in error to imagine that to refuse fecundity, of set purpose and without good reason, and to decline the cares of bringing up a family, in no way wound married love itself. That is the old error which the (romantic) drama and novel seek to illustrate. But it is vain to try, in any way whatsoever, to separate married love and fecundity . . .

The only way in which two creatures can give themselves totally to one another is through sharing in the same interests and objects. A personal relationship which can be wholly independent of external objects and interests can only be found in intimacy with God Himself, who makes us love Him by introducing us to His own bliss which is identical with Himself. But here below two lovers are always orientated towards other things and persons than themselves—perhaps games or amusements, social or intellectual problems . . . Now, it is the miracle of marriage that it provides this essential common interest, apart from the married couple, yet the condition of their union and their love, in the mystery of another personality—that of the child. I decline to see in the child nothing but a *fruit* of love. It is the very atmosphere which love breathes; the source of its reality . . . This takes us far from the 'love' of the screen and the novelette. If the child be deliberately excluded, there is nothing left after a while but an unhealthy sensibility and a false and faded romanticism. If the child be given, there is an end of egoism. Love itself is saved . . .

Regarding some current criticisms of the teaching of St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas concerning the *finis primarius* of marriage and their neglect of its aspect as 'mutual fulfilment,' Père Robilliard observes: 'Qualified ecclesiastical writers have never made of "mutual fulfilment," or "two-in-oneness," one of the *ends* of marriage, for the simple reason that they recognise these to be *marriage itself*, which precisely consists in this mutual union and reciprocal self-giving.' His article is followed by a detailed analysis of Doms' *Meaning and Purpose of Marriage* (reviewed in *BLACKFRIARS* last September) by Père Lavaud, O.P., in which he defends his own defence (notably in *Revue Thomiste*) of that much-discussed and controverted book, incidentally correcting some of the unfair impressions of Doms' position which Père Robilliard conveys. It is tempting to quote extensively from the paper that follows on 'Le Prêtre et la Grâce du Foyer,' but space

does not permit. We hope that its remarks on the priest in relation to his flock's *experience* of married life will be widely read, and help to overcome the all too common and dangerous mutual incomprehension of priest and people in its regard. 'Souffrances du mariage' covers an intimate letter from a layman on his sexual problems, and the wise and sympathetic reply of his Dominican friend. The section concludes with some notes on 'Medicine and Marriage.'

AN APOLOGY FOR APOLOGETICS is undertaken by Dr. Richard Gutzwiller in Heft 7 of the 1938-9 *Schweizerische Rundschau*. 'Apologetics,' he observes,

are not in very high esteem these days. It is said that apologetics have outlived their usefulness; that they cannot keep pace with the swift march of events or with the rapid development of false ideas. It is being alleged that apologetic over-emphasises the importance of the intellect at the expense of living faith. To-day, we are told, is no time for intellectual argument; we must meet action with action, dynamism with dynamism, deeds with deeds. The decisive thing to-day is sincere piety based solely on the liturgy and the Bible, without argumentation, and certainly without controversy.

The writer vigorously attacks this dangerous anti-intellectualist, activist pietism—more explicit perhaps, but certainly no more potent, in Central Europe than among ourselves. 'An apostolic, up-to-date Christendom *must* get to grips with the problems of its own generation; it *may* not be concerned solely with the next world or take refuge in a one-sided supernaturalism and spirituality. It must be the salt of the earth, the light of this world, the leaven which leavens *modern* man. On no account may we neglect discussion of ideas; it belongs to the very essence of our Christian mission.' After expounding the place which from the Gospels themselves apologetics has played in the Church and the world, the writer concludes with some valuable pages on the task of the apologist in the modern world.

The first necessity is that we must be able to give a clear and sure *distinguo* to contemporary ideas and ideological tendencies.

Discussion (*Auseinandersetzung*) is indispensable. It is not enough simply to oppose Christian practice to non-Christian practice. For the great movements which influence the world to-day originate from ideas and ideologies. Though Marxism could not have come into existence without the economic and social conditions of the early-capitalist period, it is nevertheless an ideology which seeks to change those conditions in a Marxist, and not in any other, direction. There are *idees* behind Marxism and it derives all its power from them. Though National-Socialism would not have existed without the Versailles *Diktat* and the resultant humiliation of the German people, it is nevertheless by reason of an ideology that the Third Reich has taken the form it has. It is ideas that give direction and force to these powerful streams. The face of the world to-day shows that that donnish book of Karl Marx, *Das Kapital*, was to be taken seriously. Present-day Germany shows that Hitler's *Mein Kampf* was to be taken seriously in its every sentence. The present situation of the Church in Germany and Austria shows that Rosenberg's *Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts* is to be taken seriously. If Lagarde, Nietzsche, Houston Chamberlain had been taken more seriously and energetically in their time, affairs in the world would be very different now It is ideas which make revolutions.

It is essential that we be able to distinguish the true from the false in contemporary ideologies. In them, it is clear enough, are a multitude of the very gravest and most pernicious errors. There can be no compatibility between Christianity and economic materialism. The over-stressing of Blood and Soil is quite unacceptable to Christianity, which is something essentially spiritual and supernatural. To such doctrines as these we can only offer a clear and uncompromising *nego*. But on the other hand, there are in these movements important truths—otherwise they could never fascinate as they do. It is, for instance, unquestionable that Race has great importance for religion, that Blood and Soil are weighty factors in the formation of human character and groupings. To much we must give a clear *concedo*. But such distinction of truth from error is only possible if we abandon a superficial polemic which sets up shouting against shouting, and undertake serious and scholarly study. It cannot be done, in the first place, in popular journalism, but only in the tranquillity which serious thought demands. The popularisation of our position with regard to current ideas can only be done when the position itself has been thoroughly worked out. . . .

When this has been done, we must exert all our efforts to refute the errors and to assimilate the truths into our own thought. Errors do not remain lying on the desks of the ideologists, nor are they dead letters in books on library shelves. Erroneous ideas exercise a colossal power, they thunder like avalanches that threaten to destroy mankind. It is not enough that in our popular writings we just say '*nego*' to these errors; we must *prove* our negations Our positive task of incorporating new and true ideas into our general outlook must be taken no less seriously, and done no less publicly. The greatness of St. Thomas Aquinas was due to his incorporation of the heathen philosophy of Aristotle, so despised by theologians of his time yet exercising so great a power over his epoch, into the great synthesis of Catholic faith and thought

But even then our task is not completed. We might distinguish every sentence in, for instance, Rosenberg's *Mythus* without really understanding it, and without really refuting it. For behind this, and every other influential book, lies something not expressed or expressible in words, but from which the rest springs. It is not only with the verbal formulas that we must get to grips; we must dig deeper and discover the concrete problems (*Problematik*), the life-experience (*Lebensgefühl*), the outlooks and attitudes to which these ideas offer a response, and which give them their appeal. And we must show how these needs are still better met by Christian faith and Christian living. That is what St. Augustine did in his *Civitas Dei* for his own time That is what St. Thomas did for his

Lastly, modern apologetics must be able to present its arguments and its response to contemporary needs in the language of our own age. We have got to be able to *translate* the language of our catechisms, the terminology of our textbooks, the scholastic formulas of Christian truths into language that our contemporaries understand. That does not mean that we should change the manner or language of our theological or philosophical studies. We should then be sacrificing what is most precious and necessary for us; we should lose our own strength which owes so much to the stern clarity and definiteness of our concepts. But when we have ourselves achieved clear thinking by the help of these concepts and terms in philosophy, and the exactitude of the language of the Church's dogmatic formulas, then, if we are to make ourselves understood, we must set about this hard work of translation When St. Clement Hofbauer said, 'The Gospel must be preached *anew*,' he did not mean that we must preach a new Gospel, but he did mean that

it must be preached in a new form. To find this new form of presentation, in word and in art, is a task which contemporary apologetic must undertake if it is to make itself understood by men of to-day.

The task is great, but it is imperative that we undertake it. It is not permitted to us to hide our light under a bushel, but we must let it shine before all men, and that means for us the men of our own time. . . .

PERIODICAL CO-ORDINATION. Incidentally to his principal theme, Dr. Gutzwiller lays stress on the necessity for co-ordination between the constructive scientific work which must be done by the learned quarterlies 'of our theological and philosophical faculties and seminaries,' and the more popular and widely diffused monthlies and weeklies. The former are indispensable if our work of 'vulgarisation'—whether 'high' or 'low'—is to be of any value in its content. From a wider angle, the same point is made by Mr. H. A. Mason in a very suggestive article on "The New Republic" and the 'Ideal Weekly' in the December *Scrutiny*:

No weekly can flourish independently, that is, can be at the same time the source and the medium of critical opinion. M. Duhamel . . . traces the hierarchy from the book through the quarterly to the weekly, and finally to the newspaper. This, put abstractly, sounds too beautiful to be true. Yet even in the last century provincial papers used the quarterlies in the process of continuous irrigation through the different levels of society. A weekly fulfils its general function in completing a certain stage in the dissemination of opinion. Some kind of consensus of opinion, and a coherent view of society as a whole (however sketchy be the coherence), is, of course, a necessary preliminary to this process . . . Such an approach . . . makes possible a kind of synthesis mutually illuminating and transforming all its elements.

Mr. Mason appends a quotation from M. Duhamel 'which might serve as a rallying point for those who still entertain some hope for the continued employment of intelligence in the direction of affairs':

Certains observateurs du monde moderne ne manqueront pas de conclure que le monde se transforme en effet et que les revues n'ont qu'à disparaître. Je persiste à croire que ce serait

un grand malheur. Les revues correspondent à une forme d'activité intellectuelle qui me semble plus que jamais nécessaire dans le désordre contemporain. Le livre est volumineux et lent. Le journal est trop bref et trop furtif. Certaine façon d'examiner, de critiquer les événements, les hommes, les ouvrages exige la revue, véhicule naturel d'une pensée vigilante, d'une pensée qui ne résigne pas sa mission.

In his recent 'Penguin Special' on *The Press* Mr. Wickham Steed has drawn attention to the parlous state in which the more or less 'serious' review finds itself at the present time, and the menace that this represents to the quality and intelligence of more 'popular' periodicals, and so to culture and civilisation generally. It is a matter of national concern from which Catholics in particular cannot disinterest themselves. Nor will they have difficulty in seeing the same disruptive factors—and for similar reasons—at work in their own Catholic press, gallantly as a few of their journalists seek to use their journals for the 'irrigation' of ideas received from the more 'solid' periodicals. Yet it can hardly be denied that the more 'popular' papers suffer from over-much 'independence' from the latter, and that Catholic thought and criticism are bound to suffer gravely from the overlapping of functions. The 'independence' is sometimes expressed in positive contempt (expressed commonly by the label 'academic') for any effort at hard, exact and considered thinking or criticism. The 'over-lapping' by the busy weekly journalist of the functions of the quarterly or even the monthly is bound to be detrimental to the formation of Catholic opinion and to involve the substitution of hasty reactions for considered judgment. The short-sighted starvation of the 'serious' secular reviews by advertisers who are hypnotised by the net-sale claims of the newspapers, to which Mr. Steed draws attention, also seems to have its counterpart in the Catholic press if we may judge from a comparative study of its advertising columns. These might indeed seem to be unpromising days in which to expect a new rigidly scientific and technical quarterly of Thomist thought. The absence of such necessarily renders more difficult the intermediate position of a monthly such as our own which must combine the functions of original and constructive thinking with

those of *haute vulgarisation* (and sometimes, owing to extrinsic causes, with those more properly exercised by the weeklies). It is, therefore, not only from altruism that we rejoice to learn of the launching of such a review in the early Spring, to be called *The Thomist*. It will be edited by the American Dominicans from Washington, but they are already assured of the utmost possible collaboration from their colleagues in England. We anticipate that this new review will fill a very serious gap in Catholic periodical co-ordination, and that *The Thomist* will stand in similar relationship to BLACKFRIARS as in France does *Revue Thomiste* or *Revue des Sciences et de la Vie Intellectuelle* or *La Vie Spirituelle*.

LIFE AND LITERATURE. We cannot leave Mr. Mason's article in *Scrutiny* without reference to the searching self-criticism with which it concludes and the reflections it suggests:

It seems a fair criticism of *Scrutiny* that it has been too content to maintain a negative attitude (to politics), and that exposure of the weakness of the Marxist position does not constitute the whole duty of a quarterly. True, certain large gestures have been made which lightly sketch in the position *Scrutiny* should occupy. Yet were a weekly to be founded tomorrow relying on the critical agreements reached in *Scrutiny*, I do not think it could find here the basis for establishing a unity between its 'literary' and its 'political' sides. Those 'underlying issues' [referred to in *Scrutiny's* manifesto] on which the critical mind should freely play, make a too infrequent an appearance. Nor if we turn to the political commentary of *The Criterion* do we receive any practical help. It is true that the work with which *Scrutiny* is associated eventually breeds a general critical attitude . . . Surely the work undertaken by *Scrutiny* does have political implications? This is no call for a general line-up on one side or other of the barricades. It is merely that *Scrutiny* should give its general attitude some more tangible shape. It seems to me that this is a task not being attempted elsewhere.

It is not; and it is to be hoped that these words herald an expansion of the *Scrutiny* approach beyond the confines of 'pure literature'; but not, we trust, on the assumption that all or even the most important of its 'underlying issues' can be covered by 'politics.' From our Catholic

standpoint these limitations of *Scrutiny*, for all its unrivalled excellencies, prevent its compensating wholly for the now almost total indifference of our own periodicals and reviews to literary criticism, while they necessarily render more easy the mistaking of esoteric finicalness for critical integrity, blocking the irrigation-process at the fount-head and widening the chasm between literature and life. Whatever were the deficiencies of *Arena*, it sought to fill a very serious gap in any co-ordinated Catholic press, and its loss is a sad one. Interesting and even important as may be the sentiments of traditionalist Continentals, and desirable as it may be for us to know about them, we are bound to regret that *Colosseum* has become absorbed in them at the expense of Catholic English criticism. At the other end of the scale the popular 'family' Catholic periodicals pursue an autonomous existence which shows little sense of any function in the irrigation-system, or even of any connection with it. Here again the French Dominicans have set a magnificent example. The lay-out, photographs and especially the contents of *La Vie Chrétienne avec Notre Dame* should inspire us with ideas of what could be made of corresponding Catholic periodicals here in England.

NEW SARACEN MENACE? A subscription (50 frs. in England) to *Univers*, the monthly organ of the Comité Français pour la Justice et la Paix (11 Rue des Frères-Vaillant, Lille), is indispensable in order to keep abreast with international events. Its purpose is 'to give news, documents and articles, presented with every care for correctness and impartiality, regarding international problems, especially with regard to extra-European, colonial and Jewish questions,' and this with a view to promoting 'a better understanding among civilised peoples and brotherly union between the different races.' Its efficiency is guaranteed by the fact that its editorial committee includes such specialists as Paul Catrice, Jean Létourneau, Joseph Folliet, Jacques Madaule, and Marc Scherer. It would be no idle claim to say that *Univers* gives you the news behind the news, and a great deal of information that is neglected by our press, both secular and Catholic. News collected in the Novem-

ber number bears witness to the immense effort which is being made by Italy, Germany, Japan and Franco's Spain to exploit the Moslem world in their own interests and against Britain and France. Perhaps the most astonishing documents are the extracts from Señor Sarrano Suner's (Burgos Minister of the Interior) speeches in Spanish Morocco. But more disturbing is Paul Catrice's article on 'The International Repercussions of the Arab Revolt in Palestine.' It concludes:

The future destiny of Arabism and Islam may yet give us plenty to think about. The conjunction of Islam with Hitlerism and Fascism may hold many surprises in store for us. An Arab journal in Jerusalem recently wrote: 'To-morrow all the peoples of the Peninsula—which to-day are divided into tribes, provinces, kingdoms, parties and religions, just as Germany was in 1840—will be gathered together to form an immense Empire. We only await the word of command of a great man who will be the Bismarck of Arab unity.'

In times which change so rapidly as our own, in these times of unforeseen and sudden evolutions, we cannot ridicule such prophecies. But there *is* reason for foreseeing at some no distant date an alliance of the materialist nationalisms of Hitler and Mussolini with Islam, and (who knows?) ultimately with that of Bolshevism. With reason has Hitlerism been called 'Brown Bolshevism' as well as 'a new Islam.' A true religious sense has plenty to fear from the paradoxical, but by no means illusory, conjunction of these three materialistic 'religions.'

Other valuable items include studies on 'The Christian and Artistic Traditions of the Basques' by Père Lhande, S.J.; on the intensification of persecution in U.S.S.R.; on the history of the Church's treatment of Jewry; on 'Education in British East Africa'; and a very gentle retort to the *Month* which has apparently pronounced the Comité to be a 'scandal.' Also several documents regarding the Spanish War, including an article 'For Peace in Spain' by Señor Mendizabal, and an apostrophe from Mauriac to Claudel regarding the latter's fine, but in Mauriac's opinion unfinished, poem 'To the Spanish Martyrs.'

PENGUIN,