

took their origin,' as having written three letters to England saying that he knew by revelation that Urban was the true Pope. Though anonymous in the State paper, this 'holy hermit' is no stranger to the friends of St. Catherine. Father William Flete, the stubborn, phlegmatic Englishman, 'the Cambridge Doctor,' as the Sienese called him, might refuse to leave his solitude even at the request of his 'Sweet Mother,' but he worked for her nevertheless. We wonder what effect the revelations of a hermit would have on the English Privy Council to-day! But in the ages of Faith St. Catherine and others like her were able to influence the Rulers of States and make peace where human passions and selfish interests were causing suffering and bloodshed. And wild and lawless men like the Plantagenet Kings of England stayed their headstrong courses for a time and listened to the Saint who rebuked them.

Richard was but a boy at this time, but like all his family he had a Dominican confessor, and the Dominicans had much influence in his council. It was no doubt through them that St. Catherine's letter was presented to the Parliament, and went far towards maintaining the fidelity of England to the true Pope.

S.M.F.

EXTRACTS AND COMMENTS

WHY AN ITALIAN POPE? The election of Cardinal Eugenio Pacelli to the See of Peter has been welcomed with almost unanimous acclamation throughout the world. True, that acclamation has sometimes been based on a misunderstanding, on the efforts of various propaganda-machines to align him on one or the other side of the ideological front which now splits the civilised world. But here and there have been expressions of more or less veiled regret that once again the Cardinals have chosen an Italian national—however 'travelled' and 'enlightened'—and lists of the Pope in the papers have served to remind the general public of the extent to which 'Italians' have preponderated in the

government of what is understood to claim to be an 'international' Church. Numerous misunderstandings are suggested by such regrets. In the first place it may be forgotten that only recently has Italy become a nation, and only in very recent years a first-class power; that those bygone Popes whom we call 'Italians' were politically the subjects of many different and often opposing minor States; and that consequently the choice of Popes from the many states which have composed, successively and simultaneously, the Italian peninsula, could indicate no possible favouritism in the realm of international politics for a nation yet unborn. It must also be remembered that of these 'Italians' a very large proportion were chosen from subjects of the Papal States themselves, from men, that is to say, who had hitherto owed no allegiance to any temporal authority than that of the Holy See itself, and who were consequently above any *a priori* suspicion of partiality towards any other civil power or nation. Finally, the very predominance of one race among the occupants of the Holy See serves to remind us that the Catholic Church is *not* 'international' in any Genevan sense which demands the principle of proportional representation on the basis of civil nationality, but it precisely supra-national in the sense that its government as such is independent of such considerations. Still more weighty and more positive reasons are suggested by Henri Davenson in the *March Esprit*:

Some consider and have been saying quite openly: a non-Italian Pope should be elected. That is very naïve. Too many people consider the Pope, the head of the universal Church, raised by his rank above the other Bishops, as if he were a colonel set above his captains and lieutenants. That is a mistake; there is no 'rank' of Pope in the holy Orders of the Church. The Pope is a Bishop, the Bishop of Rome, to which Bishopric belong particular rights and functions. The Pope is an Italian Bishop, whose Bishopric has attached to it the privilege of governing the world. In that fact there is occasion for the legitimate pride of Italians in general, and of Romans in particular, and we have no business to resent it.

Consequently it is something quite normal and in order that the Pope should be an Italian; just as we should consider it normal that the Bishop of Tokyo should be a Japanese and that

as many as possible of the bishops in China should be Chinese. History confirms this rule, as we may see if we examine the exceptions it records. Nearly all the non-Italian Popes will be found in one of four groups. Of these four groups, three are to be explained by the same cause, namely the tyranny of some foreign power over the Roman Church. Thus we find the periods of

1. *Byzantine preponderance*, exercised through the Exarchs of Ravenna; of the ten Popes between 685 and 752, nine were either Greek or Syrian orientals;

2. *German preponderance*, when the Emperor Otto III imposed an Austrian and a Frankish Pope between 996 and 1003, and when the Emperor Henry III imposed four (out of five) Germanic Popes between 1046 and 1057.

3. *French preponderance* at the time of the Popes of Avignon: between 1305 and 1378 there were seven French Popes; or, if the anti-Popes be included, twelve foreign Popes between 1305 and 1449, of whom ten were French or Savoyard.

There remains a fourth period, the only one in which the Church has *freely* chosen a number of non-Italian Popes. Between 1057 and 1159, from the Lothringian Stephen X to the English Adrian IV, there were five foreign Popes out of sixteen. This was the period of the Hildebrandine Reform and the struggle with the Empire, when the Church sought to reform herself and to be independent of the interested support of the Emperor. But if during this period non-Roman and non-Italian Popes were chosen, it was for the same reason as had already justified imperial intervention and which later was to explain the abandonment of Rome for Avignon, namely the impossibility of recruiting a good Pope in the Italian milieu which had become corrupted by simony and all manner of vices and which was troubled by the tyranny of the turbulent Roman nobility. (With Leo IX—1049-1054—one of the first great reforming Popes of the eleventh century, began the recruiting of Cardinals from outside Italy, for the excellent reason that it had become no longer possible to find good Cardinals, who were not simoniacal, in Rome itself.)

From this it becomes clear that, normally, the Pope, Bishop of an Italian see, is only chosen from outside of Italy in two cases—either when a foreign master imposes his will, or when the internal situation of Italy is such that it prevents the choice of a worthy Italian Pope, or prohibits the free exercise of his power once elected. Whence it would appear that the Popes will continue to be Italian in the future, unless such day comes

that Fascist tyranny seeks to impose on the whole of Christendom a Pope unworthy of it; which does not seem very likely.

I would add one other consideration. Since the Reformation the Italian people is the only one to have remained a Christian and Catholic people (I do not apologise for not adding, as one did at one time, 'with the Austrian and Spanish peoples'). Here is another reason why it is normal, why it is admirable, that the government of the Church should be, in large measure, confided to Italians. The Catholics of France, like those of England, America, Germany, are only a minority in their own countries. Our clergy owe to this fact their peculiar value, their courage and virtues, but also a *déformation*, easy to explain and excuse, but hard to define. Italian cardinals will *never*, under normal circumstances, vote for a colleague from the other side of the Alps; the reason for this is no unworthy sentiment of national pride or prejudice, but for a reason which is more profound and more truly Catholic. That reason I heard expressed one day by one, competent to pronounce, in a phrase which is not contemptuous but profoundly wise: 'They will think, These people are not *mature* enough for the government of the Church to be confided to them.'

Which last is perhaps an exaggeration, but intelligible enough in those who stress the importance of experience, atmosphere and tradition, and who have the enormous responsibility which electing a Pope entails.

THE INTELLECTUAL IN BARBARY. What should be the role of the 'intellectual,' and the Christian 'intellectual' in particular, in face of the new barbarism? Stoic unconcern, vitalistic compromise with current trends, imaginative escape into cultures historically or geographically remote—all these solutions are in various ways being tried, and all are, from one point of view or another, unsatisfactory. Another formula is suggested by Emile Tosi in the *March Echanges et Recherches*:

By 'intellectual' we here understand one who is devoted to the cultivation not only of ideas but also of higher values, and who by that fact finds himself called to preserve them.

When the day comes that those ideas and values are threatened, what is he to do? Is he to take refuge in an ivory tower and wait till the storm passes, and till values now eclipsed are recognised again? But history teaches us that these eclipses

sometimes last a very long time. But even supposing that he can rest content with the lonely cultivation of ideas in the midst of the barbarism which encircles him, how can he be assured that his refuge will resist the onslaught of the winds and the storms, and that he himself will not find himself one day deprived of air and light, of that liberty which is the supreme form of security, and in which alone the mind can live?

Therefore, he must do *something* about it. Not in a mood of desperate panic with a view to defending this or that political and social fabric. The intellectual knows that nothing is less permanent and stable than these, and that his own function consists precisely, in these periods when all values are confused, in drawing attention to their real subordination and hierarchy. Moreover, what the souls of men are most suffering from to-day is precisely exasperation with what is 'actual,' and especially with what is 'political' . . . at the mercy, as they are, of hair-raising newspapers, broadcasts, newsreels . . .

But surely if we were able to engage in some sort of *cultural offensive*, to recall men to eternal truths and values, we should at the same time restore in them a sane balance, a spirit of reserve which would inoculate them against the feverish oscillations to which they are to-day becoming more and more subject. At a time such as ours when 'politics,' ever more inhuman, tends to become nothing more than a cold technique to exploit the psychological reflexes of the unthinking masses and to make them more unthinking, and to arouse their excitement and anger, the intellectual should surely refuse absolutely to play the game of political interests, should teach men to regard all parties as suspect, to resist enrolment under this or that banner or slogan. This is the only way in which we can arrest the decline of culture, and in this is the only hope of re-establishing a public opinion which will guide the course of events instead of being led blindly by them. Against the *revolution in disorder*, which it is not difficult to foresee, intellectuals should throw in all their weight to establish a *rapid evolution towards order*.

A similar lesson is suggested in the same number of this excellent review in Jean Dumortier's sketch of *Solon*: 'Once again a contemplative saved the men of action.'

LOVE, SEX AND FUEHRERS. In the same number of *Echanges et Recherches* an article on 'L'Amour' by H. Birnbaum draws attention to one particularly sinister feature of the

new barbarism, and shows how it is effecting a return to the savagery from which our woaded forefathers were delivered by humanist culture and Christianity.

One cannot help noticing that love has lost its prestige and sanctity for post-War youth. The young man of to-day no longer idealises woman. No longer does he see in her that beauty which incites to noble deeds or to realise a philosophy . . . It can be said, with some exaggeration of course, but without violence to truth, that male youth to-day desires woman without loving her.

Whence comes this twilight of love? How is it that woman is no longer a stimulant to heroism? How is it, above all, that she is no longer regarded as the proper instrument for the development of a man's personality?

It is because the worship of the individual has given place to the worship of the collectivity The great war of 1914-1918 and the changes which it wrought in the economic structure have destroyed all faith in the individual. The young generation, of its own accord or under the pressure of its environment, has turned towards other myths. Hardly out of babyhood, the child is enrolled, whether it likes it or not, in associations in which everything tends to discredit the individual in its eyes. Whatever their character or their name—brigades or scouts, Wandervogel or Hitler-Jugend, Balilla or Vanguardia, Red Front or Sovnarkon—all have the same effect if not the same purpose, to make of the young man, whether he is aware of it or not, a 'collective entity.'

Thus enrolled and consecrated to the service of a collective ideal, he considers his sexual inclinations with the same realism as his other bodily functions, without any 'nonsense' of mysticism or romance. His ideal being the collectivity, it is impossible for him to idealise his sexual inclinations, inclinations so evidently individualist, and hence tainted with egoism

So the collectivist tendency of our period is particularly manifest in its transference of the conception of love. If woman has been dethroned, it is because the perfection of the personality, the reverence for personal liberty and for the salvation of the individual soul are no longer dogmas. Another dogma, that of the collectivity, has taken their place.

The *Leader* is henceforth to be the object of the young man's love and devotion. Psychologically, the phenomenon is not entirely new. But what is new is that this love for the Leader has become so widespread and organised that its importance is a distinctive characteristic of our age. For love forms per-

sonality, and, as the object of love, a Leader has a formative influence very different from a woman.

Love for a woman is doubtless powerful as a formative factor in personality. But it is nevertheless more fragile, for intimacy will soon reveal to the lover the faults in the object of his adoration. It is quite another matter when love is transferred to the person of the Leader. His fascination remains unimpaired. Whatever role sexuality may have in initiating the passion, its role is necessarily very restricted and can bring with it no disillusion in realisation. The good Leader will take care never to allow the intimacy of his adherents. His remoteness is a barrier to disillusion and precisely enhances his prestige.

Again, in love for the Leader there are no demands of exclusiveness as in love for a woman. The lover actually derives pleasure from the thought that he is not alone in his devotion, and that besides him there are thousands and millions who share a like devotion. Still more important, love for the Leader delivers him from concern for his own good and salvation: he finds his salvation by losing his personality in the collectivity. In the exaltation of his passion, he puts the welfare of his party, class or race high above his own. Love for the Leader arouses all the yearnings which submerge the individual man in the collectivity . . . As all love involves a transformation, so love for the Leader transforms the egoist individual into a collective entity. By his fascination, his charm, and by the exaltation of which he is the source and the object, the Leader induces the young devotee readily to accept all the discomforts of a hard life, and all the risks of a dangerous life. A Mussolini's 'Let us live dangerously' is assured of enthusiastic response.

An interesting historical sketch follows, in which the writer shows how this feature of our age indicates the divorce of sex and the interests of the race and the species from the interests and responsibilities of love and the individual person. It had been the great achievement of civilisation and Christian teaching to build up the union of these in creative tension—a union which is the indispensable condition of civilised personality and civilised society. He shows that the divorce of sex from love, the exclusive subordination of sex to the preservation and increase of the race and the species, are in effect a retrogression to ideas underlying primitive phallic myths and cults, whose overthrow found expression already in the Hellenic myths of

the rivalry of Venus and Psyche and in the story of Ulysses and the Sirens:

The antagonism between phallic love and that in which the spirit of man intervenes is a struggle within the personality itself, for the personality never ceases to be a specimen of the species. The two tendencies—fulfilment in the flesh and fulfilment in the spirit—dwell together and tear asunder the same personality. Their ceaseless interplay is the condition of his harmonious balance. By this harmony in love, each man has the opportunity to preserve and develop his personality without losing contact with the race and the species.

It is this tension and this struggle which the new collectivism precisely eliminate by directing them into other channels, and so threaten the very foundations of civilised society and civilised personality.

THE GOSPELS AND RACISM. Writes Abbé Jacques Leclercq in *La Cité Chrétienne* (March 5th):

The parable of the Good Samaritan is an anti-nationalist and anti-racist parable.

The Jews were the first racists. The racist idea is quite alien to Western Europe. Modern German racism betrays its Semitic origin; there was nothing like it among the Germans of history at any period.

The Jews despised the Samaritans as belonging to a debased stock, because they were descendants of pagan immigrants of the time of the Babylonian captivity who had become mixed with the remnants of the Jewish inhabitants. Their religion was likewise a form of Judaism mixed with pagan elements.

In choosing a Samaritan for the hero of His parable, Jesus affirms that racial differences are not to be a source of discrimination among those who would claim to be His own. To-day, in U.S.A., the characters of the parable might well be a Methodist pastor, a church organist and a good negro.

In our own time, while racism ravages Europe and the colour-bar ravages America, the Church dispenses alike to White and Black and Yellow the highest dignity that man can receive, the sacred unction of the Priesthood. Here in France or Belgium a Catholic crowd will kneel to receive the blessing of a Black priest or a Yellow bishop; in seeing this we see something of Catholic universality.

All men are our neighbours; and this means that we should love Yellow men as Yellow, and Black men as Black. Each race contributes its own particular characteristic to the variety of creation; each race is a creation of God, and each of its members is a child of God. We should rejoice in this rich variety which God has placed in the world, in giving to the world other races than our own.

The sin of racism is one of the gravest temptations of our time. To safeguard ourselves from it we should make a habit of thanking God for the *variety* of the human race, of thanking God that other men are not as we are. This joyful thankfulness is necessary to make us capable of loving other peoples *such as they are*, without any inner feeling of contempt or condescension—and of loving them not only as they are, but for being different from ourselves.

The Good Samaritan should represent the White races devoted to the protection and civilisation of the Black races . . . But we know in fact that the White races have exploited the Blacks to enrich themselves, and that missionaries have almost always seen their work countered by the hatred aroused among natives for 'Christian' colonisers. Charity towards men of other races means much more than alms to missionaries or refugee funds; it is something far more tender and delicate.

He was moved with compassion: and going up to him bound up his wounds, poured in wine and oil, and setting him upon his own beast, brought him to an inn and took care of him. And the next day he took out two pence and gave it to the host and said: Take care of him; and whatsoever thou shalt spend over and above, I, at my return, will repay thee.

That is the way in which we are to treat men of other races as our neighbour.

ARRIBA ESPANA! The victory of General Franco and the establishment of peace in Spain will mean, not only the cessation of this hideous fratricidal conflict on Spanish soil, but will also bring the end of a painful conflict of conscience to millions of Catholics throughout the world, as well as of much distressing division among them. How painful and critical, and how widespread that conflict of sympathies and loyalties has been is perhaps not always realised; and efforts to present it as the untimely hair-splitting of a few eccentric intellectuals have only exacerbated it. (It needs to be recalled that some 80 per cent,

of Catholics in England are adherents of some Labour Party or organisation which has consistently supported, for good reasons or bad, the Republican side.) But Catholics of all sorts must rejoice with their brethren in Spain that the Mass has now been restored throughout almost the entirety of the country, that the Word of God may now be preached without fear, the Sacraments administered, and that Catholic worship and Catholic Action now enjoy full freedom. For a Catholic such considerations outweigh all others, and it has been a matter of pained bewilderment to many, especially among Spanish Catholics themselves, that on their account alone many foreign Catholics have found themselves unable in conscience to lend unqualified moral support to the Nationalist cause, and have strongly resisted attempts to identify themselves, *as Catholics*, with it. The fact remains that, the questions of *means* and *responsibilities* apart, the Nationalist leaders have never for one moment pretended that they were fighting for these things *alone*; their terms are and always have been 'unconditional surrender,' involving not only freedom of religion, but the acceptance of General Franco's confessedly 'totalitarian' one-party State, the repudiation of Catalan and Basque autonomy, the forcible dissolution of the existing trades unions, etc., issues on which it was only natural that many foreign Catholics found it impossible that the whole Catholic Church should be involved. That this attitude was a cause of pain to Spanish Catholics who had staked their all in Franco's cause, and that for the freedom of our common Catholic faith and worship, only added to the painfulness of their own position; a position whose main difficulty consisted in the fact that 'neutrality' regarding *all* the issues of the war—and in particular the restoration of religion and the ridding of atheistic propaganda—was (as a much-discussed *Osservatore* article has emphasised) for them impossible. While we must all now pray with our Spanish brethren for the peace and prosperity of their country under the government of its *Caudillo*, and for its preservation from the numerous perils of the purity of its Catholic faith and life which now beset it, we would ask them—now that the passions of war may

have subsided—to try to understand the quandary into which the war has placed their brethren abroad, to cease their resentment at the attitude that many of them have felt obliged to adopt, and to pray that the harm which has been done to the Church's reputation in other lands as an indirect consequence of their war may be speedily undone.

CONTEMPORANEA. CATHOLIC FILM NOTES (March): *The Importance of the Film* by Hilary Carpenter, O.P.

CATHOLIC WORLD (Feb.): *Toward Peace in Palestine*, by Pierre Crabitès: how increased Jewish immigration into Palestine is defeating the best interests of Jewry and weakening Britain's position in dealing with the Axis Powers.

CLERGY REVIEW (Feb.): A balanced *Enquiry regarding Work* by Fr. Bernard Goode discusses (a) 'the dominant and determining facts in the modern world of work,' (b) 'the place of work in the Christian conception of life and how we should regard the present situation,' and (c) 'what can be done now to give back to work its proper place in the lives of individuals and of the community.'

COMMONWEAL (Feb. 2): *An Interview with Jacques Maritain* on Spain, U.S.A. and civil liberty. Impossible even to list the first-class matter that appears weekly in this lay-edited review, now stocked in England (see advertisement in this number).

EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY (Jan.): *The Liturgy and Reunion*, by Dom Bede Winslow.

HOCHLAND (Jan.): A valuable article by Dr. Matthias Laros (known in England as author of *Confirmation in the Modern World*) on the Thomist doctrine of the priority of conscience over non-infallible authority. (March): *Discipleship and Ethics* by Dom H. Beck: a contribution to the lively controversy in Germany: the following of Christ and/or systematic moral theology. *Christianity and Art* by Theodor Haecker: a contribution of importance to another German controversy: beauty and/or the Cross.

IRISH ROSARY (March): Fr. Gerald Vann, O.P., continues his excellent series on *The Christian Revolution* in its various applications. Joseph Clayton presents *Some Personal Recollections of Father Bede Jarrett, O.P., with a Note on his Work as Historian*.

- MONTH** (Feb.): Another terrible indictment of racism among U.S.A. Catholics. Also Fr. Martindale on Orwell's *Road to Wigan Pier*.
- NOUVELLE REVUE THEOLOGIQUE** (Feb.): Articles on *The Antecedents of Racist Ideology*, *The Political Racism of the Third Reich*, *The Anthropological Aspects of Race*, and *Race, Reason and Christ* (this by Joseph Folliet) comprise a valuable *Christianity and Race* number.
- ORATE FRATRES** (Jan. 22): Memoirs of Dom Virgil Michel.
- SCHOENERE ZUKUNFT** (Feb. 22): Record of British tributes to German colonising ability and justice.
- SCHWEIZERISCHE RUNDSCHAU** (Heft 9): Important special (trilingual) number on *Race and State* from all standpoints (theological, philosophical, cultural, biological, political, prehistorical and historical) by leading Swiss scholars.
- SCRUTINY** (March): *Giovanni Papini and Italian Literature* by D. A. Traversi.
- THEOLOGY** (Feb.): *Culture and Conversion*, by W. R. Jarrett-Kerr: the frontiers of apologetic and literary criticism. (March): *The Necessity of Scrutiny* by George Every, S.S.M.: an excellent article on a similar theme which includes valuable observations on contemporary writers, contemporary taste and Christian responsibility.
- VIE INTELLECTUELLE** (Feb. 10): Documented account of relations between the Vatican and Fascism during 1938. An important study by P. and A. Chanson on ownership of the means of production. (Feb. 25): Professor Etienne de Greef on crowd-psychology and its exploitation by commerce and power-politics.

PENGUIN.