

## EXTRACTS AND COMMENTS

THE CARDINAL. Seldom has the English secular press devoted so much attention to the deaths of public men as it did to the late Cardinal. Outstanding passages from the countless tributes were collected in THE UNIVERSE for July 5th. Clearly, Cardinal Bourne had aroused a universal interest and admiration which demanded something more than the conventional obituary. Even more gratifying were the understanding and accuracy with which the funeral ceremonies were described in the evening and daily papers. Special credit was due to THE EVENING NEWS, which went far out of its way to explain the details and significance of the ceremony. Fleet Street has at last learned to send competent reporters to ecclesiastical events. The exceptionally foolish anecdote which the gossip-writer in a rival evening paper was allowed to tell of the late Cardinal was the only unintended insult. Among the memoirs in the Catholic press, that by Mr. G. Elliot Anstruther in THE TABLET of January 5th deserves special mention, as does the excellent photograph of the Cardinal which was presented with the same number.

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM receives considerable attention in the January HOCHLAND. Pastor Karl Ramge contributes a very interesting study on *Vilmar and the Future of German Protestantism*. August Vilmar, Protestant theologian and historian at Marburg in the middle of the last century, would seem to have been a forerunner of Karl Thieme and the contemporary 'Romeward trend' in the Lutheran communion. A convinced Lutheran, his teaching regarding the nature and visibility of the Church, the Priesthood, the Sacraments, the Liturgy, the development of dogma, Our Lady, and even the Primacy of St. Peter approximated closely to that of the Catholic Church. He held that the 'Luther-worship' of Protestants and the 'Luther-phobia' of Catholics had alike misrepresented the real Luther of history. Luther, he considered, never thought of founding a new Church; he sought only to enrich the existing Church with his own religious experience, an experience which is 'eminently Catholic.' 'What we call the Lutheran reformation was in Luther's own intention to be brought about within the existing Church and its hier-

archic organization.' It was Luther's fatal mistake of appealing to the nobles which precipitated the schism and set Lutheranism on a path altogether alien to its true genius; the organizing of a separate Protestant Church being the work, not of Luther, but of Melancthon who himself, nevertheless, expressly acknowledged the Papal authority. The Lutheran confessional Church was the product of political rather than religious forces. 'It is not we,' wrote Vilmar, 'who organize the Church, which has had its own unity and organization since the Ascension of Our Lord. On the contrary, it is we who are sanctified by entering into the existing institution of the Church.' The implication of the article is that authentic Lutheranism at the present time can fulfil its providential destiny only by seeking to return to its source, the Catholic Church.

The same number contains a translation into German of Vladimir Soloviev's *The Vision the Union of the Churches* and a most instructive *Conversation on Unity with a Romish Orthodox* by Karl Pfleger. The writer offers some pertinent criticism of the position of those Orthodox who seek, in association with Anglicans and Old Catholics, a 'Non-Roman Catholicism.' The 'Romish Orthodox' with whom he converses is M. Kobilenski-Ellis, editor and commentator of the Mainz edition of Soloviev's works. Interest is added to Kobilenski's views by the fact that he is, it would seem, an extreme Slavophile intensely devoted to Orthodoxy. He has made his personal solution of the problem of reunion by reception into communion with the Apostolic See, but he insists that corporate reunion must be the object of endeavour both on the side of Catholicism and of Orthodoxy. In Catholicism alone can Orthodoxy fulfil its God-given mission; but Catholics must recognize the inherent values of Orthodoxy and the fact that it 'is not merely a complexus of dogmas and rites, it is a psychological condition.' The establishment of mutual understanding and appreciation is the first condition of reunion. The 'conversation' contains much that is exceedingly helpful for understanding the problem of reunion between East and West, but also much that is applicable to the problem of reunion generally by indicating the attitude which Catholics should adopt to all forms of non-Catholic Christianity.

**FAITH OUTSIDE THE FOLD.** The same matter is admirably treated in an article under this title by Mr. W. J. Blyton in the January number of *THE MONTH*. Its thesis is that finely stated by Von Hügel when he wrote: 'Only if there are fragments, earlier stages and glimpses of truth and goodness extant wheresoever some little sincerity exists, can the Catholic Church even conceivably be right. For though Christianity and Catholicism be the culmination and fullest norm of all religion, yet to be such they must find something thus to crown and measure: various degrees of, or preparations for, their truth have existed long before they came, and exist still, far and wide, now that they have come.' Or as Mr. Blyton puts it: '*Incompleteness* is the handicap of non-Catholic systems: incompleteness even more than downright negation. It is for us to supplement them.' He therefore urges:

To Catholics who would commend their Faith to others, this idea of the intellectual world should be a practical help in method, no less than an incentive to witness, and to give a reason for the Hope that is in them. It will help them to listen knowledgeably to the *affirmative* sayings of their non-Catholic and non-Christian acquaintance as more significant and real very often than their negations of omissions. The *positive* element affords us a handle, and the best handle. You can go with a man a mile, and by doing so perhaps persuade him to go with you twain. Some of their fragmentary creeds are actually vestiges of the Catholic Faith, and as such are at once recognizable by us: but others are possibly more part of the heritage of human affections, the unspoiled part of nature, the parental or social instinct, the sympathies. In either case, they are to be welcomed and understood—and linked on to what we have to offer.

The writer instances a recent discussion which our readers may recognize:

In the ecclesiastical sphere there is controversy among us as to whether Anglo-Catholicism is a half-way house which keeps people from Catholicism, or whether it is a bridge to the Church. Surely the witness of facts and figures should help us here. Statistics say that it *is* a bridge, a passage-way and an introduction, for many, and this should guide our behaviour and argument with those who have come thus far toward us. What is true of them is true, in different ways, of others. There is a great amount of good faith in the world which has not yet found its goal . . . Merely to be shocked, therefore, at

## BLACKFRIARS

views or people differing from us is an unfruitful, *naïve* reaction. Better to learn from them, see their point, and answer it. This was Our Lord's patient way . . . Tolerance that is built on understanding and not on indifference is a great opener of the eyes and mind. Indignation or fear, on the contrary, stop up ears and eyes; and the interview closes as it began, in estrangement, when it might have been a useful exchange of ideas and a growth in love and esteem. Our Lord, claiming to fulfil the words that Isaias spoke of Him, shows tender regard for the injured reed and the flickering lamp-wick. Shall his followers heedlessly break and quench?

ANGLO-CATHOLICISM—BRIDGE OR BARRIER? Mr. Blyton would probably agree with us, however, when we say that the 'Bridge-or-Barrier' controversy is, in the last resort, to be decided less by statistics than by discovering the purposes of Providence; less a matter of which Anglo-Catholicism *is* than which it *should* be, a line of inquiry in which 'facts and figures' are doubtless of great service. It seems opportune to quote the careful statement of our contributor, Dr. Oskar Bauhofer, in an article on *The Anglican Riddle* in SCHWEIZERISCHE RUNDSCHAU (July 1932), written shortly after his return from the German-British theological conference at Chichester:

For many souls Anglo-Catholicism is the bridge, the gateway for a return to the true Church. But for very many more it is rather the barrier which withholds them from taking this step, because it seems to render such a step superfluous: *Hic Ecclesia Anglicana—Ecclesia Christi*. There are comparatively few who see through the Anglo-Catholic illusion. But it certainly does not follow from this that the Catholic should seize every occasion to attack Anglo-Catholicism as such in every form. The Roman Catholic must recognize and reverence a special manifestation of God's grace in this Catholic movement in the Church of England. But at the same time it is clear to him that Anglo-Catholicism misinterprets the meaning and the providential purpose of this outpouring of divine grace . . . The Catholic does not deny the evident workings of divine grace within the Anglo-Catholic movement, which nevertheless, in so far as it is *Anglo-Catholicism*—self-sufficient and self-contained, seeking no end beyond its own frontiers—he can only regard as something which completely misconceives its own destiny. The Catholic knows that without the Anglo-Catholic movement the greater number of conversions from Anglicanism to the Catholic Church would, humanly speaking, have never

## EXTRACTS AND COMMENTS

taken place. He should therefore be thankful that non-Roman Anglo-Catholicism, and indeed Anglicanism generally, has spread abroad in the non-Catholic world a distinct 'memento' of Catholic values, although it has afforded at the same time a dangerous centre within the confines of Protestantism itself which, in accordance with the law of least resistance, attracts to itself awakening Catholic tendencies. Anglo-Catholicism is, by God's grace, a reminiscence and a reminder of the Catholic home, a reminiscence and a reminder which is misunderstood by men as the reality itself. Anglo-Catholicism cannot find its meaning and its goal within itself, but only by ascending to the *Una Catholica*; by ceasing, in short, to be *Anglo-Catholicism*.

This thesis was more fully developed by Dr. Bauhofer in an essay, *A Century of Anglo-Catholicism*, of which BLACKFRIARS published a summary (July 1933).

POETRY AND POLITICS. Bourgeois civilization has accustomed us to take neither poetry nor politics seriously; neither is considered to have any relation to 'real life'; the former is regarded rather as a distraction from it, the latter a game confined to professional players. Yet a new generation of poets, writers and artists has arisen among us: 'the poetry of Wystan Auden, Cecil Day Lewis, John Lehmann, Charles Madge and Stephen Spender, all of whom are concerned, to varying extents, with problems of action, and therefore of morality and politics.' The significance of this new trend (or should we say, this revolution?) in contemporary poetry should be understood and appreciated by Christians who have much to learn from it; an excellent introduction to its study will be found in *Poetry and Propaganda* by Michael Roberts in the January LONDON MERCURY (with which is now incorporated *The Bookman*). The article has the additional value that it is a study of the whole relation of 'pure' literature to propaganda and to life. The new poets (whose politics are, for the most part, definitely 'Left') are not propagandists in any ordinary sense of the word; but 'they write of those things which they feel most deeply' among which the social chaos and injustice of our day takes first place. The movement is a sharp and welcome reaction from the literature of disillusion and pragmatism which marked the post-War decade. We need not share the Communistic prepossessions and aspirations of these poets to agree that

at least they are trying to bring poetry back into the life of the common man by bringing the common man back into poetry. And unless some such effort is made, unless our intellectual tradition is extended to include all classes, democracy in every form must fail. It is not enough that a few professors in the universities, a recluse here and there, a schoolmaster who dare not speak, should have a just appreciation of the issues—and leave the fields to the press lords and the advertisers. It is not enough to wait for a revolution to tidy our lives for us. The direction of that revolution depends upon the action which we take now, and that action may include political action, but it must consist chiefly of the rebuilding of warped and broken personalities, so that the people may act clearly and without humbug.

'Left' literature should, however, be studied in its own organs. Of these LEFT REVIEW, organ of the Writers International, is the most representative of official Marxism. Its position may be said to be fairly stated by Montagu Slater in the January number when he writes: 'The strongest argument for a Writers' International is that it can bring writers into touch with life. 'Life' in this context equals the class-struggle—for proof of which vast claim I can only refer readers to . . . all issues past and future of *Left Review*.' The place which the writer is conceived to occupy in the proletarian revolution is instructively explained. Winifred Holtby's *What we read and why we read it*, D. S. Mirsky's *Intelligentsia*, and Allen Hunt's *Flint and Steel English* hold many lessons for ourselves, if only on the principle *fas est ab hoste doceri*. But no less interesting than the position of *Left Review* is that of the more independently minded ADELPHI. A *Semi-Editorial Soliloquy* in the January number describes its evolution from the 'sometimes exuberant and sometimes laborious explorations' of its early days to the very interesting form of Socialism which it now expresses. Its inspirer, Mr. John Middleton Murry, is plainly conscious of the inadequacies of Marxist materialism (see his *Dostoevsky and Russia* in the December number) and dissatisfied with contemporary organized Socialism and Labour. In his *Looking before and after* in the January number he invokes the *mystique* of Péguy to supply their deficiencies. We venture to think that Mr. Murry would find himself more at home in the 'personalist' revolutionary movements, which owe much of their inspiration to Péguy, than in any form of Socialism.

## EXTRACTS AND COMMENTS

**CATHOLIC REVOLUTIONARIES.** On November 28th the *Tribune Libre* of Brussels assembled to listen to an exposition of these 'personalist' revolutionary movements which have sprung up in recent years among young Catholics and others in France and Belgium. The report of the meeting in *LE ROUGE ET LE NOIR* (December 5th) is very instructive. The debate was opened by M. Jean Thévenet, a young Catholic lawyer. He related the history of the movement from its 'literary' beginnings in *La jeunesse nouvelle*, shortly after the War. He explained that the movement was still in its preliminary stages of study, discussion and criticism, a movement of a minority only. 'Our Catholic youth,' M. Thévenet explained, 'seeks the establishment of a new order by means of revolution.' Revolution does not necessarily mean violence; it means the complete transformation of existing institutions. M. de Becker, founder of *Esprit nouveau*, perhaps the most vigorous of the Catholic revolutionary movements in Belgium, showed that the spirit of Catholicism and the spirit of revolution were in full accord. 'The essential thing for a Catholic is to seek the Kingdom of God by his own spiritual development, a thing which may often demand a revolution of institutions.' But while all Catholics must agree in demanding a civil régime favourable to the attainment of their supernatural end, they are free to disagree as to the means to be employed. Catholics are consequently divided, as Socialists are, into 'revolutionaries' and 'reformists.'

Our ultimate aim is to re-establish a civilization on Christian foundations, a Christian nation, a Christian culture; and by this we do not mean a return to the theocratic state of the Middle Ages . . . Our first principle is reverence for man; hence we shall tolerate no dictatorship. Shall we employ violence? Certainly we live under a tyranny which renders violence lawful. But violence implies a contempt for the adversary; a thing we cannot admit. First of all we shall try all pacific means to bring about our revolution; if these fail we shall have recourse to passive resistance. Love of our enemies and the search for truth are the first principles of our doctrine.

Subsequent speakers attacked the official 'Catholic' party in the Belgian Parliament for its compromises with capitalism and showed the affinities and contrasts between revolutionary Socialism and revolutionary Christianity.

## BLACKFRIARS

'The Socialists seek a revolution which is no true revolution. A revolution is a reversal of essential values. The Socialists call themselves anti-capitalist. In reality they are not so. They do not attack the *basis* of capitalism, the frightful tyranny of production over men.' The lethargy of Catholics, their infidelity to the teaching and instructions of the encyclicals, were vigorously attacked. The whole report serves as a very useful introduction to the study of a movement which deserves to be better known in this country. A more detailed account of the groups which comprise it, their aims, affinities and differences, their debt to Bloy and Péguy, will be found in *Young France and Social Justice*, by M. N. Berdyaev, in the January DUBLIN REVIEW.

ROME AND SOVIET CINEMA. Those who have been led to suppose that the Church's attitude to Cinema is uniformly reactionary, negative and uncomprehending will be happily disillusioned by the enlightened and well-informed Film Page, complete with stills, which is now a regular feature of the official Vatican organ, L'OSSERVATORE ROMANO. The issue of January 13th contains an article (translated from that in THE CATHOLIC HERALD, December 29th), by Mr. G. M. Turnell on the lessons of the Soviet cinema and the efforts of the 'Kino' organization of the English Marxists 'whose energy and enterprise in the field of film art compares favourably with the tentative efforts made by Catholics; for in spite of the Pope's encouragement, Catholic opinion is still too divided and the ignorance too great for anything practical to be done.' May Rome's fine lead soon remedy this state of things!

TAILPIECE. 'Can it be that unknown to us, Mr. Aldous Huxley is a *sub rosa* Dominican?'—EVERYMAN (January 4th).

PENGUIN.