

celebration and sharing of the sacrament of the body and blood follows baptism and confirmation in the one Spirit. Even so, the *koinōnia* of the body and blood is not the last word in the process. Christianity is not a Jesus religion any more than it is a Spirit religion. Christianity is the religion of the Holy and Undivided Trinity. We have *koinōnia* not only with the Spirit but also, in a different mode, with the Son, and we have *koinōnia*, in a different mode again, with the Father. It is to that we must return in our last essay.

Into the mainstream with Cardinal Hinsley

Peter Hebblethwaite

It is a commentary on the *insouciance* of English Catholicism that so far the material on the history of the 1930s has consisted of sundry memoirs, a brilliant essay by Adrian Hastings (in *Bishops and Writers*) and a novel by Bernard Bergonzi (*The Roman Persuasion*). With the aid of the Westminster Archives and the Public Records Office in Kew, Thomas Moloney has put the study of the period on a scientific basis.¹ Even the dullish title of his book—*Westminster, Whitehall and the Vatican. The Role of Cardinal Hinsley 1935-43* — gets it about right: there were subterranean links between Westminster and Whitehall that no one, least of all the Catholic press, suspected. The Southern Desk of the Foreign Office had a keen and abiding interest in Catholic and Vatican affairs.

It was particularly intrigued by the appointment in 1935 of Mgr. Arthur Hinsley as fifth Archbishop of Westminster. He was now sixty-nine. He had not lived in England since 1917, when he became Rector of the Venerable in Rome. Further back lay the foundation and headmastership of St. Bede's Grammar School in Leeds, and a quarrel with the local Bishop, the eccentric and irascible William Gordon. The young Fr. Hinsley fled Leeds and was incardinated in the diocese of Southwark. While a curate in South London (Sutton Park and Sydenham) from 1904—1917 he maintained his academic sharpness

(according to our author, p. 21) by lecturing at Womersley. A likely tale in the Modernist period, but that is not the sort of question that detains Moloney.

More interesting to him is the way Hinsley's appointment was seen by His Majesty's Government as a move of some desperation. For there was a shortage, indeed a total lack, of good candidates. The British Minister to the Holy See, Sir Charles Wingfield, said of the runners: 'Most of them seem to be men of Irish origin, of inadequate experience, of insufficient culture or in indifferent health' (p. 23). Although 69, Hinsley appeared to possess sufficient experience, culture and health. He was known to HMG through his years as Apostolic Visitor of British Africa (1927–34). They liked what they knew of this blunt but kindly Yorkshireman, whose father had been village carpenter at Carlton, not far from Goole, Epworth (where the Wesleys were born) and Castle Howard (where *Brideshead Revisited* was filmed).

Unfortunately for him, Hinsley became Archbishop of Westminster just before the Spanish civil war would divide British and especially Catholic public opinion. It was the Vietnam of the 1930s. Hinsley was staunchly in favour of the official British policy of 'non-intervention', but that did not prevent him from hoping that Franco would win. Yet he dissociated himself and the Church from the British Fascists (who had at least five supporters who bothered to write to him, p. 60); and he was not unsympathetic to the line pursued by *Blackfriars*.

After the untimely death of Bede Jarrett in 1934, its editor from March onwards of that year was Hilary Carpenter, working in close consultation with past editor Bernard Delany, by that time English Dominican Provincial. Even before the Spanish civil war broke out he sensed that some coming conflict was afoot, and in his first editorial remarked:

Blackfriars has at times been unjustifiably praised (and condemned) for its 'broadmindedness'. It is not broadminded. Its unwritten subtitle, which is also the motto of the Dominican Order, is Truth, and truth is as far removed from broadmindedness as it is from narrowmindedness ... (*Blackfriars* June 1934, p. 375).

One is tempted, even after the lapse of more than fifty years, to urge the editor to get on with it. This he does as he strikes boldly down the middle of the fairway:

The Reds must not think to claim me as a blood-brother in Atheism because I hold that Capitalism may well have become a curse, nor should the BUF (British Union of Fascists) expect *Blackfriars* to approve the Black Shirt because the Holy Father has deigned to speak well of Fascist rule in Italy (*Ibid.*, p. 376).

That was better. Hinsley was glad that *Blackfriars* existed. It gave him an *alibi* and saved him from embarrassment when people mentioned apparent papal acquiescence with Mussolini's Fascism.

But Hinsley did not take his opinions from *Blackfriars*. Where did he get them from? Moloney reaches the following considered judgement: 'It is a remarkable feature of the period 1935—43 that the opinions held by Hinsley and the majority of the Bishops on the issues of ideology and international policy were reflected far more faithfully through the House of Lords than the House of Commons' (p. 68).

What was the explanation for this remarkable coincidence of opinion? The simple answer is that the Catholic members of the House of Commons—at that time there were 23, made up of 14 Conservatives, 2 Ulster Unionists (*sic.*), 6 Labour and 1 Independent Labour—depended on the votes of the electorate, while the Catholic peers were not so burdened. Moreover the members of the House of Lords formed, as the author notes, 'a family network with open access to Hinsley' (p. 69), and shared in the Cardinal's judgement that the Spanish dispute was 'in essence a contest between Christ and anti-Christ' (p. 71). *The Tablet* echoed these views—if it did not inspire them—and lectured the world in August 1936 thus: 'It is mortifying for Catholics to reflect that it has been left largely to Lord Rothermere ... to refute the misrepresentations of those who calumniate the Church in Spain' (p. 70).

Blackfriars was the only Catholic journal to question these orthodoxies. Not only did it review Mahler's symphonies, but it both supported and appealed to intellectuals like Eric Gill, who took his stand on the necessity of communal ownership. Gill, Donald Attwater, and Edward Watkin were the pioneering spirits of Pax, which while not absolutely pacifist maintained that existing armaments made a just war virtually impossible. Christopher Hollis M.P. in *The Tablet* was one of its principal opponents.

A line not pursued by the author, but hinted at in Brian Wicker's article, 'Making Peace at Spode' (*New Blackfriars* July/August 1981, p. 313), is that what these Catholics were really objecting to was the automatic assumption that the state was right and could demand obedience. It was a question that German Catholics already had to face. In effect they made a necessary distinction between 'Christianity' (the Gospel faithfully communicated) and 'Christendom'—that social order which resulted from Christianity typically in the Middle Ages, in which Christians could impose their own moral views on society as a whole and minorities were debarred. Jacques Maritain had called for a 'new Christendom', but in the late 1930s there wasn't much hope for it and few knew what he meant: it re-emerged after the war in the form of Christian Democratic parties in parts of Western Europe.²

The FO was innocent of such subtle debates. So was Hinsley. He

stayed polite with Gill, but neither liked nor understood him. But when Hinsley was made a cardinal on December 13, 1937, the FO took notice: for the seventeen million Catholics of the British Empire (all that red on the map) had only two cardinals: the suspect MacRory of Armagh and the French Canadian Villeneuve of Quebec. *The Tablet* thought it was inappropriate that the British Empire should be represented, at some forthcoming conclave, solely by a French Canadian and an Irishman. It pressed for a second British cardinal besides Hinsley (Benedictine Cardinal Gasquet having died in 1929). But this was not to be. *Blackfriars* generously welcomed Hinsley's elevation, noting that his time in office had been marked by 'an open spontaneity, a devotion to Christ's poor, an incapacity for subterfuge, and the power and will to rouse Catholics to action,' (*Blackfriars*, December, 1937, pp. 885—6).

In that catalogue of qualities the 'incapacity for subterfuge' was clearly the one most admired, for the *Blackfriars* editorial goes on: 'As Dominicans we have learned to recognise that these are not qualities that necessarily lead to temporal advantage' (*ibid.*).

But if Hinsley was 'lacking in guile', the same could not be said of Peter Amigo, Archbishop of Southwark, who had welcomed Hinsley as a refugee from Leeds so long before. Now Amigo engaged in an all-London heavyweight contest between South and North of the Thames. It was Amigo, the Gibraltar veteran of the anti-Modernist crusade, versus this upwardly mobile working-class Yorkshireman. Using Roman friends, Amigo led a constant guerilla campaign against the new Archbishop of Westminster. One of Amigo's tactics was to urge Rome to appoint an Apostolic Delegate to the United Kingdom, since this would prevent Hinsley—as Amigo conceived it—dealing directly with the Royal Family and thus 'arrogating to himself a primacy to which he was not entitled' (p. 87). This was at first the view of the majority of the Bishops; they preferred Rome rule to home rule. Cardinal Pizzardo (p. 89), in London for the coronation of King George VI, was impressed by the apparent stability of the British constitution when everything else was in flux, and returned to Rome to argue for closer ties with this bastion of democracy (p. 89).

And so—after much huffing and puffing—it came to pass. The first Apostolic Delegate, William Godfrey, succeeded Hinsley as Rector of the Venerable, where he stayed till 1938. He was clearly marked out for higher things. He accompanied Pizzardo to the coronation in 1936, and had been on another diplomatic mission to Malta. But initially he came to Britain only as Apostolic Visitor to seminaries and colleges (p. 90). Moloney's explanation of this move is: 'The visitation ... would allow the Foreign and Home Offices to run a discreet rule over Godfrey and permit him to return to Rome without loss of face should official signs be inauspicious' (pp. 90—1). Godfrey was finally appointed on November

21, 1938. Protestant groups objected. But the most remarkable feature of the appointment of the first Apostolic Delegate to these shores is that it was carried out behind the backs of Hinsley and the Bishops.

Of course they suspected what was about to happen and deplored it. Hinsley wrote to Pacelli, then Secretary of State, on November 1, 1938, to express the anger and the fears of the English Bishops:

Never since the 'no-popery' agitation excited by the restoration of the hierarchy in 1850 has the feeling of extreme antipathy of the Protestant majority of these islands been so fiercely aroused. The Press has never ceased to indulge in abuse of the Pope as the tool of Fascism, as the aider and abetter of the 'aggression' in Ethiopia and as the supporter of the 'rebels' against the lawfully constituted government of Spain (p. 97, unpublished).

Whatever he thought about the events in Spain, Hinsley was convinced that any Apostolic Delegate would be perceived as 'an agent of Mussolini in the interests of the Rome-Berlin axis' (p. 97). Note that this was after Munich, after *Mit brennender Sorge*, and after Hitler's visit to Rome. But the fears were real. The Vatican assuaged them to some extent by appointing William Godfrey, a true Liverpudlian, born in 1889; but then it threw this advantage away by giving him as 'first secretary', a title with diplomatic overtones, Mgr Umberto Mozzoni. Mozzoni had been in Canada, was in no sense a Fascist, but he was Italian and that was enough to damn him in the prevailing climate of opinion both in the FO and among the English Bishops.

The Catholic press had little to say about this dramatic appointment of an Apostolic Delegate. (One can compare the fuss made in February 1982 when his successor went up a rung and became a Pro-Nuncio.) *The Tablet* pronounced it 'an internal Church appointment', which meant that the laity need not bother their heads with it. Only bishops felt threatened. As Moloney says: 'There was little in this appointment to stir the imagination of the dutiful laity or even the parish priests, to whom episcopal round robins seemed merely the rumbling of distant gods' (p. 98). They were all wrong.

Historians should attend more than they have done to the most important ecumenical event of the century so far: Cosmo Gordon Lang, Archbishop of Canterbury, was instrumental in getting Hinsley elected to the Athenaeum, where, no doubt over brandy, Lang enquired whether this new-fangled appointment would make any difference to Hinsley's authority. Hinsley thought it would not. But as war came closer, the question grew in importance for the FO: whom should it consult, Hinsley in Westminster, or Godfrey in Parkside, Wimbledon? After Munich, the FO judged that it could count on the Vatican. Sir Andrew Noble set out the views on the Southern Department in November 1938:

In international relations the Vatican, like HMG, stands for decency and honest dealing. The Vatican is deeply distrustful of the spiritual and political aims of totalitarian states and within the limits of what is possible for a spiritual Power situated in an enemy country, is acting on lines that conform generally with our own (p. 119).

It is interesting that Italy was already considered 'an enemy country', and that Pius XI's opposition to Fascism and Nazism should be so clearly perceived. The Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain, and his foreign Secretary, Lord Halifax, were due to visit Rome in January 1939, where Mussolini and Ciano charmed them into believing in Italy's good intentions. They also met Pope Pius XI, which was regarded as a brave act on the part of the Unitarian PM. When Pius XI died next month, Halifax was able to claim that 'the brave stand which the Pope made against Nazi doctrines and more recently against the anti-Jewish measures in Italy has done much to diminish anti-Roman Catholic feeling in this country' (p. 120).

No doubt Halifax was right, but the Protestant Reformation Society alleged that there was an RC conspiracy in the FO and when 'Rab' Butler, then under-secretary at the FO, referred in the House to Pius XI as 'His Holiness' and 'The Holy Father', indignation knew no bounds. 'Have you forgotten, Sir, both your Bible and your history? The Papacy forms a state within the state, and has never been anything but an enemy to England'.

The irony was that Chamberlain had not really been listening to Pius XI or his Secretary of State, Eugenio Pacelli, at all. Harold Nicholson reports an angry exchange between Lord Lloyd and Chamberlain. Lloyd said that Mussolini was simply out for loot. Chamberlain disagreed. Lloyd replied in a fury: 'But surely you cannot disagree with the views of every expert? After all, I had two hours with Pacelli, the best brain in Italy, and he preached to me nothing but that Musso was out for conquest. Surely you cannot close your mind to such advice?' Chamberlain simply said that they would never see eye to eye on this one.³

These developments made the conclave of March 1939 particularly fraught. Halifax's secretary, Oliver Harvey, was pessimistic: 'Hitler and Mussolini must be rejoicing. We shall probably have some saintly peasant in his place and the Vatican will fade out again from the moral leadership it has won in the last year or two' (122). But the FO did not want to be seen interfering too obviously. Vansittart thought that the Catholic peers and the Duke of Norfolk should go to work on Hinsley. He also thought the General of the Jesuits, Fr. Ledachowski, would prove helpful. The object was to ensure an anti-Fascist Pope. The British Minister to the Holy See, D'Arcy Osborne, was sent a series of questions

to put to Hinsley ('top secret', destroy after digesting), but he thought this approach would be counter-productive:

Cardinal Hinsley would react unfavourably. I am meeting him at lunch today at the English College, but I gather he has some scruples about seeing me at all, lest I should endeavour to disturb the spirit of impartiality and receptivity to divine guidance with which he will enter the Conclave.

In the event, Pacelli was elected, though not unanimously, as was put about. A die-hard group of Italians thought him to vacillating and weak for the tough times that lay ahead. Once the balloon went up (as the phrase was), the newly founded and greatly despised Ministry of Information began to wonder what was the place of religion in British propaganda. The RC section was assigned to the Hon Richard Hope, the third son of Baron Rankeillour (p. 132). The first memo on the subject suggested that the best policy would be

to put our cards on the table at an early stage ... and get in touch with a high Catholic authority such as Cardinal Hinsley. The Apostolic Delegate had been suggested in this connection, but on mature consideration it would seem better, on personal and other grounds, to approach the Cardinal (pp. 132—3).

The next memo offered a history and analysis of RC opinion since the First World War and made the interesting but unascertainable point that 'fervent Catholics are inclined to see Britain as a materialistic plutocracy' (p. 133). Did this reflect Hilaire Belloc's thunderings about the Jews or Eric Gill's denunciations of modern industrial society? It is difficult to say. But Catholics were seen as somewhat askew to British society generally.

The Second World War provided a chance to put that right. Hinsley pledged his support for the war effort in a pastoral letter in which he declared that 'no matter how great our hatred of war we cannot stand idly by and allow our neighbour to be ruthlessly enslaved or done to death'. Catholics were exhorted to 'have confidence in our King and his counsellors, our lawful rulers' (p. 134).

Hinsley did everything that the rather incompetent Ministry of Information would require—but he did it unprompted. He castigated a Westminster Canon who had said in *The Catholic Herald* that 'all priests were responsible for the war'; 'Are you the Papal Legate, a commissioned Tridentine Reformer for our time?' he sarcastically asked. He denounced an article in *The Catholic World*, edited in the US by the Paulists, for its apparent indifference to the defence of Christian beliefs upon which Britain and France, he asserted, were engaged. He saw to it that the Forces were provided with chaplains (Amigo dragged his feet on this one), and while he had full confidence in the SJs and OSBs, he said

that 'if I tried the Friars I might have got Pacifists or Republicans or other odd fish' (p. 145).

But Hinsley was not just a clerical Colonel Blimp. He was much more like an ecclesiastical J.B. Priestley urging in his Yorkshire accent standards of justice and honour that would make the cause worth fighting for. Already in 1940 he declared that what was needed was 'not the continuance of a disordered system but a new one built on a just and moral foundation' (p. 140). Did he know about Emmanuel Mounier's *désordre établi*? Again, he was able to intervene personally with the Colonial Office to get them to release the German missionaries they had hastily interned on the outbreak of war. Hinsley knew them from his Africa days. Hitler's anti-Christian policies had made them determined anti-Nazis, he pointed out. His advice was taken. But no one ever knew. He also made helpful suggestions to Churchill about how to deal with Spain which, after the collapse of France, was directly threatened by Hitler. He advised friendly gestures towards the Church in Spain to help avert that possibility.

Hinsley's bluntness did not spare the Roman Curia. Pius XII and his Secretary of State, Cardinal Maglione, took seriously the 'peace offer' made by Hitler after the fall of France. This time, Hinsley was glad to let the Apostolic Delegate, Godfrey, do some work and soften his undiplomatic style. The British Government, Godfrey reported, considered Hitler's proposal to be a ruse and an invitation to surrender. He went on:

His Eminence begs me to add that the Chancellor of the Reich's speech, being composed of insults, defiances and threats, is not only no peace offer but does not contain any mention of guarantees or reparation(s) in favour of invaded countries, according to the Holy Father's five points (Christmas radio broadcast of December 24, 1939.) (p. 144).

Moloney sums up Hinsley's character thus:

Arthur Hinsley's style of leadership was firmly established by 1941. He was a difficult man to confine within official channels, but his flash points were recognised, even sometimes relished, in Whitehall and Westminster; his anger was unsimulated and could be excoriating, but it would be brief, followed by a period of remorse (p. 147).

It may be a trick of perspective, but Hinsley's characteristic style was emulated by John Carmel Heenan, who became Archbishop of Westminster in 1963. Hinsley had invited the youthful Fr Heenan of Manor Park to help him draft speeches and do radio broadcasts. For some reason this aroused the wrath of Doubleday, the Bishop of Brentwood, Heenan's ordinary, who complained that he had not been consulted. Hinsley ate humble pie: 'I quite overlooked the question of

courtesy and discipline', he conceded.

For, although Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, he was not the Primate. He was never allowed to forget this. His greatest trials came not from the Government but from his fellow bishops. They were a most extraordinary lot, all engaged in fighting the wrong battles in the last ditch of yesteryear. Amigo we have already met: he gave the impression that he was already immensely aged when the 1902 Education Act was passed. There is a devastating portrait of him from R.A. Butler on p. 164. There had been Francis Mostyn, a very Welsh Welshman, the last of the Vicars Apostolic, named in 1895 and Archbishop of Cardiff since 1921. As a boy he had known Cardinal Wiseman. This ancient died in 1939 and was replaced by the sixty-year old Michael McGrath. Everyone was outstripped in pugnacity by Downey of Liverpool, who managed to reduce his weight by some nine stones. 'This', Butler noted, 'rendered his health precarious, with the result that, for the critical period of the summer of 1943, he retired from Liverpool to Ireland where he was no doubt encouraged in his militancy' (p. 166). Then there was Thomas Williams of Birmingham, of whom nothing of note is recorded. It was these metropolitans who were supposed to be negotiating the post-war education settlement. But the *dramatis personae* kept on changing. Hinsley only knew about the simpler problems of education in the missions. He left education to the 'experts'. Butler could make no sense of it. At one point he was visited by the 85-year old Lord Fitzalan who, Butler reports, 'staggered into my room and, drawing himself to within an inch of my face, said that he greatly mistrusted Archbishop Downey and could not hear what I said!' (p. 166). Butler, says Maloney, in an elegant understatement, 'was left with a complex and fluid situation, patiently struggling to locate the epicentre of Catholic responsibility and authority' (p. 167).

When one hears Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger complaining about the excessive bureaucratic power of episcopal conferences, one should recall this earlier period of confusion and chaos when individual bishops threw spanners in the episcopal works apparently *ad lib* and the government was baffled by their bizarre ways of proceeding. But by March 1943 Hinsley was dead.

What was his achievement? One has not mentioned the Sword of the Spirit, which grew out of his membership of the Athenaeum.⁴ On another level one must note that he pushed Evelyn Waugh's marriage case through expeditiously (it helps to know Rome), thus earning the praise of the satirical novelist. His appointment, Waugh wrote, 'was a grateful refreshment to English Catholics inside and outside the archdiocese. There was now at the head of the hierarchy a man amenable to suggestions, of deep human sympathies, who was also a shrewd judge of men, able and willing to recognise diversities of character and talent in his subordinates' (p. 154).

That comes from Waugh's biography of Ronald Knox (p. 211). Hinsley also appreciated Knox, suggested he became President of St Edmund's, Ware, quite understood why Knox felt he must refuse the post, and set him to translate the Bible, defending him against Amigo and all and sundry. He also restored *The Tablet* to genuine lay control. Maloney observes that the Roman Catholic Community in England and Wales 'had been locked in a time-warp since 1850' (p. 241). That it broke out of this time-warp was due in large measure to Arthur Hinsley, who brought it for good or ill into the mainstream of British life.

- 1 Thomas Moloney, *Westminster, Whitehall and the Vatican. The Role of Cardinal Hinsley 1935—43*. Burns & Oates, London, 1985, pp. 263. £9.95. All otherwise unidentified page references are to this work.
- 2 For this see Giuseppe Alberigo and others, *La Chrétienté en débat. Histoire, formes et problèmes actuels*. Cerf, Paris, 1984.
- 3 *Harold Nicholson*, Volume II, by James Lees-Milne. Chatto & Windus, 1981, p. 118.
- 4 See Michael Walsh, 'Ecumenism in War-time Britain, the Sword of the Spirit and Religion and Life', in *The Heythrop Journal*, 1982. Vol. XXIII, Nos. 2 & 4.

Response

Real Presence for beginners¹

In his 'Transubstantiation for beginners' (*New Blackfriars*, December 1986), Gareth Moore has done an excellent job in presenting in simple form the 'transignification' theory of transubstantiation that appeared on the scene in the sixties. He does not present it as an explanation of transignification, but I believe his views fit into that category. A five pound note is what it is because of the significance attached to it, due to the circumstances outlined by Fr. Moore.

What is said in the article is fair enough as far as it goes, though I believe that the metaphysical issues cannot be skirted that easily (the change wrought in a piece of paper by a decree of monetary authority is not on the same level as the change wrought in any creature when brought into a different relationship with its creator—as bread is brought in the eucharist). However, the real nub of the problematic character of transubstantiation was not touched on: that of real presence. We do not relate to a five pound note as though whatever it represented were really present in it. As scholars such as Schillebeeckx pointed out some time ago, the doctrine (as distinct from the philosophico-theological theory) of transubstantiation was simply an emphatic way of asserting the real presence. I would therefore like to follow up Moore's article with one on