

The Image of Man

Ten Years of The Review of Politics

IN the summer of 1938 Waldemar Gurian, Father Leo R. Ward and myself set out to consider and prepare the foundation of a new quarterly review. Mr. Gurian had been commissioned by the President of the University of Notre Dame, now the Most Rev. John F. O'Hara, Bishop of Buffalo, to undertake this work, for which the university would provide the means. It was apparent at once that we did not want a political or historical review construed in any narrow sense, although we had no instinct to ignore the presentation, in the way of science, of facts, techniques and processes. What we desired was a kind of universal publication drawing constantly upon the past and ranging into every serious field of intellectual action. We wanted, actually, to revive the Aristotelian conception of politics, a sovereign conception that embraced everything, every interest, every event, every idea affecting the life of man in the human community. Even more, we wanted to bring to bear upon the special problems raised by modern culture the illumination of a valid spiritual and philosophical tradition, an illumination best described perhaps as the Christian world-view.

Reflecting upon the various planes of Christian activity, Jacques Maritain has distinguished "two essentially different types of periodical, the one specifically catholic and religious, and as a result catholic by *denomination*; the other specifically political or 'cultural', which we must indubitably wish to be catholic, but catholic in *inspiration* only, not by denomination." The first type "corresponds to a formally or specifically religious press, a press of general or specialized catholic action." The periodical we have established as *The Review of Politics* is, I believe, of the second type: it is not the work of the apostolate that we have set for ourselves; our work, although "catholic in inspiration," is still "temporal," involving, as the exposition of Maritain puts it, "the temporal sphere as such." That is, we have "concrete and determined standpoints on questions of this order," and, largely speaking, we have assumed "not only a social and political philosophy, but a well-defined concrete political and social line—not only in function of religious interests and the good of the Church, but also in function of the temporal and earthly good of the commonwealth and of civilization." Thus, our periodical does not "engage the Church," as Maritain

says, even though we hope that we are ultimately animated and guided by Christian wisdom. Nevertheless, we would like to think that editors of such mind as ours, "to the extent to which their inspiration is truly and integrally Christian," as Maritain notes, "witness to the Gospel and serve in an effective way in the penetration of the world and men's lives by Christianity." As the sponsors of a periodical of this type, we have the conviction that our work is vital, conforming to "a vital necessity." We have wanted sincerely and modestly, within our mode of operation and within its limitations, to achieve the unity of knowledge and human experience, with Christian wisdom as our point of reference, as our center of unity. Believing as we do that "where there is no God, there is no man," we have wanted in essence to preserve in this perspective the image of man in a civilization which would try to obliterate it.

With this considerable task we have been occupied these past ten years—since the first issue appeared in January, 1939. But we shall be the last to pretend to have accomplished it without deviation, without imperfection and faltering. That we have succeeded, in decent measure, in justifying our reasons for coming into existence, is due, minus qualification, to the editor, Waldemar Gurian. For he is the one who, with sympathy, with brilliance, and with a cosmical knowledge, has focussed the efforts of editors and contributors. *The Review of Politics* is, very truthfully, his work and his justification. Yet I know that he would never be niggardly in recognizing and approving the earnest activity and real thought that other members of the Notre Dame faculty have exhibited in the shaping of the character and course of *The Review*: Father Leo R. Ward, professor of philosophy, at the outset especially, aided us all in arriving at the meaning of our periodical; F. A. Hermens, professor of political science, co-managing-editor during the first years—until 1942—and subsequently editorial consultant, has been anxious and unremitting in his support; M. A. Fitzsimons, associate professor of history, has shown, as editorial consultant, a generous and intelligent devotion to the ideals of *The Review*, working hard and carefully in his collaboration with Mr. Gurian. A special word has to be said, moreover, for the contributions of Father Thomas T. McAvoy, head of the department of history and university archivist, who has been co-managing-editor since January, 1943. As our readers know he has done a luminous series of articles on the Catholic Church and its points of contact with American life and culture, but what they do not know about is his faithful—and forceful, too—"day labouring" for the sake of *The Review*. In matters of policy as well as in questions prac-

tical and technical he has revealed discernment and courage. As the other managing editor I have shared the "day-labouring" from the start, convinced, regardless of difficulties, that the project initiated by Waldemar Gurian was worth the expenditure of time and energy, even though the demands upon me as a teacher of literature were superabundant. The administrative editors are, of course, obliged to acknowledge with pleasure their debt to the advisory editors for their various assistance in the past decade: Yves Simon, professor of philosophy, Willis D. Nutting, associate professor of history, Father Francis Boland, head of the department of political science, and Father Charles C. Miltner, recently president of the University of Portland, formerly professor of philosophy and religion and dean of the Arts and Letters College at Notre Dame. Notice must be taken here, too, of those who work, one might say, in the underground of *The Review*: our secretaries and our printers. Their names are never on the masthead but our dependence upon them is as great as our thanks.

So far we have dwelt only upon those who administer and execute *The Review*. But this ceremonial anniversary occasion requires a statement of regard and honor to our contributors who, better even than ourselves, have understood what we desire to do, who with good heart have joined us in the doing. They have been our embodiment and our effectiveness. The editors are grateful, in particular, to the following: Jacques Maritain, recently French ambassador to the Holy See and now appointed to the faculty of Princeton University, a philosopher who has renewed, with an unsurpassed freshness and vigor, the spirit of Thomist-Aristotelian thought and employed it to penetrate and synthesize the complex developments of modern civilization; John U. Nef, professor of economic history and chairman of the Committee on Social Thought in the University of Chicago, a true thinker who, ceaselessly engaged in the search for unity, acts and lives to check the disintegration of the contemporary mind; Don Luigi Sturzo, the nestor of the Christian democratic movement and the founder of the Christian Democratic Party in Italy, who has dedicated his years to the renewal of political life in the strength of the Church; and Hans Kohn, professor of history in Smith College, an extraordinary student of nationalism, who makes a universal approach to his materials, illuminating them with the genuine learning that shuns over-specialization. Naturally, we are under obligation to countless other contributors, from England, Germany, France, Italy, Belgium and Switzerland as well as from such American universities as Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Columbia, Chicago, Michigan, Illinois, Fordham, Georgetown, the Catholic University of

America and Notre Dame. Since it is not possible to remark upon them all, we ask their understanding and the continuation of their indispensable help and encouragement.

Editors and contributors are two vital elements in the "universe" of a review. To the third element, our readers and sustaining subscribers all over the world, must go our most unreserved appreciation. Without them, it is obvious that we could not exist at all. Their unheralded comprehension of what we want to do and want to be is the most satisfying of all our experiences. They have been persistent and often enthusiastic in their support. And they seem to know that we have not and will not in any way exploit their devotion.

Finally, a profound gratitude for our first ten years is to be directed to the administration of the University of Notre Dame. The officials of the university have maintained our independence, physically and intellectually. They have had a right grasp of our intentions. They have never, in any moment or issue, interfered with our endeavor. We believe, too, that the setting-up and existence of *The Review* within the University of Notre Dame has an uncommon advantage. For, as I said in the editorial of the Notre Dame Centennial issue (October, 1942), "we believe that the Catholic heritage and life of Notre Dame, which moulds our own work, not only helps to understand the past without sectarian prejudice but also is needed to shape the actions of those wishing to develop the type of civilization which would realize in our time the eternal truth and the eternal order." It is the heritage and life which we are fortunate to share. It provides the vision, the sense of oneness, spiritually and intellectually, the sense of community that our world requires if it is not to collapse in terror. It provides us with a true sight of the nature and destiny of man and, accordingly, with a means of drawing together into a pattern the varied and diverging institutions and the tumultuous movements of our history. *The Review of Politics*, without complacency and with the temper of humility, would make the image of man, man's awareness of his existence, clearer to himself. For ten years it has worked towards this clarity, since it realizes that if man really reaches the point where he can see himself, his history and his institutions in right proportion, he may then be able to save his soul from the sword and his life from the power of dogs.—FRANK O'MALLEY