'Calling God Back to the Council Chambers': An Archbishop’s response to World War Two

Josephine Laffin

Studies of the role of the Christian churches in wartime tend to focus on the First World War and the inadequacy of their response. In the most damming accounts, church leaders are castigated for succumbing to patriotic enthusiasm for the war in 1914, and for then losing relevance and credibility when the war did not foster the spiritual awakening which they had confidently expected. As the conflict dragged on, Christians were divided over issues such as the introduction of compulsory military service. Tension arose within denominations, but the most noticeable outcome of the war for Christianity in Australia was the upsurge in sectarian bitterness which poisoned relations between Catholics and Protestants. It was exacerbated by the prominent role in the anti-conscription campaign of Daniel Mannix, the Catholic archbishop of Melbourne. While Mannix became a hero to most of the working-class, Irish-Australian members of his flock, his inflammatory rhetoric offended many other Australians.

The editor of the South Australian Methodist paper claimed in 1917 that ‘venomous snakes of treason lift their heads in many parts of our far-flung dominion, but their warmest, most crowded nests are in Ireland and Australia’.

In spite of the problems which emerged in 1914-18, and Australia’s reputation for secularism, it has been argued that a ‘robust religious ethos’ was entrenched in Australian
culture during the Second World War from 1939 to 1945. Civic leaders joined church leaders in exhorting citizens to lead upright, moral lives: God would surely not fail to come to the aid of a nation which kept God’s moral laws. The tone of much of this non-denominational ‘civil religion’ was unmistakably Protestant. What of the Catholic Church? This article will explore the response to the Second World War of the Roman Catholic archbishop of Adelaide, Matthew Beovich.

The new bishop and his diocese
Born in 1896 in Carlton, an inner-Melbourne suburb, Beovich was one of the first Australian Catholic bishops who had not been imported from Ireland or drawn from the ranks of the Irish-born clergy. He did not even have an Irish surname, although that was somewhat deceptive. While his father was a migrant from Croatia, his maternal grandparents were Irish, and he was educated by Irish Christian Brothers at St Joseph’s College, North Melbourne. In 1917 he travelled to Europe. Unlike many of his contemporaries, he went not for war service but to study for the priesthood. At the Urban College of Propaganda Fide in Rome, his hero-worship of his controversial archbishop (Mannix) gave way to an intense loyalty to the papacy. Beovich returned to Melbourne in 1923 and worked as a priest of that diocese, predominantly in the field of Catholic education. A quiet, self-effacing man, he was astonished when it was announced in December 1939 that Pope Pius XII had appointed him archbishop of Adelaide.

According to the 1933 census, South Australia had the smallest proportion of Catholics of any state in Australia — only 12% of the population identified themselves as such. The Catholic Church was the third largest denomination, but it was well behind the Church of England and the Methodist Church, and its adherents were unevenly distributed. Most numerous in working-class suburbs such as Hindmarsh, Thebarton and Port Adelaide, they were not well represented in the state’s business and professional elite. Thomas Playford began his twenty-six years as premier in 1938, and until 1953 there were no Catholics in his Liberal and Country League government. There were a few in the Australian Labor Party, but the leader of the opposition in the House of Assembly in 1940 was a Methodist lay-preacher. While the Playford era was not the Protestant golden age that it has sometimes been depicted, in the 1940s vocal Protestant lobby groups had a considerable impact on public life, successfully restricting, for example, the availability of alcohol and gambling.

This period is remembered by many Catholics as a time when discrimination on the grounds of religious allegiance was widespread, even if public demonstrations of bigotry were rare. With their separate education system, and innumerable clubs and associations, the relatively small number of Catholics tended to keep to themselves. In 1936 this was manifest in the diocese’s contribution to the celebrations to mark the centenary of settlement in South Australia — it hosted the first National Catholic Education Congress. The festivities
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culminated in a eucharistic procession along King William Street, a triumphal display of Catholic piety and solidarity. The two archbishops of the interwar years, Robert Spence (1913-34) and Andrew Killian (1934-39), focused on internal diocesan administration and did not adopt a significant public role.

When he arrived in Adelaide in April 1940, Beovich made it clear that he had no intention of confining himself to a Catholic ghetto. The day after his episcopal ordination in St Francis Xavier Cathedral, he attended a civic reception in the Adelaide Town Hall. In a speech of welcome, Lord Mayor Arthur Barrett diplomatically referred to ‘the fine citizenship of the Catholic community’. Beovich responded by assuring the gathering that good citizenship was a natural consequence of the training Catholics received: it was necessary to be a good citizen in this life to merit the glory of heaven. That evening, speaking to lay Catholics, he went further. Good citizenship could not be divorced from Christian faith:

We in these days pray for peace, but we know full well there will be no peace until the nations and the peoples return to the Lord their God, because without God there can be no peace. There was a time, not so distant, when men having in their minds the destinies of the nations told God to stand without the council room, and what a sorry mess they made, and we are reaping what they sowed. We shall call God back to the council chambers into His proper place ...

The next day he reaffirmed his enthusiasm for his new state and again flagged his intention to participate in civic life: ‘I hope to contribute as best I may to the legitimate aspirations of this city and state’.

The ‘Peace of Christ’ and Prayer for Victory
In May 1940 Beovich returned to the Town Hall to address the Commonwealth Club. Conscious that most of his audience were not Catholics, he gave a brief history of the papacy, stressing that the pope was the visible head of the church founded by Christ, and that the neutral Vatican State was not part of Mussolini’s Italy. The pope was in an ideal position to arbitrate between the warring countries,
Beovich argued, if only the nations would listen to him and his pleas for peace. He declared that Australian Catholics were convinced that the Allies’ cause was just; therefore they would pray for victory as well as peace. However, he insisted that a true and lasting peace could only be obtained if it was based on Christian principles. He had taken as his episcopal motto, ‘Pax Christi’, and throughout the war years he constantly expounded his understanding of what that meant.

One such occasion was a public lecture which was held on 28 July 1940 in the Bonython Hall at the University of Adelaide. Albert (“Tacky”) Hannan, the crown solicitor and one of the few socially prominent Catholics in Adelaide, first asked Beovich if there could be a Catholic meeting at the Town Hall ‘to show solidarity for England and the war’. Beovich recoiled from the suggestion. ‘Our patriotism would be judged not by speeches and flags but by enlistments and contributions to the war funds’, he wrote in his diary. Hannan ‘then got another brain wave’ and arranged for the university council to sponsor a series of public addresses on ‘The Crisis of our Civilization’. This time Beovich agreed to participate. Many were turned away as the hall (with a seating capacity of over one thousand) filled to overflowing. Beovich identified a ‘grave illness’ in Western civilisation: pride. This was manifest in the rejection of the authority of the Church, the secularisation of education, and an increase in divorce, abortion and use of artificial means of birth control. It was a typically Catholic diagnosis of society’s ills. Beovich went on to describe the ‘pagan attack on our Christian civilization’ by Stalin and Hitler as ‘the worst menace yet encountered in the history of Christendom’; nevertheless, ‘it would be little use to conquer abroad and suffer defeat at home’.

In various subsequent speeches, including a New Year’s Eve radio broadcast, he reiterated that while the Allies’ cause was just, Australians should ‘set our own house in order’: ‘The greatest enemy which the nation faced was what was called secularism, the attempt to divorce God from human society’.

Such statements need to be seen in context. Prime Minister Menzies’ declaration on 3 September 1939 that Australia would follow Great Britain into the war against Germany had not triggered to anywhere near the same degree the patriotic emotions of 1914, and during the early years of the conflict there was no great sense of urgency. For most Australians, life changed little. A record amount was bet on the Melbourne Cup in 1940, and a survey of public attitudes the following year highlighted the ‘sense of disillusionment, futility, distrust, disgust, diffidence and indifference which so many possess with regard to politics and society in general and the war in particular’. That began to change in December 1941 when Japan entered the war. By the end of February 1942 Singapore had surrendered and Japanese bombs were falling on Darwin.

As the conflict drew closer, Beovich’s public utterances took on a more sombre note. At the opening of a new Catholic school on Australia Day, 26 January 1942, he called for ‘wholehearted cooperation with the Commonwealth Government’ in the grave crisis the nation was facing. In May he launched the Catholic United Services Auxiliary (CUSA). This provided recreational facilities in Angas Street for service men and women. From June 1942 the diocesan paper, the Southern Cross, ran a regular column titled ‘Catholic Patriotic Activities’. A special Mass and Communion Breakfast was held for troops from the United States in July 1942. With their reputation for being ‘over-sexed, over paid and over here’, American servicemen were a mixed blessing. Beovich shared widespread concern about declining sexual morality during the war years. He did not go as far as Archbishop James Duhig of Brisbane, who advocated a curfew for girls under seventeen and a ban on marriages between Australian women and American servicemen. However, Beovich and Bishop Thomas McCabe of Port Augusta issued a pastoral letter on 10 August 1942 which exhorted Catholics to withstand ‘the many dangers and temptations to faith and morals’ which existed in ‘these difficult days’.
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Beovich also encouraged the Catholic Women's League to provide safe accommodation for female munitions workers. He formally opened the rather bizarrely named St Mary's Munitions Hostel on 25 October 1942.\footnote{21}

In April 1943 Beovich responded to Prime Minister John Curtin's appeal for prayer for Australia by declaring that 'love of the land of our birth is a virtue implanted in our hearts by God Himself', and that when the nation was in such grave danger, it was necessary to 'banish selfishness and complacency and to do what is in our power to assist our country'.\footnote{22} He promoted distinctively Catholic forms of prayer — Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament and the Rosary — but was sensitive to the ecumenical difficulties that this created. Before consecrating his diocese to the Immaculate Heart of Mary in 1943, he asked priests to remind their parishioners that Mary 'differs from her Son as the finite from the infinite, as the created from the uncreated. We do not give her that adoration which belongs to God alone.'\footnote{23}
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\caption{Matthew Beovich and B.A. Santamaria in 1943 (Courtesy of the Adelaide Catholic Archdiocesan Archives)}
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\textbf{The debate on post-war reconstruction}

By the end of 1942 the Japanese advance had been halted, and during 1943, with increasing numbers of American troops in the South-West Pacific, it became clear that the tide had turned in Australia's favour. Beovich pre-empted victory and leapt into the debate on post-war reconstruction. The reformist federal Labor government in December 1942 created a Department of Postwar Reconstruction. Ben Chifley was the minister responsible, and H.C. Coombs the director-general. Coombs later wrote that he and his colleagues were 'stimulated to believe that human communities could, by corporate action, shape the context in which the lives of their members were to be lived'.\footnote{24} They invited submissions on how this could be done. A Catholic response was provided by a committee chaired by B.A. Santamaria, assistant secretary of the Australian National Secretariat of Catholic Action.\footnote{25} An abridged version of the submission, titled Pattern for Peace, was approved by the Australian Catholic
bishops' Committee on Catholic Action, and issued in 1943 as the fourth of the Australian hierarchy's annual social justice statements.

Beovich energetically promoted *Pattern for Peace* in a radio broadcast on ABC state radio on 11 May.\(^{26}\) He called for the establishment of a basic wage which would be the same for men and women, increasing for men when they married and on the birth of each of their children. He also supported more widespread distribution of ownership in industry and the curbing of monopolies; the stabilization of rural life through the linkage of independent farms in networks of cooperative enterprises; greater control of trading banks so that in the administration of credit the public interest alone would be considered, not private profit; and, last but not least, a fundamentally Christian education system.

Apart from a brief mention in the newspapers, *Pattern for Peace* faded into obscurity.\(^{27}\) A far more lively debate was generated by the 'Common Cause Movement', founded in Adelaide in March 1943.\(^{28}\) Its members included a few prominent Anglicans, Methodists and Presbyterians who committed themselves to, among other things, 'work for a post-war world in which the social evils of the pre-war world: poverty, unemployment, bad housing, malnutrition and inequalities of opportunities for education, health and leisure will be banished'. The fact that the group included a few communists aroused the ire of a vocal Catholic critic, Albert Hannan, and may explain why Beovich did not become involved.

On 12 September 1943 Beovich gave another address, this time on ABC national radio. The theme was 'The Making of an Australian'. He outlined what he regarded as the urgent problems facing Australia: 'a declining population, a dangerous class conflict in industry, and a decline in agriculture'. He then described the ideal response:

...an Australian will face these serious problems by recognising that there is greater happiness and security in large families in spite of the sacrifices involved. He will not dislike foreigners but strive to understand them. He opposes racial hatred in Hitler, he will not countenance it in ourselves. He will do everything practical to welcome the immigrant, helping him to become acclimatised and absorbed into the social life of the country. He will realise that workers have a right to cooperate and share in the control of industry policy and to be treated as men and not simply as mechanical units or cogs in a machine. In striving for social justice and cooperation he will follow Christian principles because only men animated by the positive Christian ideal can discipline their selfish desires sufficiently to bear the sacrifices required to carry out national policies for the true progress of our country.\(^{29}\)

The archbishop was being idealistic and he knew it. Having been labelled 'Dago Beovich' at school,\(^{30}\) he was only too well aware of Australians' insular dislike of foreign immigration.\(^{31}\) As with similar idealism in Methodist circles, his opinions are significant not because they represent the thinking of the average person in the pew during the war years, but because they show a church leader willing to raise awareness of social and economic issues. In his history of Methodism in South Australia, Arnold D. Hunt cautions against assuming that the progressive social objectives endorsed by the local Methodist Conference in the mid-1940s would have been acceptable to the majority of Methodists.\(^{32}\) A similar caveat must be borne in mind when considering Beovich's public utterances. However, given the emphasis placed on obedience to church teaching in the Catholic Church, and the respect generally accorded the hierarchy in his era, Beovich may have been in a better position than Methodist leaders to influence his flock.\(^{33}\)

Moreover, at the same time as he led from the front on issues such as immigration, Beovich continued to wage war on well-known Catholic targets. 'They have rationed our tea, and I suppose it is not to be wondered at if they ration the beer', he mused in mid-1942, before going on to bemoan that things which were 'intrinsically evil'
were permitted to continue: indecent literature and films, and the sale of contraceptive devices. He thought it quite odd that cars could be forced off the road due to a shortage of tyres, but rubber could still be found for twelve million condoms to be manufactured each year. Methodist idealists were more worried about alcohol and gambling. For Beovich, drinking and betting did not fall into the ‘intrinsically evil’ category: they only became harmful when used unwisely.

Confrontation
It has been said that ‘the Church’s quietude on the War was in direct contrast to its theoretical verbosity on how post-War Australia should be reconstructed’. Beovich, however, did not remain quiet when he thought that the interests of his church were under threat. In January 1942 he heard a rumour that the buildings of Rostrevor College were going to be turned into a military hospital. He confronted the military authorities. When the report was confirmed, he demanded to know why, of all the schools in Adelaide, one of the most important Catholic colleges had been singled out. He advised the Christian Brothers not to relinquish the school, but to continue to make arrangements for the new academic year. The army backed off. Not content with this victory, Beovich persuaded Mannix to write a statement protesting at the compulsory borrowing of Catholic education buildings (which had, of course, been constructed without any financial help from the government — the great Catholic education grievance). He sent it to Archbishop Norman Gilroy of Sydney to forward to the Federal Cabinet. In Brisbane Duhig adopted a much more conciliatory approach: ‘Though no diocese was as badly hit as his, he led the bishops in accepting the necessity of the policy ... He wrote especially to the archbishop of Adelaide, who wanted to denounce the military authorities as acting like Nazis in Germany.’ Beovich was unmoved, pleased that as a result of his representations all Catholic buildings in his diocese were left undisturbed.

On another issue Beovich and the archbishop of Brisbane also clashed. Horrified at the bombing of his beloved Rome by Allied forces in July 1943, Beovich contacted Mannix and Gilroy to arrange a protest. Gilroy, as secretary of the standing committee of the Australian hierarchy, forwarded a cable (drafted by Mannix) to the pope, expressing sympathy at the ‘outrage’ which had occurred. In spite of opposition from Duhig and two other bishops, Gilroy also sent cables to Churchill and Roosevelt asking for no further raids on Rome. In an address in his cathedral, Duhig blamed Mussolini’s Fascist government for not making Rome an ‘open city’, and he accepted that the Allies had tried to avoid bombing churches and places of historic interest. In a private letter to Gilroy, Duhig indicated that he thought the cables were imprudent, if not unpatriotic and subversive, and a cause of deep embarrassment to Catholics in the armed forces. His biographer applauds his stance: ‘Others may have been more politically involved than Duhig, but no bishop — and few politicians — had a sounder instinct for what the Australian people would tolerate ... his stand confirmed his reputation in the minds of public and politician: the archbishop of Brisbane was a man to speak for Australia.’

Beovich was not interested in speaking for Australia when Rome was under attack. As bombing raids increased in intensity in March 1944, he wrote to the priests of his diocese:

We cannot, and will not remain silent in this critical hour when the life of the Holy Father is in imminent peril and the centre of our Holy Faith is threatened with destruction ... In your love and reverence for the Holy Father you are asked, on the next three Sundays, to speak of these matters to your people and to exhort them to crowd the meeting in the Adelaide Town Hall on Easter Sunday ...  

So many heeded the appeal that hundreds had to be turned away. Those who managed to get inside the Town Hall were told by their emotional archbishop that ‘we have come ... to grieve with
the Holy Father and to show that our hearts beat in unison with his heart. A motion was unanimously passed: ‘That this great meeting of Catholic citizens of South Australia ... expresses unswerving devotion to and profound sympathy with our Holy Father, Pope Pius XII; we share his anguished protest at the bombing of Rome and the State of Vatican City, and we wholeheartedly support his appeals to all the belligerents not to make a battlefield of the Holy City of our Catholic Faith’. Copies of the resolution were sent to the apostolic delegate, the prime minister, the governor general, even the British prime minister and the president of the United States. Beovich exclaimed in his diary: ‘It was a wonderful and inspiring meeting and I felt proud and grateful to the priests and people of Adelaide’. Years later, Darcy Woodards, his financial secretary, recalled in his memoirs:

I found him to be a very quiet man. He never seemed to get excited or perturbed about any difficulty that arose ... The only time I recollect seeing him excited was during the war, when we had a big meeting in the Town Hall to protest against the bombing of Rome. Well, he literally foamed at the mouth. It was the only time I ever saw him excited.

Predictably, there was a reaction from South Australians who did not hold Rome in such high regard. An anonymous correspondent wrote to the *Advertiser*: ‘To me, and to many other British people, Rome signifies the birthplace of Fascism in this war. It is certainly not my spiritual home. I have far greater love for London, the centre of our Empire. The reverend gentlemen who protest against the bombing of Rome were not very vocal when London was being reduced to rubble.’ A week later, ‘RAAF’ claimed:

The average person does not, nor do I, favor the bombing of Rome, but rather regards it as a deadly medicine for a deadly disease, viz. the cancer of Nazism which has taken root in the city. I am confident that if it should be necessary to raze Rome to the ground the spirit of Christ in the hearts of true men will still be equal to the task of building the ‘brave new world’ ... If it will shorten the war, or save one Allied life, then let our air fleet set course for Rome.

Given the small percentage of Catholics in the state, it is likely that these views reflected a more common response than Beovich’s passionate denunciation of the bombing. Ironically, while Beovich had refused Hannan’s request in 1940 for a rally to show Catholic sympathy for England, he succumbed in 1944 to his own brand of exuberant patriotism.

Another potentially divisive issue was the treatment of ‘enemy aliens’ and prisoners of war in Australia. By December 1944 there were at least 1500 men of Italian birth interned in South Australia and it could be assumed that the majority had been baptised Catholic. Many of the prisoners were sent to work on farms to compensate for the scarcity of rural workers. As one of the few priests in South Australia who could speak Italian, Beovich visited prisoners of war on farms and at the main distribution centre at Sandy Creek near Gawler, where five hundred men were located. Many took the opportunity to receive the sacrament of confession, and Beovich was pleased to report to the apostolic delegate that even though most of the farmers who employed the men were not Catholic, they were taking them to the nearest Catholic churches for Mass, an indication that sectarian bigotry was still muted in South Australia, in spite of Beovich’s campaign to save Rome.

**The growth of ecumenism**

Overall, the war years seem to have generated far more ecumenical collaboration than sectarian division. One of the first South Australians to welcome the new Catholic archbishop to Adelaide was William Harris, president of the South Australian Methodist Conference. In 1941 an energetic new Anglican bishop arrived from England, Bryan Robin, and he and Beovich had a number of meetings, at least one held over lunch.
Both men were interested in the ecumenical initiatives taking place in England. One of the most significant developments was a letter published in *The Times* on 21 December 1940 which supported Pope Pius XII's Five Peace Points. Its signatories included the archbishop of Canterbury and the cardinal archbishop of Westminster. In June 1943 Gilroy also issued a statement with his Anglican counterpart, Archbishop Mowll. Before signing the document he sent a copy to Beovich for his opinion. The cautious Beovich suggested a little more precision in the wording, but was, on the whole, supportive. On 2 December 1943 Beovich himself sat on the platform of the Adelaide Town Hall with Robin and John C. Hughes, a prominent Methodist minister who was president of the Council of Churches in South Australia. Together they presented a joint statement calling for greater reliance on Christian principles in daily life.

As the war drew to a close, Beovich reminded his priests that, as canon law prohibited Catholics from taking part in Protestant religious services, they should suggest to their local civic councils that any commemorations of the Victory should be such that all citizens could attend 'without any hurt to their religious convictions'. He personally went to see Playford, and as a result there was a simple commemoration service outside Parliament House on Friday, 16 August 1945. No clergy were involved. The first hymn, Catholic convert John Henry Newman's 'Lead kindly light, amid the encircling gloom', expressed faith in the midst of distress. It was a surprisingly mournful choice for the occasion, but one familiar to both Catholics and Protestants. The premier and the governor each gave a short speech, and the service concluded with the hymn 'O God our help in ages past/ Our hope for years to come', the Last Post and the national anthem. The crowd was then invited to go to either the Anglican or the Catholic cathedral where Robin and Beovich addressed their respective congregations. As Beovich's successor, James Gleeson, later commented, the ecumenical initiatives of the war years 'may seem small things in our Post-Vatican II Church but, at that time, they were highly significant and quite controversial issues initiated by the first Australian-born Archbishop of Adelaide'.

Alas, victory had a bitter aftertaste. In Beovich's address in St Francis Xavier Cathedral on 16 August 1945 he emphasised that peace had to be based on Christian principles of justice and charity and not 'new weapons of destruction'. He was more direct a month later. The atomic bomb, he declared, was 'intrinsically wrong'. Even if it had shortened the war, the end did not justify the means. For once he and Duhig were in agreement. Mannix also spoke out strongly against the atomic bomb. The general reaction of the Australian community, however, seems to have been one of relief at the end of the war, jubilation at the victory and incomprehension of the horrors of the new weapons.

**Conclusion**

Matthew Beovich's confident assertion in 1940 that God could be 'called back to the Council Chambers' was over-optimistic: the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki testifies to that. Nevertheless, the Catholic archbishop of Adelaide cannot be accused of declining into irrelevance during the war years. The shy, diffident priest from Melbourne emerged as an articulate Catholic spokesman. Without compromising Catholic teaching or piety, he promoted a nuanced form of patriotism in which no trace of British imperialism could be found. Convinced that the Allies' cause was just, he encouraged the Catholics of his diocese to support the war effort and he made it easier for them to participate in the 'civil religion' which permeated the war years. At the same time, he challenged Australians to reflect on some of the deeper social, economic and moral issues facing their nation.

Perhaps most significantly, at a time when Catholic involvement in the ecumenical movement was almost non-existent, Beovich
fostered good relations between Catholics and the wider, predominantly Protestant community. While his passionate response to the bombing of Rome must have 'jarred the harmony of the Australian war effort', there is no evidence that it did serious damage, at least to Beovich's relations with the state's civic leaders and the heads of other Christian denominations. Many years later, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of Beovich's consecration as a bishop, Thomas Playford recalled his 'courtesy and cooperation' and paid tribute to his 'outstanding service' during those 'dark and trying days' when the nation was at war. Emerging from the war with his credibility intact, the stage was set in 1945 for Matthew Beovich to play a significant role in the modest religious revival of the post-war years, but that is beyond the scope of this paper.

This essay has been peer reviewed.
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