

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum. United States and Europe—\$2.50.
 Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.
 Editor, Rev. James T. Foley, D.D.
 Associate Editor, H. P. Mackintosh.
 Manager—Robert M. Burns.
 Address business letters to the Manager.
 Classified Advertising 15 cents per line. Remittances must accompany the order. Where CATHOLIC RECORD Box address is required send 10 cents to prepay expense of postage upon replies.
 Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.
 The Editor cannot be held responsible for unsolicited manuscripts. Every endeavor will be made to return rejected contributions when stamped addressed envelopes are enclosed.
 The CATHOLIC RECORD has been approved and recommended by Archbishops Filiozzi and Sheil, late Apostolic Delegates to Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Oshawa, New York, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 28, 1925

**TABOO ON DISCUSSION
 FOSTERS INTOLERANCE**

Everyone is familiar with the periodical outbreaks of violent and virulent hatred and abuse of the Catholic Church; and close observers may also note the perennial if latent suspicion, distrust and antagonism to all things Catholic on the part of many Protestants who deprecate the excesses of the baser sort of anti-Catholic bigots. And this remains true in spite of numerous and notable exceptions.

Catholics are few who do not feel at one time or another that Protestants still protest against giving equal treatment to Catholics. For that is the origin of the term, and not, as the popular misconception would have it, as denoting those who "protest against the errors of Rome." In 1529 the Diet of Speyer, presided over by King Ferdinand as the Emperor's deputy, tried to reach a compromise by which the practice of the new religion should be allowed in the Lutheran States but that the same liberty should be allowed to those who should continue to adhere to the Catholic Church. The five princes most concerned handed in a protestation against this toleration of the Catholic religion in their territories; and from this the name, Protestant, was extended to the whole movement against the Catholic Church, and the historic name has been perpetuated to the present day; and with the name something of the spirit that prompted the protestation.

The founders of the Ku Klux Klan may have been actuated by the most ruthless of mercenary motives, and the millions out of which they fleeced their dupes are held up as proof that this is so. But that only emphasizes the fact that there was a deep, unreasoning prejudice to which the exploiters might confidently appeal. The incredibly rapid and widespread extension of this grotesque society is proof conclusive that their confidence was not misplaced. Should all this be explained by saying that it was an appeal to ignorance, credulity, and religious prejudice, it must be admitted that the success of that appeal lays bare an astonishingly large cross-section of these unenviable attributes of Protestant civilization in America.

Nor is it always the ignorant who are anti-Catholic. A few months ago a Catholic was elected one of the seven Fellows of Harvard. This was the first and only Catholic chosen for this high office. Promptly and peremptorily a highly educated Harvard graduate entered an emphatic public protest not for any worthy reason but solely because the Fellow-elect was a Catholic. In the discussion that followed this Protestant showed himself closely akin to the K. K. K. in credulity, as well as vehemence and recklessness of statement.

The condition indicated by these facts, which could be multiplied indefinitely, is well known by Catholics and is freely enough admitted by many Protestants. We do not complain of it. We simply note an outstanding fact. Newman, who was half his life a Protestant, bears eloquent testimony to the fact in his "Present Position of Catholics." This *damnosa hereditas* we believe can not and will not stand the test of full, fair and free discussion. It flourishes because such discussion is taboo.

For this reason we welcome a discussion which is poles apart from religious controversy that is already begun in The Forum.

Michael Williams, editor of The Commonwealth, and author of High Romance, wash himself for the greater part of his life outside the Catholic Church; though not a Protestant, in the positive sense of the term, he accepted for a time the different

substitutes for religion that are adopted nowadays by many so-called Protestants. He, therefore, has a first hand and sympathetic knowledge of the non-Catholic point of view.

In The Forum of March he writes: "Probably the person most puzzled by such manifestations of the anti-Catholic spirit is the average American Catholic citizen. Ordinarily, living with his non-Catholic neighbors on terms of equality and friendship, and simply taking the American principle of religious toleration for granted, his state of mind when confronted by the covert or open opposition to him and his kind, because of his and their religious beliefs, is one of angry bewilderment. This is increased by the fact that it is very seldom, if ever, that the case against him and his fellows is presented frankly, openly, and fairly. Scores if not hundreds of violently anti-Catholic books, pamphlets, and newspapers, some of the latter with very considerable circulation, appear on all sides during these periods of excitement. Great organizations spring up and exert really tremendous if evanescent political and social influence through attacking the Catholic religion.

Even the most cursory examination of this anti-Catholic literature shows that its authors make great play of what is supposed by them to be the irreconcilable difference between the principles of Catholicism and the principles of the American nation. The Catholic also discovers that many of his non-Catholic friends and neighbors, while not descending to the rather tawdry type of abusive language that is ordinarily characteristic of American anti-Catholic literature, nevertheless frequently display more or less sympathy with the anti-Catholic crusade, and are inclined more or less to believe that there 'must be something in it.' And still, when a Catholic looks about him for a reasonable, calm, documented statement of the case against his Church, he fails to find it. The only consideration of the subject that is discernible is carried on below the surface of public discussion in obscure, fanatical journals and pamphlets. At best, they are only sources of irritation and rancor. At their worst, they have frequently caused violent rioting.

It would be an excellent idea if an attempt should be made to supply a really worth-while statement of the case against Catholicism, so far as its relations to American institutions are concerned. It would clear the air of a great deal of merely trivial or obviously false, and sometimes malicious, stuff. For the most part Catholics disdainfully refrain from noticing the usual sort of thing that appears and reappears in the professional anti-Catholic press. Quotations from apocryphal speeches or letters by George Washington or Abraham Lincoln, or other representative American patriots or statesmen, condemning Catholicism; garbled or purely fictitious quotations from Papal documents; bogus 'oaths' of the Jesuits, or the Knights of Columbus; the rehashing of utterly discredited 'revelations' or 'confessions' of very dubious 'experts' and ex-nuns; pale echoes of Maria Monk and Father Chiniquy; insinuations and sometimes open charges that the Catholic churches have secret arsenals of rifles and bombs, or that the Catholic University at Washington and other Catholic institutions of that city choose their locations in order to provide points of physical attack upon the White House,—this sort of thing seems below even contemptuous notice, yet it is amazing how widely it is circulated and how explicitly it seems to be credited. That, quite apart from and infinitely higher than this dangerous rubbish, there is an anti-Catholic state of mind, or mood, more or less common to a great multitude of respectable and worthy people, is also true. But, for the most part, this sentiment, or mood, lacks a clear or precise utterance. It lacks its literature. Possibly this cannot be helped. It may be that it is not possible to find material sufficiently definite to construct and maintain any worth-while argument against the Catholic Church in the United States, in so far as its supposed antagonism to American institutions is concerned."

The editor of The Forum announcing this open discussion writes:

"We always think of America as preeminently the land of religious liberty. Here no one is persecuted for his faith, either socially, politically, or economically. The United States is almost the only great nation in which no official clerical party exists. For many years it has been the consistent policy of politicians and journalists to keep religious questions out of politics and out of print. But throughout this period the Roman Catholic Church in America has been the subject of a sort of backstairs controversy. There have been whisperings and mutterings on both sides. With the advent of the Ku Klux Klan and as a result of the turmoil in the Democratic convention in 1924 over the candidacy of Governor Smith of New York, this matter has forced itself into the open in spite of the religious taboo which we have mistaken for religious tolerance. Tolerance implies a willingness to discuss a question frankly and fearlessly. And because The Forum believes that it is tolerance rather than taboo which we must achieve in religious matters, as in all others, it is opening its pages to a discussion of this question. In the present article, Mr. Williams challenges Protestants and other non-Catholics to come out into the open and assert the specific items in their bill of complaints against his Church. In the April Forum, John Jay Chapman accepts this challenge.

John Jay Chapman was the educated Harvard graduate, poet and author, who in the traditional Protestant way protested so vigorously against the election of a Catholic Fellow of Harvard. He will maintain the thesis that the essence of Americanism is to be found in the reliance on the Private Mind whereas the essence of Roman Catholicism is to be found in respect and subservience to External Authority. These two ideas, he will maintain, in the April Forum, are antagonistic and unassimilable. In the May Forum, Dr. Frederick J. Kinsman, formerly Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Delaware and now a Catholic layman, will reply to Mr. Chapman.

Readers of The Forum are invited to contribute their opinions to a Symposium which will be published in a subsequent issue.

This series of articles are, of course, copyrighted. Now and then we obtain permission to reprint a copyrighted article for the benefit of the readers of THE CATHOLIC RECORD. We cannot hope, we can not even ask, to reprint this whole series. But many of our readers may buy these numbers of this magazine at news-stands or book stores. Those who might find that difficult may obtain the four issues—from March to June—containing this interesting and invaluable discussion, at the special price of one dollar. The address is The Forum, 247 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. Not the least of the benefits to Catholics from reading this discussion will be the opportunity of getting the Protestant point of view.

liberty. Here no one is persecuted for his faith, either socially, politically, or economically. The United States is almost the only great nation in which no official clerical party exists. For many years it has been the consistent policy of politicians and journalists to keep religious questions out of politics and out of print. But throughout this period the Roman Catholic Church in America has been the subject of a sort of backstairs controversy. There have been whisperings and mutterings on both sides. With the advent of the Ku Klux Klan and as a result of the turmoil in the Democratic convention in 1924 over the candidacy of Governor Smith of New York, this matter has forced itself into the open in spite of the religious taboo which we have mistaken for religious tolerance. Tolerance implies a willingness to discuss a question frankly and fearlessly. And because The Forum believes that it is tolerance rather than taboo which we must achieve in religious matters, as in all others, it is opening its pages to a discussion of this question. In the present article, Mr. Williams challenges Protestants and other non-Catholics to come out into the open and assert the specific items in their bill of complaints against his Church. In the April Forum, John Jay Chapman accepts this challenge.

John Jay Chapman was the educated Harvard graduate, poet and author, who in the traditional Protestant way protested so vigorously against the election of a Catholic Fellow of Harvard. He will maintain the thesis that the essence of Americanism is to be found in the reliance on the Private Mind whereas the essence of Roman Catholicism is to be found in respect and subservience to External Authority. These two ideas, he will maintain, in the April Forum, are antagonistic and unassimilable. In the May Forum, Dr. Frederick J. Kinsman, formerly Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Delaware and now a Catholic layman, will reply to Mr. Chapman.

Readers of The Forum are invited to contribute their opinions to a Symposium which will be published in a subsequent issue.

This series of articles are, of course, copyrighted. Now and then we obtain permission to reprint a copyrighted article for the benefit of the readers of THE CATHOLIC RECORD. We cannot hope, we can not even ask, to reprint this whole series. But many of our readers may buy these numbers of this magazine at news-stands or book stores. Those who might find that difficult may obtain the four issues—from March to June—containing this interesting and invaluable discussion, at the special price of one dollar. The address is The Forum, 247 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. Not the least of the benefits to Catholics from reading this discussion will be the opportunity of getting the Protestant point of view.

ALL MEN BELIEVE IN
 MIRACLES
 BY THE OBSERVER
 The Boston Herald in a recent article said:

"Who today looks through a microscope or a telescope without thinking of the lenses of the eye? Who looks today upon the newly-arrived airplane without thinking of that primitive aeronaut the bird? If everything had arisen by chance, how account for the electric battery invented by the 'gymnotus electricus,' or for that other anticipation of human science which enabled insects to discover a method of making light without heat? Take the mechanisms of man's body as examples. Professor Arthur Keith recently described a number of extraordinary things which have been done without anything like conscious contrivance on the part of the organism itself. All of us are fitted with better kinds of combustion engines than man ever thought of. The bones of our body are living levers. The heart is a pump, one which in the ingenuity of its construction, the delicacy of its regulation, and the perfection of its working surpasses any model of man's invention. Most wonderful of all, the human body possesses a telegraph system, as well as automatic telephone exchanges. What can it all mean? Mere accident, by which some living creature happens to be superior to some others and therefore succeeds in dowering its successors with the superiority, or

is it something resembling what we know as design on the human level? And are we to be content with the information that the fittest survive, a mere commonplace in its way, when what we supremely need to know is how the fittest arrive? If all these marvellous contrivances can be introduced independently of man's conscious strivings, and in advance of his knowledge, his books and his conquest of nature, there must be some reason for it. A Harvard professor calls this neglected factor, 'purposive striving such as finds its only analogue in the steadfast purposive striving of a resolute personality.' Should not the recognition of it greatly tend to the promotion of sympathetic relations between science and religion?"

Perhaps so, if it were possible to say what is meant by the "purposive striving of a resolute personality." But who in all the world can tell what that means if it does not mean a recognition of God. It seems to mean some sort of effort to account for man without looking outside of or above man himself, or explaining how or why man was created and what is the purpose of his existence in this world.

The Boston Herald seems to hint that it would be well for scientists to look into the claims of religion. But that is precisely what modern irreligious science is determined not to do. Which is the reason why a thousand so-called scientists are today trying with might and main to explain a murder in Chicago (which by the way is only one of hundreds of murders committed every year in that city) by talking about cells and glands and split personalities and psychological abnormalities and pathological queerness.

One learned writer, ambitious to solve all present day problems of criminology and at the same time explain all history, takes up the case of the Emperor Nero and concludes quite confidently that he inherited from his mother a set of abnormal glands. The learned gentleman cautiously declines to commit himself as to whether Nero's glands were overdeveloped or underdeveloped; but he is sure they were abnormal; otherwise he would not have played the fiddle while the city of Rome was burning. Such is modern science. Such are its self-satisfying victories over time, space and circumstance. Of course Agrippina is dead these nineteen or twenty centuries; but what of that? What difficulties can twenty centuries present to a full-fledged modern scientific imagination?

The trouble with much of the modern science, so far as it is not under the influence of the Catholic Faith, is, that it ignores God, the devil, the Bible, the Apostolic tradition, the Natural Law, the Ten Commandments, the Sermon on the Mount, and everything else by which human action can be tested or understood, and, having ignored all that, and refused to look at it, modern science is driven to explaining human actions by man and the human body alone. So it is that we hear so much about cells and muscles and glands, about emotional childishness and split personalities, and pathological queerness.

NOTES AND COMMENTS
 SAYS AN OVERSEAS CONTEMPORARY:
 "A very pleasant surprise was caused at Cardinal Gasquet's jubilee luncheon by the arrival of a messenger from the Vatican with a present from the Holy Father—a magnificent cake and a large box of cigars." With regard to the latter, would not a resolution of protest from the W. C. T. U. be in order?

WHILE PRESBYTERIANS are threshing out the "Union" question and Methodists, or at least some of them, are repudiating "modernism" as inherent in the new "United Church," a theological professor with a scientific turn (Prof. W. J. Thomson) writes in the Methodist Review on the person of the Christ. His article is entitled, "Jesus in the Light of the Parthenogenesis," which title in itself is illuminating.

THIS IS how he goes about it: "Jesus' respiration was 18, his pulse 72, his temperature 98.6 degrees (two-tenths above normal, be it noted), his blood pressure normal, with a normal blood-count and a normal percentage of hemoglobin. The nervous system of Jesus grew from the ectoderm, the upper zone of the blastula, the alimentary from the lower zone."

He THEN proceeds to explain scientifically the Virgin-birth by "parthenogenesis," that is, whose "agents are salt solutions of acid, fatty acids and fat solvents, alkaloids and cyanides, blood serum and sperm extract, heat and cold, agitation and electric current." Which sort of thing, says the learned editor of the Calcutta Herald, "should settle once for all those thirty souls that hanker after truth and feel chagrined that religion should not keep abreast of science. They have got what they want." But what a mockery of religion is the publication of trash like this in a Methodist periodical!

THE CONSTANT vigilance of the Holy See for the welfare of the nations is instanced by the establishment at the Oriental Institute at Rome of a course in Islamic doctrine under the direction of a Turkish priest who is a recent convert from Mohammedanism. The Holy Father himself is directly responsible for this new departure. The Christian world has grown accustomed to regard the conversion of Islam as almost impracticable. But to the everlasting Church nothing in the way of conversions is impossible, and Peter never falters in his mission to all mankind.

ONE IS SO used to regarding Switzerland as preponderantly Lutheran, or rather Calvinistic (for, there is a distinction that the election of a Catholic President comes somewhat as a surprise. But the Catholics really form 41% of the population. In several cantons they are in the majority, and Lucerne and the Forest cantons (the original home of Swiss freedom) are almost entirely Catholic. The President of the Republic is elected annually, and for this year the choice has fallen upon M. Jean Marie Musy, one of the Catholic deputies of the canton of Fribourg. Enough to make Master John Calvin turn in his grave!

IN INITIATING legislation looking towards the severance of French relations with the Holy See, M. Herriot made boastful proclamation of the nation's independence of extraneous influences. It is a pity he could not make the same proud boast for himself. M. Herriot is a member of the Grand Orient Lodge, and here is the degree which appears in the minutes of that body for 1923, page 365: "Freemason members of Parliament, who are, so to say, the emissaries of the Order, must remain subject to its jurisdiction as long as their mandate lasts. They must accept the parliamentary directions of the General Assembly; in every circumstance of their political life they are under an obligation to obey the principles that guide us. . . . At stated periods they are obliged to give an account of their mandate to their respective Lodges. . . . and must within Parliament form groups doing their best to further the interests of Freemasonry."

M. HERRIOT'S programme can be read word for word in the same publication; suppression of the Vatican Embassy, suppression of religious teaching in the schools of Alsace as in the rest of France, suppression of religious orders. It becomes clearer and clearer that it is the Grand Orient that governs France, and that Premier Herriot, like his predecessors, is but its tool and its slave.

THAT FRANCE does not lack true patriots who fear not to speak out and to warn their compatriots of the abyss to which their country is being pushed by its sworn enemies, is well-known. Of these, M. Chauffier is in the front rank. Writing in Le Figaro, the great Parisian daily, he utters this solemn warning: "France has separated her interests from those of Catholicism. The result has not been long in coming. Our influence in the Orient is diminishing from day to day and is descending to zero. Our national Catholic power of missionary expansion, which constitutes almost our entire action in the Orient, is in danger of becoming exhausted. The Holy See, no longer finding in France the necessary means, is trusting to other countries, more wide awake, more active, and more able, to solicit their valued collaboration. We must also realize that if the interests of the Holy See and those of France are in conflict, it is France that will always be the loser. The Holy See

can get on without us. We have need of her. And it is we who create the conflict."

SIR EDWARD ELGAR's setting of Cardinal Newman's sublime poem, "The Dream of Gerontius," was rendered in Toronto last week by the Mendelssohn Choir and the Philadelphia Orchestra, this being the second time in that city. The first was by the Sheffield Choir some fifteen years ago. The rendering of this modern masterpiece would be an artistic event in any city, and as Toronto is given to pluming itself on its capacity for appreciating good things it was the more inclined to prize the distinction in this case.

NOT BEING critics we have no intention of inflicting any disquisition of that kind upon our readers. But it was gratifying to note the impression made, upon those with some capacity for judging, by Sir Edward Elgar's treatment of this great Catholic poem. It was received for the most part with reverence and understanding of the "wonderfully religious spirit and nature of the work," with its "far more deeply reverent music and more truly sacred art," than many other oratorios with which the music-loving public, on this Continent at least, are more familiar.

ONE DISCORDANT note there was however—that of the Mail and Empire, whose critic voiced the materialism of the age rather than its artistic temper, not to speak of its spirituality. Who but one wedded to earth, and given over wholly to that spirit of modernism of which we today hear so much, could see in the beautiful theme of the poem nothing but a "perfectly appalling conception of death," "repugnant" in its "whole idea," and "horrifying in its implications." Yet the same erudite scribe finds it "trivial"—surely a contradiction in terms to which no well-balanced critic would commit himself. To such an one it of course signified nothing that the whole world of letters has long accorded to Newman's poem a place very close to the summit, or that Elgar's setting of the same has been hailed as the greatest musical achievement of the generation in the English-speaking world.

OREGON SCHOOL CASE

**BRIEFS OF COUNSEL GIVEN
 U. S. SUPREME COURT**

Allegations set forth by officials of the State of Oregon in their appeal to the United States Supreme Court to reverse the Federal District Court of Oregon and sustain the validity of the anti-parochial school law enacted in that State in 1922, are answered in briefs filed with the Supreme Court here by attorneys for the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary. The Catholic side of the controversy—in effect a defense of the entire private school system, religious and nonsectarian—is outlined in two briefs and two appendices. One brief with the appendices has been filed by William D. Guthrie of New York, chief counsel for the Catholic Sisters, and Bernard Herschkopf, assistant counsel. The attorneys for the Sisters whose names appear on the other brief are: J. P. Kavanagh of Portland, Ore., Jay Bowerman, Dan J. Malarky, Hall S. Lusk, E. B. Seabrook, and F. J. Loneragan.

On the other side, appearing for Governor Pierce and Attorney General Van Winkle of Oregon is an array of legal talent headed by former Senator George E. Chamberlain.

BRIEFS OF NON-CATHOLIC BODIES

Additional briefs in opposition to the validity of the anti-private school law have been filed on behalf of the North Pacific Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists and the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church, both taking this action under the legal status of "friends of the court." Both the Adventists and the Episcopalians have schools in Oregon which are menaced by the anti-private school law in the same manner as are the Catholic institutions.

ARGUMENTS OF NON-CATHOLIC BODIES

In the main body of his brief, after a statement of facts and a short preliminary review of the case, Mr. Guthrie presents his arguments in five principal categories designed to prove the following contentions: that the suit for equitable relief was not prematurely brought; that the courts of the United States have jurisdiction because a federal Constitutional right of the plaintiff-appellee (Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary) was invaded by the enactment in question; that the enforcement in suit is not a legitimate exercise by the police power of the State; that the legislative power of a State in relation to education does

not involve the power to prohibit or suppress private schools and colleges; and that the statute in question impairs the obligation of the contract embodied in the charter issued by the State of Oregon to the Sisters as a corporate body.

The brief then declared that the Sisters do not and have not made any challenges on the following points:

"1. As to the power of a State to enact compulsory education laws providing generally that all children shall attend some school, and correlatively as to its obligation and duty, upon making such attendance compulsory, to provide free tuition.

"2. Nor as to the power of a State to require under just and equal regulations that teachers shall be competent, of good moral character and patriotic, and that they shall be licensed by State or local authority.

"3. Nor as to the power of a State within reasonable and just limits to prescribe particular studies for children, or to prohibit such studies as would be reasonably calculated to be prejudicial to them, or prejudicial to affect their morals, religion, or patriotism, but not to prohibit other and proper studies."

Continuing the brief says: "It should likewise be emphasized at the outset of the discussion that there was no suggestion below in pleading, brief, or argument that the teachers, men or women, employed by this appellee or in the Catholic parochial or the other private schools of the State of Oregon were not trained and competent scholars, of good moral character and eminently qualified to teach children; nor that there was any ground for doubting their patriotism and loyalty to our national and State governments; nor that the curriculum of these schools or the result obtained therein was in any way unsatisfactory to the State educational authorities, or unequal in educational value or result to that obtained in the public schools; nor that anything taught or inculcated in these schools was inimical to the State, or in any way or sense whatever prejudicial to the morals, patriotism, or welfare of children."

MOTIVE OF LAW CLEAR

Mr. Guthrie then makes a blunt statement as to the motive animating those who sponsored and enacted the Oregon law as follows: "But in truth, unless court and counsel are to be blind to what 'all others see and understand' and what was clearly present in every aspect and phase of this litigation, though direct mention thereof has been studiously avoided, the sole offense of the members of this appellee, the Society of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary, was that in connection with their schools they were teaching the children and orphans confided to their care the sacred truths and doctrines of religion according to the tenets of the Roman Catholic Church.

"Inexcusable and cruel, indeed, is the libel contained in the oblique innuendos we find in the brief on behalf of the appellant, Governor of Oregon, and particularly the charge at page 52 thereof that injurious effects may result 'from the standpoint of American patriotism' if American parents are allowed to guide and determine the character of the education of their own children, and that they may be taught in religious schools disloyal and subversive doctrine and that the claims upon them of the religion to which they belong are superior to the claims of the United States," etc. The Catholics now appeal from this libel to fair-play and justice and to the judgment of all candid, impartial and tolerant American citizens."

CATHOLICISM COMPELS PATRIOTISM

Pointing out that in Catholic schools "patriotism, obedience to the law and loyalty to the Constitution are taught, not merely as a patriotic duty, but a religious duty as well," the brief goes on: "The fundamental and controlling motive for the establishment and maintenance of Catholic parochial or elementary schools is the profound conviction on the part of Catholics, in which conviction clergy and laity are a unit, that the welfare of the nation, the stability of our constitutional system of government, the continuance of civil and religious freedom, and the lasting happiness of the individual citizen depend upon the code and standards of morality, discipline, self-control and temperance taught by religion. And this broad-minded view is not confined to Catholics, but is shared by Protestants and Jews throughout our country.

"No amount of sophistry can alter the fact that in the case at bar the freedom of the parents, guardians and custodians to send their children to private or parochial schools is, in the strictest and elementary sense, of the very essence of the property rights of the appellee society."

NOT WITHIN POLICE POWER

As to the question of whether or not the Oregon Act was a legitimate exercise of the police power of the State, Mr. Guthrie in his brief arguing that it was not such a legitimate exercise of power, declares that such power includes that of regulating the conduct of private schools or of prohibiting the teaching of subversive or disloyal doctrines but does not include the right to destroy such schools altogether. On this point he calls attention to