

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum. United States and Europe—\$2.50. Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L. D., Rev. James T. Foley, D. D., Editors (Thomas Coffey, L.L. D., Associate Editor—H. F. Mackintosh, Manager—Robert M. Burns, Address business letters to the Manager.

Classified Advertising 15 cents per line. Remittance 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 Falconio and Sbarretti, late Apostolic Delegates to Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

LONDON, SATURDAY, SEPT. 19, 1925

THE AUTHORITY OF THE POPE

The discussion that has been going on in the Forum on America and Roman Catholicism makes clear the fact that the Protestant Tradition holds its sway over a certain type of American mind as effectively as it did in England three quarters of a century ago when Cardinal Newman's immortal analysis of this peculiar obsession was written. Education, apparently, does not loosen its hold on the minds of many of its victims. It is strangely like the superstitions that influence the beliefs and the lives of primitive peoples.

In the August number of the Forum there is a symposium of letters commenting on the discussion. Here is an extract from that of George Washington Williams of Baltimore, Maryland:

"If the Pope is infallible in his judgment, and his views and those of the United States were to differ, what would a good Roman Catholic do in such an exigency?"

"Suppose the Roman Church should develop another Armada, comparable to the Spanish Armada, which would start out from Europe, with the blessing of the Pope bestowed upon it at the sea's edge, with the design of conquering the United States, as that Armada was sent to conquer England,—what would then be the duty of a Roman Catholic citizen of the United States?"

One might as well tell a simple fellow, who firmly believes in ghosts, that there is no menacing danger to him if he passes at night a place reputed to be haunted, as to assure George Washington Williams that neither he nor the United States is in any danger from the Roman Catholic goblin. He has been brought up in the belief that "the gobelun will get you—if you don't watch out;" he may have outgrown other childish superstitions, but he knows that there is a Roman Catholic "gobelun" that will get him and his country if they don't watch out.

The Forum has been very fair in allowing both sides of the question to be fully presented. But we shall take the answer to George Washington Williams from the letter of Professor R. H. Dabney of the University of Virginia.

He writes:

"Queen Elizabeth and President Wilson were equally aware that the theoretical position of the Roman Hierarchy and the actual position of many individual members of the Roman Church are two wholly different things. If President Wilson ever saw the silly cartoon depicting Joseph P. Tumulty telephoning to the Pope all the secrets of the American Government, he was either exasperated or moved to mirth. For he, the son of a Presbyterian minister, knew that Tumulty, though a Catholic and a Knight of Columbus, was also an American patriot and his loyal friend. The shrewd Elizabeth, knowing that she would lose her crown and probably her head if the Spanish Armada, which had been blessed by the Pope, who regarded her as a bastard, a heretic, and an usurper, were successful, nevertheless placed the Catholic, Lord Howard of Effingham, in command of her fleet. For she also knew that Lord Howard was, above all, an Englishman who would never willingly permit Spaniards to defeat an English fleet. If the timid souls who now tremble before the bugaboo of a papistical conquest of America had as much horse sense and knowledge of human nature as Elizabeth, their fears would be allayed."

But neither horse sense nor any other sort of sense, neither reason nor reasoning, will exorcise the silly devil of suspicion and distrust that obsesses the victims of the Protestant Tradition.

Nor will lip-worship of democracy or the brotherhood of man keep them from unjust discrimination against their Catholic fellow citizens.

But the bad old tradition with its legacy of suspicion, distrust and hate, is losing its hold over the more intelligent of its heirs when "horse sense and knowledge of human nature" are allowed their usual scope. Harry Pratt Judson of Chicago, after reading the discussion in the Forum, writes to that magazine, in part, commenting as follows:

"The venerable Roman Catholic Church has a long record of many ages. It has shared in the good and evil of changing times. Not all ecclesiastical administrators have been saintly; inquisitions have not been merciful. But both have reflected the spirit of the changing centuries. The great Church has been mellowed by time. In our republic, wholly aside from theological questions,—and I write as a Protestant by education and by conviction,—the Catholic Church is a power for good. It controls the conscience of many who need such control and who could be reached by no other agency. It is a bulwark of society against disrupted forces. Its best is very good; and churches should not be judged by their worst unless they are practically wholly evil. Such surely is not the case with this Church. It is true that the central authority in the Roman Catholic Church is in a foreign country. But the activity of the papacy in international politics is practically obsolete.

"There are malevolent agencies which aim at the destruction of our republic, but I do not count the Catholic Church among them,—I count it as against them."

By "the activity of the papacy in international politics" Mr. Judson is referring to the time when there was a real United States of Europe—something that is only an ideal today; when there was a real league of Christian nations—something that is at least an aspiration toward which we are striving today. When Europe was wholly Catholic, it was a natural thing for Europeans to make the Pope the supreme arbiter, the active head of the league of Christian nations. The Pope, however, was such, not by virtue of his office as spiritual head of the Church, but by the common consent of the Christian people. In the present divided state of Christendom the Pope, of course, is conceded no such authority. Hence, at the present time, the Pope neither interferes in purely civil affairs nor claims any right to do so.

This is all so clear to Catholics that it goes without saying. But Professor Dabney, who shares as well as admires "the horse sense and knowledge of human nature" of Queen Elizabeth, shows clearly that he has not the faintest notion of what is meant by the infallibility of the Pope.

He writes: "In theory, of course, the Roman Church was founded by God, and consigns to eternal flames all beyond its pale. In theory, too, the Pope, who claims infallibility, when speaking *ex cathedra* upon questions of faith and morals, could declare that the election of a Protestant as president of the United States would endanger the true faith and be perilous to morals. But, in fact no Pope would be rash enough to do so."

As to the first assertion that "the Roman Church consigns to eternal flames all beyond its pale," any Catholic school boy could tell this University professor that the Catholic Church passes judgment on no human being alive; for all she hopes, for all she prays. She teaches what Christ teaches: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be condemned," or, as the Protestant version has it, "shall be damned." Catholic theology makes such qualifications of this doctrine as the teaching of Christ justifies. As a mere matter of scholarly information it would be worth any teacher's while to know just what Catholic doctrine is on this subject.

As to the second statement that the Pope, in virtue of the doctrine of infallibility, "could declare that the election of a Protestant as President of the United States would endanger the true faith and be perilous to morals," our liberal minded professor shows himself as innocent of any knowledge of Papal Infallibility as a Ku Kluxer from the mountains of Tennessee or an

Orangeman from the back townships of Ontario. Any twelve year old boy or girl in any parochial school in the United States could tell this University professor that such a decision on the part of the Pope is altogether outside the scope of Papal Infallibility. On the impossible assumption that the Pope should make any such absurd and unwarranted decision in matters so clearly outside the scope of his spiritual authority, no Catholic in America, or in any other country in the world, would feel any obligation whatsoever to be governed by such a decision; nor would any Protestant resent more warmly than his Catholic fellow-citizens such unwarranted interference.

We shall later return to this subject and show that the Catholic doctrine of Papal Infallibility carries no such implications, either in theory or in fact, as this University professor, in spite of his good will and "horse sense," believes it carries—"in theory," at least.

OUR LITTLE TRIUMPHS

BY THE OBSERVER

It is in human nature, and not in the best of it, to love to crow over someone else. One sees it in the child, and in the savage, and it is a characteristic of the men of learning and culture hardly less than of the uncultured adventurer and swashbuckler. All that learning and culture have done is to make it a social impropriety to openly boast over others. The interior love of having more or having better, either mentally or materially, than someone else gives way to nothing but the Christian virtue of humility, and that is a rare thing amongst men and women.

Dare we say that it is especially rare amongst women? Is it really true that it is rarer among women than among men? Men think so; but it may be because men and women have different objects to which they direct their vanity. A woman loves to look prettier than another woman; to have nicer clothes; and a man affects to despise what he calls superficial appearances; he says he has no time for them, but is intent upon more important things. But his important things come to about the same weight and measurement after all; he feels good for about the same reason as the woman; that is, that in one way or in another he has what he thinks is an advantage over someone else.

For both men and women, commonly, it resolves itself into a question of money. Not that both men and women are not vain of great mental or physical gifts when they have them; but we think they contribute less than money to that feeling of superiority which makes so many people imagine they have achieved happiness. We suppose some will feel like disputing this, and will say that nothing, surely, can do more to make people vain than to be physically well-favored; than beauty in woman or manly good looks in man. Well, if vanity were dependent on good looks, few people would be vain after the age of thirty, unless they denied what their mirror told them. But vanity goes on to the end of life; and, on the whole, purse-pride, we think, lasts longer than any other; provided the purse holds out.

Purse-pride is not confined to the very rich; we used to think it was, until we were confronted with cases of well developed purse-pride in men and women whose purses were not remarkably large or well filled. Here we come back to where we started. It is not so much what we have, as that we find ourselves in a position to draw a contrast with others who have less, and so to feel good at having what seems to us to be an advantage. That is the lowest root of vanity. Who is the vain on a desert island alone?

Now, why is it that money is the chief fodder for the growth of vanity? We think it is because it is the commonest and the most available. The ordinary man in the street cannot hope to rival a great speaker or a great poet; his natural equipment is insufficient for that purpose; but it is quite possible for him to get into the position where he can pass in a Rolls Royce the great poet or the great speaker who rambles along in his rolls-rough. Disparity of minds is permanent; but disparity of means is largely accidental and is not necessarily permanent.

So it happens, we think, that it is on money rather than on brains that most people rely for making

their dreams come true, their dreams of being able to crow over someone else, or at least of being able to strut a bit even if the crowing be repressed. But, to be frank about it, the crowing is seldom much repressed. Men go about it more crudely than women, but men and women alike do their crowing. The conversation is so steered as to emphasize that they have more means, or know bigger people, or have travelled more, or made, in some other way, a bigger dent in a world which hardly knows they are in it.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

COMMENTING FURTHER ON MARY, Queen of Scots, and her long-assumed connection with the celebrated "Casket Letters" another paragraph or two may not be amiss.

MRS. AINSWORTH Mitchell's examination did not extend to the letters themselves for they are no longer in existence. When they were first produced before the Commission assembled at York, Mary, who indignantly pronounced them "false and feigned, forged and invented,"—in one word, forged—demanded through her representatives that they be submitted for her personal inspection. This most necessary and most reasonable demand was refused. Copies were made of the precious documents which were then returned to the Earl of Morton, one of the delegates of the usurping Lords, and by him taken back to Scotland. That was the last seen of them. It was no part of the purpose of Murray and his fellow-conspirators that the documents should ever undergo critical examination. They were therefore summarily destroyed. They had done their nefarious work; the wells of history had been poisoned, and the Queen, deposed and cruelly slandered, was left to the mercy of her enemies.

MR. MITCHELL had not, therefore, the original letters to go by. The contents of the "Casket" (if there ever was such a casket) consisted of eight letters, alleged to have been written by Mary to Bothwell, twelve sonnets inscribed to the same, a contract of marriage said to have been written by the Earl of Huntly, and signed by Mary and Bothwell, and another contract or obligation, "written by the Queen's own hand, promising to marry the said Bothwell." This "contract" was produced by Murray before the Commission on 7th December, 1568, and is specifically mentioned as one of the documents subsequently examined by the Privy Council a week later. Of the letters themselves as produced before the Commission it is even uncertain in what language they were written, French, Latin or Scots. The copies still in existence differ materially from one another.

It is this alleged marriage contract which formed the basis of Mr. Mitchell's investigation. It is an integral part of the Casket contents. Fortunately, it was not among the documents returned to Morton, and thus escaped the summary destruction which overtook the rest. The original is still in the MSS. Department of the British Museum, where it will ever remain as a link in the chain of Mary's vindication. That it is a forged document, the work of the Secretary Maitland, and not Mary's, Mr. Mitchell has conclusively shown, as exhibited in the excerpts made from his finding last week. And, taken in conjunction with the researches of Goodall, Hosack and Skelton into the historical and legal aspects of the question, no doubt remains that the hand that forged the Contract, forged also the other contents of the Casket.

"IN SHORT," as Mr. Mitchell concludes, "the fact that the only document which tradition asserts to have been one of the original papers in the Casket has been found to show hidden characteristics of the writing of Maitland is presumptive evidence of the truth of the charges brought against him (Maitland) by Camden and by Bishop Leslie."

BOY SCOUT PILGRIMS

London, Eng.—Cardinal Bourne, the Chief Scout, Sir Robert Baden-Powell, G. C. V. C., and the Italian Ambassador are to participate in a great send-off gathering of 750 British and Irish Boy Scouts who leave London for Rome to join about

10,000 other Scouts from many parts of the world in making the Holy Year Pilgrimage. The contingent leaving England is said to be the largest foreign party traveling to the Eternal City.

A feature of the pilgrimage will be a parade of the 10,000 in the Square of St. Peter's and a march through the Holy Door. The Pope is to receive the Scouts in a special audience.

MEXICO IMITATING SOVIET RUSSIA

BISHOPS AND PRIESTS ROBBED OF RESIDENCES.—PRESS MUZZLED

By Charles Phillips (Special Correspondent, N. C. W. C.)

VI.

Guadalajara, Mex., Sept. 1.—Most Americans have no idea of what it means to live in a free land. Never having lived in any other kind of a land, they have no appreciation of what true freedom is. To develop a little of that appreciation which would make them glad and thankful that they are Americans they ought to take a trip to Mexico.

In the Soviet Russia which I knew during the Bolshevik wars of 1920-1921, the people of the aristocracy and the intelligentsia—that is, the persecuted minority—lived in a state of perpetual terror. No man put his own home lights out at night; he waited for the city power to be turned off. Then he was pretty sure that there would be no visitation of the police that night. He went to bed; sometimes he slept. That was a nerve-racking life to lead. But it had this certainty about it, anyway—it was war. One had to expect such things, especially if one had the misfortune to belong to the minority.

MEXICO GOING ROAD OF RUSSIA

In the Soviet Mexico today—and Mexico is rapidly going the road of Russian sovietization—there is no war, officially. Supposedly there is peace. But for one class of people, and ironically enough it is the majority class, not the minority, there is no peace. There is only uncertainty and terror. And the terror may come down on them with its red hand not alone in the night but at any hour in broad daylight. For the Catholics of Mexico, and especially for Catholic priests, bishops, religious, teachers, or any others who live an active Catholic life, there is no such thing as liberty today. In Mexico a priest cannot vote. In Mexico a priest cannot own, acquire by gift or purchase or by inheritance any real property. In Mexico no man can join a religious order without breaking the law. All vows, priestly and monastic, are forbidden. So the story of Mexican "liberty" runs on.

BROTHERS OF ST. JOHN DESPOILED

In the city of Guadalajara, I visited the hospital of the Brothers of St. John. This is the same order which conducts the pharmacy at the Vatican; an Order famous for hundreds of years for its hospital work. In Guadalajara, through many generations, these Brothers of St. John had built up such a great institution for the care of the poor, the insane, the sick, the crippled, that in time their hospital came to be ranked as one of the largest and best equipped on the American continent. It was not this famous hospital, however, which I visited. The place which I saw was a very little place, clean and spotless but with the stamp of complete poverty on it at every turn—from the threadbare soles of the old Brothers to the patched and worn blankets on the beds. What had happened to reduce this great work of these good men to such mean proportions?

This had happened; according to the present Constitution of Mexico, a document which grandiloquently proclaims freedom and liberty to all, it has become a crime before the law to care for the sick in the name of Christ, to care for the needy in the name of religion. So today the great hospital of the Brothers of St. John at Guadalajara is confiscated by the Government, one half of it practically gone to ruin already through disuse, the other half let out to public renters for tenements and shops, one of these being a saloon where murderous "tequila" is dispensed instead of the healing medicines once given out. So today, also, the great ranch or "hacienda" which supplied the funds for the operation of the hospital as well as the food, the milk, the butter, the fruits for its patients—all the gift of a charitable woman who devoted her property to the support of the Brothers—today that hacienda too is confiscated, its profits in large part gone into the pockets of grafting politicians. All in the name of liberty—Mexican liberty!

I visited a school of domestic science conducted by an Order of Nuns, a really remarkable institution in which young native girls are taught all the arts of house-keeping from fine needlework to the management of the washtub. No better example could be found of what the Catholic Church is doing in Mexico in the way of raising the standard of living for the native through practical education. But perhaps the very suggestion of domestic service is anathema to the liberty-loving Mexican Government? At any rate, this school, once a flourishing and certainly a very

useful institution, now carries on with difficulty in a building which, in spite of the depredations of soldiers who occupied it during the last revolution, might easily be fixed up and made into a first class place—if the Sisters were not afraid to fix it. But they are afraid. They are only living on sufferance now, just barely tolerated by a Government which, up to the moment, has had other quarry too big for them to give their attention to this school, quarry such as great churches, colleges and seminaries. But they may land on it at any time.

Imagine a country, calling itself free, in which bona fide citizens devoting themselves to a work of pure public service, are afraid to lift their fingers in the direction of progress!

I could not tell you how many Catholic schools and colleges I have visited in Mexico; I have lost count. But I can tell you that, in this land of "Constitutional freedom" not one of these schools was operating freely and at ease, not one without the ban of the government on it and in imminent danger, at any moment, of being raided and closed. Most of them, in fact, have been raided, not once but several times. The life of a Catholic school in Mexico is about the most precarious and uncertain thing that I can imagine. It is here today, but no one knows where it will be tomorrow, whether in the next block or on the other side of the town. Certainly, in many instances, it is not today where it was yesterday. The process ordinarily is, the day after a school is closed, it quietly reopens in some private dwelling; and so the thing goes on until it is once again raided. And why is it raided? Because, in liberty proclaiming Mexico, it is forbidden by the National Constitution to teach religion, even in primary schools.

BISHOPS AND PRIESTS DRIVEN FROM HOMES

Nearly every priest and bishop in Mexico today is living in a rented house or apartment. Of seven Archbishops and bishops whom I personally know, not one is allowed to reside in his own home. One of them is an exile from his State; the others to a man live in rented apartments, often a few blocks from the old traditional residence of the bishop, from which, in every case, they have been evicted by force and violence. In Guadalajara, to accomplish the eviction of the Archbishop, who spies of the government had exploded dynamite in his house at four o'clock in the morning—and then cynically accused him of the crime himself! And not one of these men escape the worry of sooner or later precipitating government confiscation of the rented property which they occupy. Each bishop, of course, has a chapel in his home; but that is illegal, since, according to the present Constitution of Mexico, religious services cannot be performed except exclusively in government owned buildings and under the supervision of government officials. "Tomorrow," one Archbishop said to me, "they may seize this house, simply because I am living in it. The owner lives in the United States. If they take the house, he can never get it back. And if that happens, how can I ever pay him?"

PRESS IS MUZZLED

Such is freedom in Mexico. The press is muzzled. No paper, religious either in name, purpose or content, may publish news concerning the government, or criticize even individual members of the government, under penalty of suppression and fine. There is no such thing as public opinion. I know of one governor who had two editors of secular papers put out of the way because they dared to question his acts in print.

Fear rules the land. Fear rules the majority. Not in the night alone, but in broad daylight, may the Terror come. The bright sunlight of a semi-tropical day makes shafts of brilliance in the dust that rises across the street from my hotel—dust that lifts in white clouds across the plaza where government workmen are demolishing one of the oldest churches in the city. The same bright sunlight floods the scene an hour or two later where I stand above the famous Barranca and look out over the rolling tablelands, the green buttes and the conical ranges of the wild mountain country of Guadalajara. "There," says my guide, pointing off into that beautiful, that majestic wilderness, almost equal in grandeur to the vistas of our Grand Canyon of the Colorado, "there for two years I lived, hunted by the military, living in

caves, sleeping in ravines, sometimes going a whole day without food."

Why? What crime had this kindly eyed, gentle mannered, gray haired man committed, that he should be made a fugitive, hunted and driven like a wild beast—that his freedom should be taken from him, so that it has come to pass that only in these days when he was in exile in America did he know what liberty was? "Ah, America!" he exclaimed, "in America you are free!"

His crime was this: he is a Catholic priest, an Archbishop, giving his whole life to the service of humanity for the glory of God.

POLISH PRELATE BEATIFIED

By Mrs. Enrico Puvol (Rome Correspondent, N. C. W. C.)

Whilst the series of Beatifications and Canonizations has given so many glorious names to the calendar of the Saints of the Catholic Church, a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites has confirmed the devotions locally paid for centuries to a Pole of Blessed Memory.

It will be remembered that, besides the ordinary means of Beatification through Canonical processes and presentation to the Sacred Congregation of Rites, the Code of Canon Law allows of another path, that is, that of religious services held in a given district to some Servant of God after the Pontificate of Alexander III. and before the Constitution of Urban VIII. These twofold were set because Alexander III. reserved to the Pope exclusively the Canonization of Saints, permitting, however, honors to those of Blessed Memory to be recognized locally by Bishop's decree, and by spontaneous devotion of the faithful. Urban VIII. forbade any sort of worship which was not established by decree of the Roman Pontiff.

In virtue of these laws, the Sacred Congregation of Rites recently published a decree recognizing and confirming the honors paid to the Blessed Bogumil, Archbishop of Gnesen in Poland.

This prelate was born of an old and illustrious family in 1118. He was sent with his brother Bogumil to Gnesen, at that time the principal city of Poland, to begin their studies under the saintly and learned Otone, who was later Bishop of Bamberg. From there they went to Paris to perfect themselves in sacred and profane science. When they returned to their country Bogumil entered the Cistercian order whilst Bogumil, having inherited a very large fortune from his parents, erected a church at Dobron in honor of the Holy Trinity, endowed it and constituted it a parish church, with ecclesiastical approval. In the meantime his uncle, Janislav, Archbishop of Gnesen, summoned him, gave him the office of Chancellor, and persuaded him to enter holy orders. When he had been ordained, his uncle nominated him parish priest of Dobron, and shortly afterwards Deacon of the Cathedral of Gnesen. In order to fill both offices, Bogumil every Sunday, after reciting the Office in the Cathedral, went on foot to the parish church fifteen miles away to say Mass.

CHOSEN ARCHBISHOP

In the year 1167, when the Archbishop died, Bogumil was the unanimous choice for the place, but he would not accept the high office until he saw it was the will of God that he must do so, as manifested by the vows and insistence of his electors and the confirmation of the Pope, Alexander III. Having received episcopal consecration, he brought to his new office all the good qualities of the good pastor, and employed a great part of his rich patrimony in endowing parish schools. He was also a great benefactor of the Cistercian Order, and the foundation of the Hermitage of Coronow was due to him.

After five years as Archbishop, impelled by a desire for solitude, he begged Pope Alexander III. to accept his resignation and insisted so much that he succeeded in obtaining his freedom. When he was released from the weight of the Episcopal ministry, he first of all went to the Camaldolese Monks in Hungary to accustom himself to a life of solitude. Then he retired to a hermitage near Dobron which he did not leave for ten years save to hear confessions and preach the Gospel. In that Hermitage he died, worn out with work and an austere life, June 10, 1182.

Soon after the death of Bogumil popular piety attributed to him the title and worship of Blessed, which has never been in any way interrupted from that day to this, as is proven by many historical documents.

DIOCESAN PROCESS

The diocesan process of recognition of these honors was carried to completion in the parish of Wladislav in the years 1903 and 1904 and in 1910 the report was transmitted to Rome and referred to the Sacred Congregation of Rites. In the meantime the canonical rules followed in compiling this case had been changed, and the bishops of Poland in 1920 asked for and obtained from Pope Benedict XV. a decree that the proceedings already carried out for the Blessed Bogumil should be recognized as valid. In the last few years the other conditions necessary have been compiled