

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
 United States and Europe—\$2.00.
 Postage and Insurance, Canada, U.S.A.,
 Mexico, etc., extra.
 Editors: Rev. James J. Foley, D.D.,
 Thomas Coffey, LL.D.,
 Associate Editor—H. F. Mackintosh.
 Manager—Robert M. Burns.
 Address business letters to the Manager.
 Classified Advertising 10 cents per line.
 Remittance must accompany the order.
 Where Catholic Record Box address is required,
 send 10 cents to prepay expense of postage
 per copy.

Ordinary 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 Falcioni and
 Marretti, late Apostolic Delegates to Canada,
 the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa,
 St. Boniface, the Bishops of London,
 Hamilton, Peterborough and Oshkoshburg,
 N. Y., and the clergy throughout the
 Dominion.
 P. S. John, N. B., single copies may be
 released from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 249 Main
 St., and John J. Dwyer.
 In Montreal single copies may be purchased
 from J. Milloy, 211 St. Catherine St. West.
 In Ottawa, Ont., single copies may be pur-
 chased from J. W. O'Brien, 141 Nicholas St.
 In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be
 purchased at Murphy's Bookstore.
 The following agents are authorized to
 receive subscriptions and orders for The
 Catholic Record:
 General Agents—M. J. Haggarty, Stephen V.
 James, George J. Quigley, Resident Agents—
 Miss Bridget S. Anderson, Sydney; E. R. Costello,
 719 Dundas St. W., Toronto; J. G. O. G.
 Chamberlain, "Pawa West," Miss Geo. E.
 Smith, 288 Main St., St. John's, N. B.;
 Edward McPike, 251 Martin Ave., Elmwood,
 Winnipeg, Man.; John P. O'Farrell, 18
 Hamilton St., Quebec City; Miss Margaret E.
 Mulligan, Canora, Sask.

LONDON, SATURDAY, NOV. 11, 1922

IRISH REPUBLICANS AND MORAL STANDARDS

Since from the very nature of things man must live in society, and for ordered social living authority is essential, the Church has always taught that obedience to lawful authority is a divinely imposed duty. It is Catholic teaching, also, that, whoever may exercise it, all authority comes from God. Whether, as some theologians hold, civil authority was given by God in the first instance to the people and by them delegated to their rulers, or, as held by others, that the people having chosen their rulers, authority was then directly and immediately given them by God, matters little. All agree that the power of the ruler comes from God. To deny this is to deny positive and explicit Catholic teaching. The simplest Catholic child and the most learned Catholic theologian receive this great truth on the infallible teaching authority of the Church of Christ. It elevates and ennobles obedience into a Christian as well as a civic virtue. Yet the very conception of authority, as Mr. Belloc points out, during periods of wealth and peace was so blurred and almost lost that men grew to make a contrast between authority and liberty. "But," he adds, "it is the experience of every man that authority is the condition of freedom. You cannot have an association of human beings—you cannot have the material life of man carried on—without authority."

It is a matter of general observation and comment that there is a wave of anarchy, social and moral, sweeping over the world. The figure suggests that condition is but temporary, for a wave subsides and though the damage may be great, things become normal again. It may be more probable that the alarming condition is but a stage in a progressive deterioration due to the growing disregard for all authority—parental, social, moral and religious.

It is not surprising, indeed it is inevitable, that Catholics should be more or less affected—or infected—by the spirit of the age in which they live. But it is to many very painful to find Ireland, imbued for generations with Catholic teaching and loyal to the Church through dark ages of oppression and persecution, now at the dawn of national freedom, apparently deeply infected with the spirit of anarchy.

The Pastoral Letter of the entire Irish Episcopate, which we reprint elsewhere in this issue of the Record, bears sorrowful testimony to the fact that there are Catholic Irishmen who repudiate Catholic teaching, defy ecclesiastical authority, subvert the moral law and still claim to be good Catholics. Again and again have readers asked us if the newspaper accounts of Irish conditions are true; if indeed these rebels or "irregulars" are Catholics. The Bishops' Pastoral Letter is the answer.

Such Catholics concede that obedience to civil authority is a duty; but they claim that the lawful civil authority in Ireland is the Republic to which they have sworn allegiance; that this is a question of fact and not a moral principle; and furthermore, that in political questions the Bishops have no authority and therefore can, in con-

science, claim no obedience to their political decisions.

In dealing with the situation the Bishops of Ireland do not mince their words:

"They carry on what they call a war, but which, in the absence of any legitimate authority to justify it, is morally only a system of murder and assassination of the National forces. No nation can live where the civil sense of obedience to authority and law is not firmly and religiously maintained."

Vigorously, unequivocally, and with the full consciousness of the responsibility of their sacred office, the Bishops deal with the moral aspects of the political situation:

"No one is justified in rebelling against the legitimate Government, whatever it is, set up by the nation, and acting within its rights. The opposite doctrine is false; contrary to Christian morals, and opposed to the constant teaching of the Church. 'Let every soul,' says St. Paul, 'be subject to the higher powers'—that is, to the legitimate authority of the State."

"From St. Paul downwards the Church has inculcated obedience to authority as a divine duty, as well as a social necessity, and has reprobated unauthorised rebellion as sinful in itself, and destructive of social stability, as it manifestly is, for, if one section of the community has that right, so have other sections the same right, until we end in general anarchy. No Republican can evade this teaching by asserting that the legitimate authority in Ireland is not the present Dail or Provisional Government. There is no other, and cannot be, outside the body of the people. A Republic without popular recognition behind it is a contradiction in terms."

"Such being Divine Law, the guerilla warfare now being carried on by the Irregulars is without moral sanction, and, therefore, the killing of National soldiers in the course of it is murder before God. The seizing of public and private property is robbery. The breaking of roads, bridges, and railways is criminal destruction; the invasion of homes and molestation of citizens a grievous crime."

With regard to the oath of allegiance to the Republic the Bishops are no less clear and explicit:

"We know that some of them are troubled and held back by the oath they took. A lawful oath is, indeed, a sacred bond between God and man; but no oath can bind any man to carry on a warfare against his own country in circumstances forbidden by the law of God. It would be an offence to God, and to the very nature of an oath to say so."

In the denial of the right of the Bishops to interfere in the political situation the Irish rebels resort to a specious sophistry. In matters purely political the Bishops claim no right to interfere authoritatively; though no one can deny their right to full and free citizenship. But when, as is now manifestly the case in Ireland, public and private morality is involved in political methods it is not only their right but their imperative official duty to proclaim the moral law as binding the conscience of all Catholics. To deny this is to deny the fundamental principle of Catholicity. The standards of morality are and must be objective and unchangeable. For Catholics it is the living voice of the Church that is final in such matters. Unconsciously it may be, but none the less certainly, the claim of the Republicans to decide what is and what is not morally allowable is the adoption of the Protestant principle of private judgment, and the denial of the divinely constituted teaching authority of the Church in matters of faith and morals. This is plain heresy and apostasy.

And as Hilaire Belloc recently said:

"It is profoundly true, as every man who has had experience of life knows, that the philosophy of the Catholic Church covers the whole of life and coordinates it. A proof of that lies in this, that any individual who, having accepted the Catholic philosophy as a whole, was led by some accident, some strain, some temptation to rebel against a part of it has always felt that he was out of tune and was compelled by the necessity of the position either to return or give up the whole. It never failed."

The position taken by the rebellious Irish Republicans is one that

is utterly impossible for Catholics to maintain.

Will the unfortunate men who now defy their divinely appointed spiritual guides return or openly apostatize? Whatever may happen in the case of individuals there is reason for the confident hope that Ireland will be saved through her deeply religious spirit. During the recent meeting of the Irish Catholic Truth Society there was scathing condemnation of the disorders; but the brighter and more hopeful side was indicated by Professor Michael Hayes, speaker of Dail Eireann:

"We in Ireland," he said, "are passing through a crisis not unique in history, a crisis which other nations have successfully survived, and which this nation, too, shall survive. In this country we have elements of strength and unity which will make our future. The Irish people are entering on an era of responsibility, and the responsibility will do them good."

"The lecturer asked who thinks of God in the modern world."

"I answer that the Irish people think of God. It may not appear so sometimes from incidents, or a series of incidents, but fundamentally, and speaking of the whole Irish people, I maintain that it is true that the Irish people think of God."

And this great and consoling fact to which this informed Irishman bears deliberate and considered testimony is the sure foundation of our confident hope for the future of Ireland.

THE LESSON OF ONE SUICIDE

Raymond Bradley, a sixteen-year-old high school pupil of Bridgeport, Conn., committed suicide a few days ago. If this misguided boy had not left a note giving the reasons that had impelled him to end his life, his act would probably have been chronicled in two lines of type at bottom of a column. For, terrible to relate, the suicide of school children in the larger cities of the United States is no longer "news" that demands much space for the telling. In New York, not long ago, five girls of from fourteen to seventeen, attending schools widely separated, killed themselves within a period of four days.

The note left by young Bradley is a sad but striking commentary on the widely prevalent notion that book-learning alone makes for morality and on the thoughtlessly accepted dictum that the Biblical story of creation should be ridiculed to the young.

"I loved my love, but she didn't love me," wrote this poor youth, product of the age of cheap moving pictures and the erotic novel. Then he adds as other reasons for a despondency that had rendered him desperate, the constant brooding over the questions "Who made the world?" and "Is there a God?" considered in connection with the theory of Darwin concerning the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest.

Of the 484 girls of the average age of sixteen and the 228 boys of an average age of fifteen, who committed suicide in 1920 (the last year for which authentic figures are obtainable) how many, in their immaturity, sought a way out because they could not answer confidently the first question in the Catechism? And if youth, with life only opening, is driven to self destruction, what forces of discontent and consequent danger, smoulder among thousands of the middle-aged who have accepted the dogmas of negation?

Today there is clamor for the closing of all schools in which religion is taught. How many of those who join in this clamor stop to consider that the teaching of religion, the recognition of the authority of God, is a bulwark against Bolshevism, a national defense against the despondent discontent that urges youths not only to self-murder but to the murder of their fellows and the destruction of society?

Those who deliberately raise the clamor in which others unthinkingly join, are Bolshevists. They but follow the example of their Russian preceptors who recently wrote into a new criminal code prohibition of the teaching of religion in all schools, private as well as national. There is a mistaken notion that the Catholic Church alone will be the sufferer if the parochial and private schools are forced to close. The fact is that the Church will not

suffer nearly so much as the State. There never was a time when the Church was unable to find means of instructing her children in the fundamentals of the Faith; the time will never come when she will fail in this duty.

But never was there a time when the State needed the stabilizing influence of religious ideals and acceptance of authority as it needs it today.

It is a ghastly joke to couple the word "Americanism" to a campaign for the closing of schools which stand for everything that is sane and stable in the American life.—N. C. W. C.

Since this article was written this despatch appeared in the newspapers:

Cadillac, Mich., Nov. 1.—A tragedy of youthful love and jealousy is told in violent deaths of two Mesick High School pupils and serious wounding of another as the culmination of a shattered romance and the thwarted advance of a boy whose attentions to a schoolmate were repulsed.

Loretta Redman, sixteen, is dead. Nettie White, sixteen, is in Mercy Hospital here, suffering from a shotgun wound. Ray Judd, seventeen, who did the shooting in a fit of jealous rage, is dead by his own hand.

One conclusion we think is obvious. If religion in education is necessary—and all Christians are coming to share the Catholic conviction on this question—it can not stop with the elementary school. Quite evidently it should extend through the period of secondary education. This no less, but emphatically more, when our children attend secular High schools than when they are fortunate enough to be able to attend Catholic secondary schools.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

"There is a determined effort on foot today to put religious education in the Public schools."

So the Rev. Dr. Webb at the recent Baptist Convention in Toronto. And he added: "Such a procedure is utterly unbaptistic." One was prepared then to hear a defence of the old order which reserved the school for secular education and relegated religious instruction to the home and the Sunday school. But neither Dr. Webb nor his brother delegates any longer believe in thus side-tracking religion. So that Dr. Webb's objection is to the assumption by the State of the right to impose as an integral part of the curriculum some attenuated form of religious or ethical instruction.

That this is the "determined effort" to which Dr. Webb objects is borne out by this sentence in the summary report of the proceedings: "To the imparting of religious instruction in the Public schools the Baptists as a whole are uncompromisingly opposed."

Yet the Convention adopted the report on the subject which embodied these three principles. They are worthy of serious perusal:

These were: "It is the inalienable right of childhood and a necessity to its complete development, to have thorough and effective training in religion and morals."

"No person is adequately educated for the responsibilities of life as a Canadian citizen whose religious and moral possibilities have been left undeveloped."

"The home and the Church are primarily responsible for religious instruction of the child, and the parent has a right to ask that time shall be set apart for the religious instruction of his child during the hours commonly devoted to educational purposes."

"It is the judgment of your board, therefore, while believing that full advantage should be taken of such opportunities as may be offered by the Departments of Education for religious exercises and moral instruction and citizenship training, etc., that it is primarily the responsibility of the Church to provide for the religious education of the young, whether on Sundays or week-days, and that our efforts in regard to religious instruction in connection with the Public schools should be directed toward the establishment of a system of instruction under Church auspices rather than as an integral part of the curriculum of the school."

It is a matter of congratulation that the Catholic position with regard to religion in education is coming into such general acceptance. Yet, it must be recognized that no compromise in religious education nor any substitution thereof for ethical instruction can ever be acceptable to Catholics. Here we are glad to find ourselves in general agreement with the Baptists.

THE AUSTRIAN RELIEF FUND

We gladly give editorial prominence to this letter from His Lordship, Bishop Fallon. We know that it will stimulate the generosity of our readers, every one of whom should show their gratitude to God for manifold blessings by contributing according to their means to relieve or prevent appalling sufferings amongst a stricken people.

Bishop's House, 90 Central Ave.
 London, Ontario, Canada.

Nov. 1, 1922.

Editor CATHOLIC RECORD:

Would you be good enough to acknowledge through the columns of your paper the receipt of the following subscriptions to the Austrian Relief Fund?

Right Rev. M. F. Fallon, Bishop of London, Ontario	\$1,000.00
Rev. M. J. Fallon, St. John's, N. B.	250.00
Francis O. Gaskier, Detroit	200.00
Students of "The Pines" Chatham	100.00
Pupils of the Sacred Heart School of Maske, London	100.00
St. Mary's Academy, Windsor	60.00
Children of London Separate School	70.00
The Ursuline Community, Chatham	50.00
St. Andrew's College, London	25.00
Rev. C. Collins, C. S. B., Sandwich	20.00
Academy, Toronto	20.00
Miss Mary McGlow, Toronto	20.00
Miss Elizabeth Neville, Ottawa	15.00
St. Malon, New Ireland, Conn.	10.00
Rev. J. R. Quigley, Tillamook, Ore.	10.00
St. Mary's Convent, Philadelphia	10.00
Miss Margaret Goughan, Philadelphia	10.00
David Battle, Thorold	5.00
Rev. E. Hyatt, Field, Ont.	5.00
Joe Tobin, Carleton Place	5.00
R. G. Gurney, Toronto	5.00
Flene, Philadelphia	5.00
J. B. Perkins, Belleville	2.00
St. Mary's Convent, Toronto	2.00
R. H. Hamilton	1.00
Miss Mary FitzHenry, London	1.00
Miss R. McKoon, Ottawa	1.00
	\$1,915.48

I have received a letter dated Oct. 5th, 1922, from the President of the Catholic Women's League of Upper Austria. May I submit to your readers a few sections therefrom?

"Our Chancellor, Mgr. Siepel, has had promises of support from the League of Nations. It is a ray of hope though the results can come only at a much later period. We shall certainly have one or two very bad years to meet, and I especially dread the winter that is rapidly approaching. It must bring the climax of misery and poverty because the people are absolutely unable to pay the prices asked for the most indispensable necessities of life. We see very painful symptoms already; letters are pouring in from all parts of the country beseeching us to help and it is heart-rending to feel and see how little we can do, compared to the extent of trouble and misfortune."

Because the need is so urgent this Fund will close on Dec. 4th, and all proceeds will immediately be sent to Austria. I hope that those who read this letter will make an effort to aid in so worthy a cause. I shall not make further demands on your space until I ask you to publish the final results.

I remain yours faithfully in Christ.
 M. F. FALLON,
 Bishop of London

A MOHAMMEDAN EMPIRE

By THE OBSERVER

One of the most eminent journalists in England wrote on September 30th, on the Near East question, as follows:

"We have to think of the Turk, not merely as a Turk, but as a Mohammedan. He is a fighting member of a faith which once came out of Arabia and swept the world, knocked at the gates of Vienna, trampled over Spain, and seemed destined to conquer Europe. More than once it was touch and go whether the Cross or the Crescent waved over Europe. The cross prevailed and for centuries Mohammedanism has lain inert in the desert. But the War, with its revelation of the hates and devilities of the Christians has fanned it into new life. It is awake. It is full of dreams and ambitions. And the British Empire is a Mohammedan Empire. India alone contains twice as many Mohammedans as there are Christians in these Islands, and in the overseas dominions. This enormous fact lies at the heart of what is happening. If we get wrong with the Mohammedan world the British Empire is doomed."

We are so accustomed to being told in Ontario that the British Empire is a Protestant Empire that this is a change at least; but we can hardly suppose that the idea of our being a Mohammedan Empire will be very pleasing to some people of Ontario. But, from a political point of view, and the political point of view is in favor amongst Protestants, there is a good deal of truth in the Englishman's contention. At all events, all English statesmen have shaped their policies for the past sixty or seventy years on the assumption that that is the correct view to take of our imperial position. Well, we suppose that it is not wholly agreeable to have to face the situation as it has had to be faced these last few weeks; but no doubt many

will see that it might be worse; and that if we cannot be a Protestant Empire, and are compelled to be a Mohammedan Empire, we may at least be duly grateful that we are not yet a Catholic Empire; and that if anyone outside the four hundred folds and four hundred thousand shepherds, of Protestantism, must be tolerated as dictator of our policies, it is to be a Sultan or a Moustapha Kemal, and not a Pope.

But are we a Mohammedan Empire? There are in the Empire about 80,000,000 Mohammedans, of whom about sixty-six millions are in India. The population of India is about 325,000,000; in which the largest elements are, Hindus 225,000,000; Mohammedans 66,000,000; and Buddhists 12,000,000. Some time in the future, when there is a question to be decided about our relations with Japan, we shall be told that we are a Buddhist Empire. But to go back to the Mohammedan question. The Mohammedans of India are not a very great menace in themselves; they are not numerous enough, as compared with the other and larger elements in that vast country. It is true they are more warlike than the Hindus; but on the other hand there are some of the smaller bodies in that country that are not to be controlled by them, and are very well disposed towards the English, such as the Sikhs, whose few millions are a greater security for English rule in India than many millions of a less vigorous and less warlike race would be. That is the situation in India.

There is no doubt that England has in the past felt some anxiety about the possible effect on the Mohammedans of India of the attitude of Turkey. But it is well known that much of the fanaticism has been drained out of Mohammedanism in the last thirty years, and it is doubtful whether today there would be any great enthusiasm in India for a "Holy War." That is not to say that they would not welcome a chance to get more independence; but that is another matter. The reverence with which the office of Sultan was regarded in the past by reason of the Sultan's being the head of the Mohammedan religion, has diminished greatly because of the political changes and constitutional changes in Turkey, and also because of the growth of unbelief and the relaxation of the old practices of devotion in Turkey.

England's anxiety today is on another ground altogether; and the old notion of a Mohammedan rising in India is used only to alarm the public. But India is still, of course, a matter of grave anxiety at London. Our Indian possessions were stolen and robbed from others; and the descendants of those others are fully aware of it. It is not their religion that is worrying them today, but their chances for getting a larger say in the business of their own country. England wants to go on governing India in the interests of England; and India wants more freedom to govern herself in her own interests; that is the question today; that and the natural uneasiness of one who has a defective title by reason of the fact that the property was got wrongfully in the first place.

If England wants to hold India, she must give recognition to the new generation of young and educated Indians who are growing up in that country. Long ago, when England wanted to justify her outrageous treatment of Ireland, she had the custom of raising the cry that there was a plot in favor of the Stuarts, about whom no one in Ireland cared anything. Similarly today, there is a great outcry about the danger of the Mohammedans of India taking over the country, which is nonsense. England's danger in India lies in her Indian policy.

AT THE CONFESSOR'S SHRINE

St. Edward's Day, the one day of the year when Catholics and Anglicans unite in devotion at the shrine of the last of the Saxon Kings of England, was observed this year with the usual manifestations of piety.

All day long the raised step around the shrine in Westminster Abbey was crowded with worshippers while others waited to take their places. Catholics and Anglicans, their rosaries in their hands, mingled together to seek the intercession of the Confessor, as he is familiarly known to the English. This ancient shrine has been undisturbed by the events of the centuries since the Saint's reign came to

an end although most of the other shrines of Catholic England have been desecrated or destroyed.

BOY LIFE

"Talks to Boys" By Rev. J. P. Conroy, S. J.
 Published by permission of the Queen's Work Press

ON ADDING MACHINES

And seek not you what you shall eat or what you shall drink. But seek ye first the kingdom of God and His Justice. (St. Luke.)

Seeking is an impulse in man's nature, and it shows itself from our earliest years. The little girl just past the crawling age seeks a sawdust doll, and clings to it tenaciously until it is blackened and battered beyond recognition. Then she seeks to find out how dolly lives so long without food, and she drags the sawdust out of it.

The little boy seeks a toy engine, and after he has it and speeds it up and down its little track until he is weary, he seeks to find out what it is on the inside that makes the engine go. In a jiffy it is all apart.

And as youth comes in, this tendency, from an indeliberate, becomes a deliberate tendency. The boy, the young man, seeks to see things, to know things. He wishes to find out what the world is doing. He mingles with the crowd, craves new experiences, runs after pleasures, desires to travel from place to place. And as he tires of one thing he seeks another.

With maturer years the seeking goes on. And now it is for power, or influence, or dignity. He has fewer objects of pursuit now and is more steady and less noisy in their quest, but the intensity of interest in the chase remains becomes even more intense as it settles along deeper grooves.

Then age enters, and with it the search for repose, for undisturbed tranquility; and the old man seeks to avoid the whirl just as ardently as the young man seeks to plunge into it.

From childhood to old age the seeking goes on, either for good or for evil. Always it will be one or the other, but the seeking impulse runs through everything. And in one way or another it is always for self, a continuous reaching out for something for ourselves.

"Is this right?" you will ask. "Does it not seem selfish to live a life such as this?"

Yes, it is selfish. But that does not mean that seeking is essentially wrong. For it is a part of God's plan that we should be selfish. He has judged us worth the great price of His blood, and it is His desire that we appreciate our worth. Self-esteem, then, and self-seeking is a duty of our lives. But this must be followed out according to God's plan, and not according to our plan. Christ tells us that man is and must be a seeker, and while recognizing the two ways in which he seeks tells us which of the two we must choose.

"Seek not you what you shall eat or what you shall drink." That is to say: Not a sensual life, nor a society career, nor fine clothes, nor money, nor notoriety, is the proper object of our pursuit. But "seek ye first the kingdom of God and His justice." God's service, God's law, and as much as we need of the other things will drift in of themselves. That is the difference in the seeking. One way is to seek for ourselves and forget God. The other way is to seek God and trust Him to care for us after that. One of these ways is good, the other evil.

And this is the touchstone of self-knowledge. Do you wish to know what kind of boy you are and how you stand with God? Then ask yourself what you are seeking. Toward which of these two lives are you leaning? What is the whole drift of your actions? In which direction are you driving your soul?

To give ourselves the right answer to this question is not as easy as it seems. To find out what we actually are requires examination.

"But I do examine," you interrupt. "I examine my conscience as to my actions every month, every week, at confession. Besides, at my night prayers I count up my mistakes—when I don't forget. That is taking pretty good care to find myself out, don't you think so?"

Yes, it is what we might call good care, provided we count up all our mistakes. But did you ever notice while counting that we are dealing with the same mistakes week after week and month after month? They don't seem to change at all, those mistakes, some of them serious. Isn't that a sign that somewhere inside us there is a big