

## The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.  
United States and Europe—\$2.00.  
Publisher & 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.  
Residence 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 5 cents.  
The Editor cannot be held responsible for unsolicited manuscript. 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 Shevill, 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, JULY 12, 1924

### NOT A RELIGIOUS ISSUE

The spirited debate in the Democratic Convention in New York over the plank in the platform denouncing the Klan revealed the lack of moral courage—so often deplored in politicians—but it also revealed the fact that all politicians are not infected with this disease. Many leading Protestant Democrats were courageous and outspoken. Senator Underwood of Alabama, a candidate for the Presidency, has all along insisted that the Democratic party repudiate the Klan, its principles and its methods, by name. This fact the delegate who put Senator Underwood in nomination proclaimed outspokenly. That ended the pussy-footing. The question had to be fought out to a finish. The artificers of the Platform, or a majority of them, were willing to denounce the Klan, its principles, its methods, its aims and its objects but were not willing to name the Ku Klux Klan! The event gave them a majority first announced as one, later increased to four, in a delegation with 1,098 votes.

Amongst the protagonists of the Klan—for such those who opposed the naming of this intolerant organization are considered—was William Jennings Bryan who took the ground that to name the Klan was to inject a religious issue into politics.

Editorially the New York Times thus answered Mr. Bryan whom, with good reason, it considers the evil genius of the Democratic Party:

"The hostile reception which Mr. Bryan's speech on the Klan got from large numbers of the delegates and the audience on Saturday night was not due solely to disagreement with the position which he was taking. There was in it a feeling that he was grossly inconsistent. He deplored introducing a religious question into politics. But what has he been doing himself for the past two or three years except just that thing? He has gone before Legislatures to advocate the enactment of laws forbidding the employment in the Public schools of teachers who did not agree with him about the Bible and about evolution—that is, with his religious views. But as soon as he was faced with the danger that a question having religious implications might split his party wide open, he protested with all his power that such matters should never be brought into politics.

"Strictly speaking, the issue involved is not religious. It is political. It goes to the very roots of American political ideas. Religion enters into it only because a fanatic and domineering band, secret and oath-bound, undertakes to proscriber one form of religion in the United States. It is the Klan that seeks to force a religious issue. But this has been done in a way inevitably to thrust it into our public life and make it predominantly political. The Klan fights with political weapons and must be fought with them. What the men and women who oppose the Klan are determined to do is, not to force a religious issue into politics, but to take it out, once and for all. They are simply maintaining a fundamental American principle, written into the Constitution, enshrined in our best traditions, become one of the instincts of American democracy, preached by its founders and practiced by its exponents, a precious heritage from generation to generation. No one who lays a rude hand upon it need hope to escape, when he is beaten off, by pretending that he is attacked on religious grounds. The attack is because he shows himself an enemy of American institutions."

This lucid, logical and forceful exposition of the Klan issue in politics will interest our readers.

It is in the realms of prophecy to say what will be the effect of the failure of the Convention to recognize the real question in issue. But many will hazard a guess that the pussy-footers have effectively defeated their avowed object—that is preventing a split in the party.

### "THE TRUTH ABOUT SPAIN"

In the English papers for some time past Spain has been a live topic. Mr. Arnold Bennett has been writing from Spain to Lord Beaverbrook's paper, The Express, weekly letters which the Catholic Times describes as "tirades against Spain, the Spanish people and the religion they profess."

But Mr. Bennett, who gives no evidence of even knowing the Spanish language, did not have it all his own way. For instance, the following letter from Mrs. Austen Chamberlain appeared in the Daily Express, and the editor had the decency to give it prominence on the first page.

Sir,—As one who lived for five years in Gibraltar and has travelled much in Spain, and counts many Spaniards amongst her friends, I should like to protest against the articles entitled "The Truth About Spain," by Mr. Arnold Bennett, published in your paper.

What object can be served by this superficial criticism, unsupported by facts or knowledge, save such as could be acquired in the few weeks Mr. Bennett gave to this great subject.

If Mr. Bennett had spent as many years as he has weeks in Spain I venture to think that he would write with more courtesy and a better understanding of this great and friendly nation.

Yours faithfully,

IVY CHAMBERLAIN.

2, Morpeth Mansions, S. W. 1.

And from Manchester is broadcast Mr. W. F. Bletcher's "Spanish Talks" which, to those at least who listen in, are an antidote to Mr. Bennett's weekly letter. The reason of the contrast is that Mr. Bletcher spent the last thirty-five years in Spain.

Mr. Bennett applies the "literary test" to Spain and, of course, finds "education" in a parlous state.

Mr. Bletcher says:

"The poorer classes may be, relatively speaking, what we call 'ignorant'; but morally and spiritually they are more than our equals. They are the best friends in the world, affectionate, sincere, and unselfish to a degree."

And here we may very pertinently quote from a letter addressed to college men in America a little less than a year ago by Roger W. Babson, the famous statistician.

"Education," he said, "is a mere tool which can be used either for good or for evil. Two men graduate from the same law school—one uses his education to uphold the law and the other uses his education to help men evade the law. Two chemists graduate from the same technical school in the same class—one uses his training to make foods pure, the other uses the same training to adulterate foods. If statistics have taught us one thing in the last twenty years it is that the spiritual factor is the greatest factor in the growth of communities and nations."

This aspect of education might well escape Mr. Arnold Bennett's consideration as he appears to avail himself only of "liberal" sources of information. But he can hardly be excused from gross bias when, in dealing with education, he omits any reference to the national Education Congress held recently at Madrid. This was composed of delegates from all parts of Spain, mostly men and women actively engaged in educational work of every grade from Universities to the elementary schools—professors, school teachers, members of religious teaching Orders, and a considerable number of provincial and municipal councils who have interested themselves in the development of schools. In his inaugural address the Cardinal Primate dwelt on the opportuneness of the time at which the Congress met, for the Government had announced as a main point of its policy the multiplication of schools throughout the kingdom, the improvement of the position of the teachers, and measures for increasing the efficiency of existing schools. He considered it highly useful that those practically engaged in education should at this time formulate their views as to the

future of the schools. And His Eminence closed with this sane—if not "liberal"—view of education: "The hopes of the future of Spain depend on the religious teaching in the schools supplemented by the influence of a Christian home life."

We may fittingly close with an extract from an article written for the Universe by Mr. D. B. Wyndham Lewis, until recently one of the contributing editors of The Express.

"I went to Mass early next morning in St. Jean-Pied-de-Port, in the old church within the citadel. How is it possible to resume in a few words the memory of that Mass?"

"The Easter sun was already flooding the little square, the trees were green, the air was like wine. Ten minutes before Mass the nave was full of women, blackclad, with their black veils; and five minutes before a tremendous clatter up the wooden stairs into the gallery, running half round the church, announced the arrival of the men.

"The Mass—the second of the day; there was another before the High Mass—was said by a tall, old priest, deliberate and sonorous, with a magnificent head, as so many old men among the Basques have; and for music there were Basque Easter hymns, joyous, jaunty, almost sprightly, led by a young priest who mounted into the men's gallery; his ringing baritone dominated even that lusty singing.

"I had heard sad droning Basque hymns in Holy week; their Easter hymns go to quick, swinging tunes, and they sing them in their incomprehensible tongue with a great roar of devotion. The air of the church was tremulous with joy; the candle-flames and the steady voice of the priest at the altar seemed to quiver with it; and at the *Domine, non sum dignus* the shrill, little bell summoned almost the entire congregation to the Feast. In such a church, whose walls are drenched in continuous prayer since the time of Charlemagne, the familiar words of the Mass assumed a new beauty and a sweeter homeliness. Here the Age of Faith had never ended. The devotion of the centuries filled the place like incense.

"I went out into the sunlight, full of unforgettable things, and went back presently to breakfast, and found an Englishman there full of windy and damnable nonsense about Shelley and his religion.

"Who (he said) could be nearer to God than that bright, beautiful creature?"

"And then a very old peasant, wrinkled, gnarled and patched, hobbled past.

"I said, seizing this palpable gift from heaven, 'Why, that old peasant; and at least a thousand times nearer than Shelley.'"

So to the eyes of understanding sympathy things Spanish present a beauty to which ingrained prejudice—whether honest or not—is blind.

It was a page of seething indignation against "reactionary" Spain culled by the Literary Digest that impelled us to summarize this English discussion of things Spanish. The particular occasion for the familiar outburst was the expulsion of Professor Unamuno. We shall deal with this next week.

### ARE THEY INSANE?

When Representative William D. Upshaw of Georgia accepted an invitation of the New York delegation in Congress to attend the funeral of Charles F. Murphy in St. Patrick's Cathedral, he forgot to ask permission from Dr. Gilbert O. Nations. That champion of individual liberty demanded an explanation. Mr. Upshaw replied that as a Baptist he was strong for individualism himself and that while he had accepted the invitation as an act of courtesy, he had come from the funeral with a new conviction that every soul beneath the flag should be allowed to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

Whereupon, The American Standard, under the heading "Congressman Upshaw and the Jesuits," proceeded to tell Mr. Upshaw a few things about the dangers of embracing adders and to supply him with extracts from an Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII. which must have surprised the Congressman as much as they will astound others.

"If," says the Rev. Dr. C. Lewis Fowler, the editor of The Standard, "you weep with the Roman Catholic enemies of America because one of their heads has been struck off by the two-edged sword of Christ,

then you must be classified with the Roman Catholic enemies of America. And are they enemies of America? Read the answer in their own words as uttered by Pope Leo XIII., which I quote literally."

Here is a part of the "literal" quotation:

"Moreover, we proclaim the people of the United States to have forfeited all right to rule said republic . . . and on or about the Feast of Ignatius Loyola, in the year of Our Lord 1893, it will be the duty of the faithful to exterminate all heretics found within the jurisdiction of the United States of America."

Now what will doubtless puzzle Representative Upshaw about this remarkable document, which is declared by the learned doctor of divinity to have been published on Christmas Day, 1891, as a contribution to peace on earth, is why it was not obeyed. The feast of Ignatius Loyola—July 31—came and went in 1893, yet of the many millions of those whom Dr. Fowler likes to talk of as "the slaves of Rome," not one remembered his obligation to the extent even of braining a Protestant baseball umpire with a pop bottle. Instead, they busied themselves with preparations for the celebration three months later of the silver jubilee of the episcopacy of Cardinal Gibbons, who, hailed on that occasion by Archbishop Ireland as one "who joins hands with the laborer and the capitalist, with the white man and the black man, with the Catholic, the Protestant and the Jew . . . the most loyal co-laborer of the Pope of Rome, an American of Americans," received the blessing of this very same Leo who, according to Dr. Fowler, had incited him to slay rather than join hands with Protestants and the congratulations of the President of the United States who seemed blissfully ignorant of the fact that he had escaped slaughter only because "the slaves of Rome" had impudently disobeyed orders.

Are the Dr. Fowlers who manufacture encyclicals and seek to foist them on educated fellow citizens insane? One may marvel at their malevolence, but when malignancy resorts to forgery it might be expected that at least a forgery would be submitted which would prove the allegation sought to be advanced. Only the mentally unbalanced would produce a document which in itself would disprove their main contention.—N. C. W. C.

No they are not insane. They know well the extent of the superstitious ignorance which they unscrupulously foster and to which they profitably pander.

### THE GREED FOR POWER

BY THE OBSERVER

In reading the history of nations, one is struck with the constant inroads, the continual aggressions, attempted, sometimes with success, sometimes without it, of the civil power, the power of the State, on and against the authority of the Church and the family. With all its show of power, the State has never been able to follow its own evil ways except by paralyzing or crippling, temporarily, the power of the Church and the family. The aggression is not accidental; it was foreseen and predicted by Christ when He warned His disciples that men would hate them for His sake. The men who were to hate the Church for His sake were to be those men who lived for the world and did not want to be bothered by a power which would call them to the bar of moral theology for their acts. From the beginning of the history of Christianity, such men have fought against the authority of the Church.

Now, it is natural to find such men in the forefront of the rulers of the world. For, who should take the lead of men who are deeply concerned for worldly things in that pursuit of worldly things which finds its most complete expression in ambition to rule and control others? Is not that the very place where the worldling will find himself pursuing the things that are dear to his heart—power, pride, money, fame? Yes, the worldlings will not neglect the seats of the mighty; they never have done so; they are not doing so today.

Power is a thing of which worldlings can never get enough; the desire for it is a craving that grows with what it feeds on. From the first days of the Church, rulers of countries have never been content

to confine themselves to the field in which they are legitimately the rulers; they have never been able to keep their fingers out of the affairs of religion, and they have meddled not to help but to hinder. Country after country and people after people were lost to the Church because the ruler of the State was not satisfied with the power that rightfully belonged to him, but sought to be the director of the field of religion besides.

As soon as the Church was released from the Catacombs, those vast excavations under the City of Rome and the vicinity in which she had been confined for about three hundred years, she had to contend with the Roman emperors who imagined that because they ruled the State they were entitled to rule the Church. And from that day to this, the Church has never been free for one year from similar trouble with some ruler or set of rulers. In more modern times the plan of interference is somewhat different, but the main idea is exactly the same.

A few hundred years ago, a ruler who found the Church in his way would have put a score or so of her bishops and priests to death; nowadays, in the absence of such arbitrary power, a parliament or a council merely takes their property away from them, as in France or in the Balkans, exiles them as in Mexico, and to some extent in France, or imprisons them as in Portugal; or, if the country be a bit more democratic, as in the United States, the constitution is amended so as to close all Catholic schools as in Oregon. In Canada, the interference of the State in the affairs of the Church takes the course of an extreme insistence on certain theories as to the control of schools and of an unreasonable opposition to and dislike of what is called "clerical interference" in public affairs, and is passive and indirect rather than active and direct; but it is there just the same. On several historic occasions in this country the claim has been made quite boldly by statesmen that the Church has no right to offer guidance to her children in any matter that affects politics, no matter how grave a question of moral right or wrong may be involved.

We have said that the main idea has been, in all State encroachments, of the past as well as of more recent times always the same, namely, that the people of a country are to be ruled by laymen in as many matters as those laymen can possibly bring under their control. That is just the same idea that has lain at the root of all the troubles between the Church and the nations in all ages; it is part of the endless fight between the flesh and the spirit, the world and heaven, the devil and Jesus Christ.

But why does the State feel so ambitious to control the family, marriage, the child, the school, and early education? Simply because the greatest power exercised in this world is not exercised in cabinets or in parliaments or about the steps of a throne. The greatest power in this world is the power of religion; and this is true in spite of all the difficulties that are put in its way; and that authority is exercised most effectively in the family circle and in the school in which the training is given to the child which will move and control him all his life, often as he may forget it and be untrue to it.

The endless task set by the devil to those who act as his agents on earth whether consciously or unconsciously, is to suppress God. In this task there are degrees. The Russian Socialist, jailing priests for teaching religion to boys and girls before they reach the age of eighteen years, and the Canadian bigot, splitting hairs to prove that the Catholics ought to be deprived of reasonable aid to train their own children in their own religion, are both engaged in the suppression of God; the Russian being more courageous and more logical about it, which is the only essential difference between them.

There are forty million people in the United States today who never enter a church of any sort; and that situation was brought about by theorists who refused to allow the State to aid in the teaching of religion, as long as all the people of the country were not agreed on one religion. We have copied that situation in Canada. The State thus interferes negatively with the Church; insisting on the suppression of God in all the public schools because all men do not agree in their religious views.

Now we see a movement in a dozen American States to abolish Catholic schools. Why? Because the State, that is, the people of the State by a majority, want to take the whole matter of common school education into the hands of the State, and out of the hands of the Church. Power: The State wants power, and more and more and always more power; and the Church must get out of the way. The non-Catholic churches have usually acquiesced in the main; and are beginning now slowly to realize that they have made a gigantic mistake.

### NOTES AND COMMENTS

To those who keep in touch with the development of ideas among the sects and to the decay in belief which invariably accompanies it there is nothing more remarkable than the re-casting of judgment in regard to the Reformation of the sixteenth century and the character of the so-called Reformers. Not that the old infatuation has ceased to hold sway with the great mass, but that those with the necessary equipment in scholarship, and the courage to look facts in the face, who have gone behind the tradition of the intervening centuries have had a great awakening, and found themselves obliged to admit that the leaders of the great revolt fail to measure up to the standard ascribed to them.

This is particularly true of the Church of England. However tenaciously the mass of its adherents may cling to the long-cherished conviction that the Reformation was in design and in fact an emancipation of the human intellect, the truth has, nevertheless, slowly forced itself upon them that the means by which it was effected were not only iniquitous in themselves, and disastrous in their results, but that its chief instruments were in the main men of questionable character and actuated by the lowest of human motives. In other words, that Littledale's celebrated characterization of them as a "set of thoroughly unredeemed ruffians," cannot be set aside as a mere rhetorical flourish.

THIS COMES out very strongly in the Hulsean Lectures for 1921-22 delivered before the University of Cambridge, and now published under the title "Erasmus the Reformer: a Study in Re-statement." The author is Rev. L. Elliott Binns, B. D., Rector of North Cadbury, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Coventry. It is a very interesting book, and while perfectly loyal to Anglican traditions and censoriously critical as to the state of the Church in the sixteenth century it is no less outspoken in regard to the "Reformers." Erasmus himself is the real reformer, and the character of Luther as contrasted therewith unlovable in the extreme. To class the great humanist as a "Reformer," however, in such company is not only untrue to history but libellous in fact.

ERASMUS, it is true, was as alive to the evils of the times as any man, and quite frank in his criticism of those in high places who fell short of their high calling, not excepting even the occupants of Peter's Chair. But he was too good a Christian, and too profound a scholar to be misled by the specious pleas of those who were ready to shatter the unity of the Church and break utterly with the See of Peter as a prelude to the realization of their own vile ambitions. All sorts of inducements were made to him to throw in his lot with the "Reformers," but he remained faithful in his allegiance to the end and died as he had lived, a Catholic.

It is not, however, with Erasmus that we have here to do nor with the "lesser lights of the Reformation," but with the person of its chief exponent, Martin Luther. Those old enough to remember the celebration years ago of the fourth centenary of his birth will not have forgotten the avalanche of panegyric which characterized it throughout. There was no virtue which Luther did not adorn, and no conceivable blessing which as a result of his "break with Rome" did not accrue to mankind. Up to the sixteenth century it was emphatically proclaimed Europe had for more than

a thousand years languished under the shadows of superstition and degradation. Luther was the glorious sun which, bursting from behind these clouds, ushered in the reign of righteousness and freedom for mankind. All this and more was the unvarying note of the celebration of his birth, as it had been for the four hundred years preceding.

THE WORLD has travelled a long way since then, and while the cult of Luther still holds sway over the rank and file, scholars are not wanting to expose the truth. The Hulsean Lectures of 1921-1922 are in this respect but a summing-up of the researches of the past twenty-five years. They contain nothing really new, but it is something that a leader of thought among Reformation adherents has the courage to tell the truth. That in spite of his conclusions as to the character of Luther he should still adjudge him a hero is, however incomprehensible to us, his own affair, and we would not presume to doubt his sincerity.

WE HAVE but space here for a few excerpts. Luther rejected the authority of the Church and professed to set up the Scriptures as the final seat of authority instead. "Until the Leipzig dispute of 1519," says Dr. Binns, "he held to the Pope; after that to a general council; at the Diet of Worms, 1521, this authority was abandoned, and the Scriptures alone held worthy of obedience. But even the Scriptures had to be censored and part rejected, as inconsistent with his chosen doctrines; so that it is the inner consciousness of Luther himself which remains as the final court of appeal." Or, in the words of the historian (Armstrong) of Charles V. whom Dr. Binns quotes: "Luther and his associates lost all reverence for authority except that of the lord from whom they drew their stipends," on which dictum Dr. Binns remarks: "Luther had to travel a long way before he reached this last state of degradation, and on the way from time to time he exhibited true nobility of character; his fatal habit of allowing expediency to control principle is the obvious explanation of his decline." The general estimate of the man in other passages and of the results of his work form a curious commentary on this assumed "nobility of character."

ANOTHER estimate as to the Reformation idea of the seat of authority is that of Dr. Liddon's, the celebrated Dean of St. Paul's, quoted by Dr. Binns: "Its interpretation of the New Testament was guided by a traditional assumption as arbitrary and as groundless as any which it ever denounced. The real source of its 'Gospel' was limited to a few chapters of St. Paul's Epistles, understood in a manner which left much else in Holy Scripture out of account; and thus the Old Testament history, and even the life of our Lord Jesus Christ, as recorded by the Evangelists were thrown comparatively into the background. . . . As a consequence, those entire departments of the Christian revelation which deals with the corporate union of Christians with Christ in His Church and with the Sacraments, which by His appointment are the channels of His grace to the end of time, were not so much forgotten as unrecognized." "The charge of thrusting the Gospels into the background," adds Dr. Binns, "may seem to some unfair as applied to the Evangelists; it certainly holds true of Luther who deliberately states that 'St. Paul's epistles are more of a gospel than Matthew, Mark and Luke.'"

"THIS INCOMPLETE presentation of the gospel together with the preaching up of private judgment did much to foster, even when it did not originate, some of the worst evils of the times." What those evils were does not remain in doubt. "Protestantism in its early days was accompanied by a relaxation of moral standards which almost amounted to a collapse." The two doctrines which were especially blameworthy were the excessive emphasis laid on faith, and the denial of human responsibility. "No one," said Luther, "will amend his life; the elect will have theirs amended for them; the non-elect will perish in their misery." As a consequence Erasmus tells us