

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
United States and Europe—\$2.50.
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.
Sensitiveness 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 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 Fulton
and Sheil, the Apostolic Delegates to
Canada, the Archbishop 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, AUGUST 8, 1925

TWO GLORIOUS CHAPTERS IN AMERICAN HISTORY

Philadelphia will celebrate next year the sesquicentennial of the Declaration of Independence. "Sesqui" is a Latin word meaning "once and a half," or, "half as much again," sesquicentennial therefore means the hundred and fiftieth anniversary. Many will remember that the centennial of the Declaration of Independence was celebrated in Philadelphia in 1876.

Naturally the promoters of the Sesquicentennial International Exhibition are beginning to advertise. They hope to make it something greater than Chicago's World's Fair, The Pan-American Exposition, or the British Empire Exposition still going on at Wembley.

We are in receipt of a sheet in which various eminent Philadelphians set forth different phases of the significance of the coming celebration. Father Kirlin, pastor of the Church of the Precious Blood, deals with the subject of religious liberty, especially as affecting Catholics. In the course of his signed article the following occurs:

"The liberty of conscience that is enjoyed today throughout the land had its source in our city of Brotherly Love. Here, as nowhere else in all the world, there was liberty and freedom to worship God according to the dictates of conscience, not only for Catholics, but for all religious sects. In every other colony England's penal laws were in force against Catholics and others who would not conform to the Church of England. This is the more surprising when we recollect that these colonists were, for the most part, refugees from religious persecution in other lands and yet they were themselves intolerant in the colonies they established. It seems true, indeed, as someone has written: 'The Pilgrim Fathers sailed from a land in which they were persecuted in order to find a land in which they might persecute.'"

Then he goes on to extol in warm but merited terms William Penn's "holy experiment" of true brotherly love. "In spite of all kinds of opposition the utmost freedom was given to all religions in Pennsylvania. While Catholics did not dare build a church or openly hold service anywhere else in the English domain, they met publicly in Philadelphia and held their services without fear."

All that is said in praise of the great and gentle founder of the colony, which is now become the great State of Pennsylvania, is but giving honor where honor is due. Nor would we take by a single qualifying word anything that has been said or will be said in praise of the great Quaker who gave his name to Pennsylvania. But this colony was organized 8 August, 1681, the deputy governor being William Markham, a cousin of Penn. Penn himself landed there 28th October, 1682. It is to his eternal honor that the laws which he inspired established religious liberty, allowing freedom of worship to all who acknowledged one God, and provided that all members of the Assembly, as well as those who voted for them, should be such as believe Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, the Saviour of the World. He was one of the first to have an adequate conception of Democratic Government. Thus he wrote: "Governments rather depend upon men than men upon Governments; let men be good, and the Government cannot be bad; if it be ill they will cure it. Though good laws do well, good men do better; for good laws may want [i.e. lack] good men and be abolished or evaded by ill men; but good men will never want good laws nor suffer ill ones. That, therefore, which makes a good constitution must keep it, viz., men of

wisdom and virtue; qualities that, because they descend not with worldly inheritance, must be carefully propagated by a virtuous education of youth. For liberty without obedience is confusion, and obedience without liberty is slavery."

The Catholic Encyclopedia says that "Penn was far in advance of his time, in his views of the capacity of mankind for democratic government, and equally so in his broadminded toleration of differences of religious belief. Indeed, it has been well said that the declaration of his final charter of privileges of 1701 was not alone 'intended as the fundamental law of the Province and the declaration of religious liberty on the broadest character and about which there could be no doubt or uncertainty. It is a declaration not of toleration but of religious equality and brought within its protection all who professed one Almighty God,—Roman Catholics, and Protestants, Unitarians, Trinitarians, Christians, Jews, and Mohammedans, and excluded only Atheists and Polytheists.' At that time in no American Colony did anything approaching to toleration exist." ("That time" is, as indicated above, in 1701.)

Notwithstanding the very friendly, even kindly feeling of Quakers towards Catholics the election of Thomas Fitz-Simons, a wealthy American merchant of Irish birth, as one of the Provincial Deputies in July, 1774, is the first instance of a Catholic being named for a public office in Pennsylvania. It may be added that Fitz-Simons was a member of the Convention that met in Philadelphia, 25th May, 1787, and framed the Constitution of the United States.

Not American Catholics alone but all Catholics, under whatever flag they now enjoy religious liberty, may well join wholeheartedly in giving deserved honor to William Penn. But it must be noted that Penn came to America in 1682 a year after the Colony was founded. A glorious chapter in the history of religious liberty was begun in America over half a century earlier.

George Calvert, first Lord Baltimore, purchased a plantation in Newfoundland in the year 1620, which he called Avalon. In 1622 he applied for a Patent and received in 1623 a grant of the south eastern peninsula of Newfoundland, which was erected into the Province of Avalon, and quasi-royal authority was given him. He went to Avalon in 1627 to observe conditions in the province and to establish a colony where all might enjoy freedom in worshipping God. He landed at Fairland, the settlement of the province, in 1627 and remained till fall. When he returned the next spring he brought with him his family, including Lady Baltimore, his second wife, and about forty colonists. On his first visit to Avalon he brought two priests, and on his second visit one priest.

After Lord Baltimore's second visit to Avalon, a Protestant minister, Mr. Stourton, went back to England and complained to the Privy Council that his patron was having Mass said in the province, and that he favored the Catholics. No attention however was paid to Stourton's complaints. In the war with France French cruisers attacked the English fisheries, and Lord Baltimore's interests suffered heavily.

About 1628 Lord Baltimore requested a new grant in a better climate. In the following year, before word came from the king, he went to Virginia and, being a Catholic, was received with various indignities. He returned to England and at first received from Charles a grant of land south of the James River. Meeting opposition from some of the Virginia Company, he sought another grant north and east of the Potomac, which he obtained. Before the charter was granted, however, he died.

Cecilius, second Lord Baltimore, was the eldest son and heir of George Calvert, first Lord Baltimore. When his father died, in 1632, the charter of Maryland was granted to Cecilius, who was made a palatine and "Absolute Lord of Maryland and Avalon." It was Lord Baltimore's intention, at first, to come to America with the colonists, but as there were many enemies of his colonial project at home he concluded to send his brothers, Leonard and George, at the head of the expedition. The former was appointed governor.

The enemies of the charter, chiefly members of the London Company, did everything in their power to defeat the objects of the proprietor. It was claimed that the charter interfered with the grant of land of the Virginia Company, and that, owing to its liberality, it would attract people from other colonies and depopulate them. The arguments of the enemies of the charter were of no avail, and finally the colonists numbering twenty gentlemen and about three hundred laborers, embarked on the Ark and the Dove, in the harbor of Cowes, Nov., 1633. Before sailing, Leonard received instructions for the government of the colonists. Religious toleration was the keynote of Baltimore's policy throughout his long career. In spite of the fact that the Catholics were persecuted when Calvert's government was overthrown, every time his authority was restored persecution ceased and every faith had equal rights. When the Puritans were persecuted in Massachusetts, Baltimore offered them a refuge in Maryland, with freedom of worship.

Lord Baltimore paid for the expedition, which cost him in the first two years forty thousand pounds in transportation, provisions, and stores. He provided them not only with the necessities, but also many of the conveniences adapted to a new country. So well were they equipped for the founding of a colony that it was said they made as much progress in six months as Virginia made in as many years.

It will be noted that the founders of these Colonies were called Proprietary Governors; that their power in their respective colonies was almost royal; they had the power of absolute veto over any legislation passed by the Assembly, a power that the Calverts, used only in the most extreme cases.

Penn was given his grant of land in payment of a debt of £16,000 which the British Government owed his father, Admiral Penn. In the coming Sesquicentennial therefore, the tributes that will undoubtedly be paid to the great Quaker as a pioneer of religious liberty will be fully merited. For, with the almost unlimited powers of proprietary Governor, he might have imposed restrictions on religious freedom as narrow and intolerant as those which obtained in nearly all the other Colonies.

Nevertheless it is evident from the foregoing sketch of early American history that the glory of being the first to proclaim and establish the great principle of religious liberty in the new world belongs, as an indisputable historic fact, to the Catholic Lord Baltimore, founder of Maryland.

It will be noted that Penn's colony had its beginning in 1681, Penn himself coming out in 1682. He had suffered persecution with Catholics in the old land; and doubtless sympathized with them; but at that very time he had before his eyes the inspiring example of religious freedom in Catholic-founded Maryland. For though the Puritans to whom Lord Baltimore had given asylum had rebelled and seized the Government (1682 to 1689) during which time they excluded Catholics from the Administration and restrained them in the exercise of their faith; still when Lord Baltimore again obtained control (1689), religious liberty was restored until 1692. Therefore during the first decade of Penn's settlement it is not true, as Father Kirlin writes, that "in every other Colony England's penal laws were in force against Catholics and others who would not conform to the Church of England." And the example of Maryland could hardly have failed to impress deeply the broadminded Penn and must have been an inspiration to him in his "holy experiment," an experiment which had already been successfully tried in the neighboring colony.

It is true that in 1692 owing to Protestant disturbance in Maryland William of Orange, King of England, declared that the Proprietary's claim forfeited, made Maryland a royal province, and sent over Copley, as the first royal Governor. The Anglican Church was then made the established church of Maryland, every colonist being taxed for its support. In 1702, religious liberty was extended to all Christians except Catholics. Catholics were forbidden (1704) to instruct their children in their religion or to send them out of the Colony for such instruction (1716).

Priests were forbidden to exercise their functions and Catholic children could be taken from a Catholic parent. In 1716 an oath was exacted of office holders renouncing their belief in transubstantiation. An act disfranchising Catholics followed in 1718. So it became true that in Penn's Colony "as nowhere else in the world there was liberty and freedom to worship God according to the dictates of conscience."

Another paragraph from Father Kirlin's article brings home to us with startling force the absolute negation of liberty that then obtained so far as Catholics were concerned; and goes far to justify the patriotic Philadelphia priest's enthusiastic glorification of the shining exception that Penn's Colony made to the general rule.

The paragraph in question follows:

"While Catholics dared not build a church or openly hold service anywhere else in the English domain, they met publicly in Philadelphia and held their services without fear. On the day in 1708 that Lionel Brittin, Philadelphia's leading merchant, was received into the Catholic Church at a public Mass at his house at Second and Market Streets, a successful priest hunt in London with the arrest of the worshippers at Mass was reported in the Gentlemen's Magazine."

On reading such comparatively recent history we can thank God for the marvelous resurrection of the Catholic Church in the English-speaking world.

The scriptural injunction, "honor to whom honor is due" compels all, and especially all Catholics, to honor and reverence the name of William Penn. Yet it will ever remain an undisputable fact of history that, in the holy experiment of religious liberty and freedom of worship, Catholic-founded Maryland led the Quaker Colony of Pennsylvania by half a century. The "conspiracy of silence" must not be allowed to obscure this glorious chapter of American history. Why should the "Mayflower" be on every school boys lips while "the Ark" and "the Dove" sound strange and unfamiliar.

All honor and an ever shining glory to the Quaker William Penn; but, at least, equal honor and glory to the Catholic Lord Baltimore, the pioneer of religious liberty.

NATIONALITY

By THE OBSERVER

The question has often been asked, "What constitutes a nationality?" It has been defined as "a natural society of men who, by unity of territory, of origin, of customs and of language are drawn into a community of life and social intercourse." Others amplify this definition. They enumerate as the constituent elements of nationality, race, religion, language, geographical position, manners, history and laws, and say that when these or some of them combine they form a nationality, and that it becomes perfect when a special type has been formed, when a great homogeneous body of men acquires for the first time a consciousness of its separate nationality, and thus becomes a moral unity with a common thought. This is the self-consciousness of nations, which establishes in nations as in individuals a true personality. And, as the individual man, according to those writers, has an inalienable right to personal freedom, so has the nationality. Every government of one nationality by another, they say, is a form of slavery; but in this they probably go too far. They say that the true right of nations is the recognition of the full recognition of the right of each nationality to acquire and maintain a separate existence and to create or to change its government according to its desires. They say that civil communities should form, extend or dissolve themselves by a spontaneous process, and in accordance with the right and principle of nationality. Upon this reasoning, every country which has ever appealed to a foreign power to suppress movements amongst its own people and every country which has thus intervened, has acted in a manner essentially criminal. Such, pushed to its full extent, and definition, is a philosophy which has played a great part in the modern history of Europe, particularly in the last fifty years, and more especially in the recent attempts to reconstruct Europe. This idea of nationality

must not be confused with the idea of democracy, from which it is very different. The idea and the passion of nationality are very often found in close combination with a great devotion to a dynasty which had little or nothing to do with democracy; and thus we saw it a few years ago when a passionate sense of nationality was combined with a passionate devotion to the Kaiser to make a great war possible and to let it loose on the world. Nations which value very little internal or constitutional freedom, are often passionately devoted to their national individuality and independence. The various elements above marked out as laid down by the writers quoted as constituting a nationality do not, or very seldom do, come together in the same people,—or in people living under one government.

No one of these elements is in itself sufficient to make a nationality. As a matter of history it is true that all great nations or most of them, have been formed in the first place by many successive conquests and aggrandisements, and have been gradually fused into a more or less perfect organism. In most of the countries racial elements are inextricably mixed. To mention countries with which our readers are most familiar, England absorbed a great many Danes, Ireland absorbed a great many Englishmen and Danes and Scots; and in these cases there has been a fusion. Language and religion have a great power in forming national unities, yet there are examples of different creeds and different languages very successfully blended into one nationality; an instance of which is the Belgian nationality. On the other hand, there are examples in Europe of separations of feeling and character, due to historical, political and industrial causes, where race, creed and language are all the same. Within certain limits, the doctrine of nationalities represents a real and considerable progress in human affairs. So far as it means a recognition of the principle of free consent by the great masses of the population to a certain form of government or a certain class or kind of rulers, it seems to make for peace in the world and for contentment amongst the peoples of the world.

On the other hand, in so far as it tends to break up strong nations into weak fragments; so far as it tends to give certain turbulent small nationalities enough independence to make it easy for them to make trouble, it unquestionably has its disadvantages; and it is in this aspect of the matter that Europe is most interested today. There are a number of small nationalities are now free or more free than they used to be; and it remains to be seen what use they are going to make of their freedom. It will be little consolation to the powers who secured them their freedom to know that they are free if they throw Europe again into a general war; and there are signs enough of such a danger.

The doctrine of nationalities is double-edged. It is a ready weapon in the hands of the demagogue, and it is possible, and even easy, to make it the means of waves of emotion and disturbance which threaten the most valuable elements of civilization. The difficulty of drawing the line in the right place was deeply felt at the Peace Conference; and the difficulty has become more apparent with each year which has passed since then. Now we have vast masses of people in India and in Egypt, clamoring for recognition of their nationality. After all, the object of all human government is the happiness and welfare of mankind; and that object is not necessarily attained by the mere recognition of a theory of government: It is to be attained only by justice and wisdom in the actual work of government.

The peoples of the countries of "The Little Entente" are now supposed to be free, and all the Balkan peoples; but are they free from misgovernment? In most of these countries they are not. And after all men cannot long be happy when misgoverned, even though they are governed by men of their own nationality. It is quite likely that the people of Italy have asked themselves often these last fifty years what they had gained by their national unity. And the peoples of the Balkan nations must have already begun to ask themselves how they have benefited by being

freed from the domination of Austria and Hungary and Russia.

There may be people who had rather be governed badly by their own nationality than well governed by races they hate or dislike. But in most cases where trouble has been found by one nationality in governing another, it has not been because one nationality was governing another but because they were governing badly and without regard to the good of the people they were governing. The case of England and Ireland illustrates what we mean by that.

It is not foreign government but bad and selfish government that has caused most of the heart burning in the small nationalities; and unfortunately bad government is not made impossible by applying the doctrine of nationalities.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

FROM TIME to time allusions have been made in these columns to products of the early printing presses, mostly of a Catholic character, which because of their inherent qualities, no less than for their rarity, command high prices in these later days. It is not necessary, however, to go back to the products of the fifteenth century, known in the book world as "Inconabula" for instances of such phenomenal rises in value. First editions of modern poets who have in the event become famous, for example, or of some of the earlier or mid-Victorian novelists, are quite remarkable in this respect. There is Edgar Allan Poe for one, whose first published volume of poems now commands almost more money than poor Poe earned in his whole sad life. The subject may be of sufficient general interest to warrant a paragraph now and again.

TAKE THAT delightful writer, Jane Austen, for example. Writing anonymously, and practically unknown beyond her own family circle during her lifetime, she survived a long period of obscurity and neglect to have come into her own within the past thirty or forty years. Among the cultured she never lacked ardent admirers, it is true, and men so eminent as Sir Walter Scott, Sir James MacKintosh and Lord Macaulay have paid tribute to her genius. Scott it was who said: "That young lady has a talent for describing the involvements of feelings and characters of ordinary life which is to me the most wonderful I ever met with. The big bow-wow strain I can do myself, like any now going; but the exquisite touch which renders ordinary commonplace things and characters interesting from the truth of the description and the sentiment is denied to me. What a pity such a gifted creature died so early!" Jane Austen was born in 1775, and died in 1817, so that her life spanned but a period of forty-two years.

MACAULAY has left like testimony on record. "I have now read once again all Miss Austen's novels," he writes in his journal. "Charming they are. There are in the world no compositions which approach nearer to perfection." Sydney Smith wrote in a somewhat similar strain; 'Sir James MacKintosh thought her a woman of real genius, and Cardinal Newman too was among her admirers, though "her clergyman are detestable creatures," as in truth they are. But it must be remembered that Jane Austen, though herself devout, wrote at a period when on universal testimony religion had reached almost its lowest plane.

AMONG MISS AUSTEN'S modern admirers is to be included Goldwin Smith, who has written the best of her biographies. "The Life of Jane Austen" is a delightful book full of understanding and appreciation, and lightened up by innumerable exquisite passages and phrases. It is, indeed to be regretted that Goldwin Smith did not confine himself to pure letters instead of those excursions into politics and economics, which to so great a degree absorbed his time and his energies. Literature would for him have proved a much more secure title to fame. Of Jane Austen he wrote: "On her was bestowed, though in a humble form, the gift which had been bestowed on Homer, Shakespeare, Cervantes, Scott, and a few others—the gift of creative power."

Now, as to the modern commercial value of Jane Austen's novels,

"Sense and Sensibility," was published in 1811, when its writer was thirty-six; "Pride and Prejudice" (generally, esteemed her best) two years later; "Mansfield Park" appeared in 1814; "Emma" in 1816; and "Northanger Abbey" and "Persuasion" in 1818, a year after its author's death. For "Sense and Sensibility," she received £150, which "with gray humility" she accepted as a magnificent sum. The manuscript of "Emma," we think it was, that was sold to a bookseller for £50, but he thought so little of his venture, that it lay in a drawer for a year or two untouched when it was sold back to Jane's father for the price he had paid for it. "It is but due to his shade to say that he had evidently never read it." (Smith). The entire sum which Jane received for her works up to the time of her death did not reach seven hundred pounds.

THE FIRST edition of "Pride and Prejudice" appeared as already stated in 1813. It was in three volumes and bore the imprint: "T. Egerton, Milmay Library, Whitehall." A recent London catalogue prices a single copy at £195; "Mansfield Park," 1814, same publisher, at £30, and "Emma," by the Author of "Pride and Prejudice," 1816, at £21. How Jane Austen's pupils would have dilated had this taken place in her lifetime.

IT HAS been said of Jane Austen's novels that they lack action and are really "about nothing-at-all." Granted! But it is the great tribute to her unique genius that she was able to make "nothing-at-all" interesting. She simply held the mirror up to her time and made the men and women in her little world objects of interest to successive generations. It, of course requires some degree of cultivation to be able to appreciate the delicate strokes of her art in this respect but once grasped they are "a joy forever." On this, and on her place in literature we cannot do better than reproduce Goldwin Smith's summing up: "The subjects which presented themselves to her were of the kind with which, and with which alone, she was singularly qualified by her peculiar temperament as well as her special gifts and her social circumstances to deal. But the lives of these genteel idlers after all were necessarily somewhat rapid, and void of anything heroic in action or feeling as well as of violent passion or tragic crime. Few sets of people, perhaps, ever did less for humanity or exercised less influence on its progress than the denizens of Mansfield Park and Pemberley, Longbourn and Hartfield, in Jane Austen's day. As they all come before us at the fall of the curtain, we feel that they, their lives and loves, their little intrigues, their petty quarrels, and their drawing-room adventures, are the lightest of bubbles on the great stream of existence, though it is a bubble which has been made bright for ever by the genius of Jane Austen."

ELSEWHERE the same writer says: "Jane Austen by her creative genius, has produced so many charming groups of figures among whom the serious and comic parts of character are distributed. At her word they move from scene to scene through the little drama of their lives, developing their characters as they go. You look on, enjoy the show, and forget your cares. Perhaps at the same time you insensibly improve your knowledge of humanity and of yourself, enlarge your sympathies, and it may be, take in some lesson of unselfishness, courtesy, respect for the feelings of others. No higher mission had Jane Austen; no higher mission did she pretend to have; if you want a theologian, a political philosopher, a regenerator of humanity, or a moral disciplinarian in your novelist, you must look elsewhere."

PROTESTANT URGES VATICAN ADMISSION TO THE LEAGUE

Paris, France.—A Protestant pastor, M. Edouard Soulier, deputy from Paris, speaking recently at a political banquet of the legitimate claims of Catholics, declared that the French Government should, in his opinion, ask for the admission of the Holy See to the League of Nations.

"Catholicism," he said, "should, itself, be considered as a veritable League of Nations. The Second International, the Labor International, has obtained the annexation of an International Labor Bureau