

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum. United States and Europe—\$2.25. Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, LL. D. (Rev. James T. Foley, D. D., Editors) (Thomas Coffey, LL. D., Associate Editor—H. F. Mackintosh, Manager—Robert M. Burns. Address business letters to the Manager. Classified Advertising 15 cents per line. Remittances must accompany the order. Where CATHOLIC RECORD Box address is required send 10 cents to prepay expense of postage upon replies. Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents. The Editor cannot be held responsible for unsolicited manuscripts. Every endeavor will be made to return rejected contributions when stamped addressed envelopes are enclosed. The CATHOLIC RECORD has been approved and recommended by Archbishops Falconcio 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, JUNE 14, 1924

THE SAVIOUR OF AUSTRIA

Throughout a world surfeited with horrors of war and horrors of the mis-called peace, the shooting of Dr. Seipel, Chancellor of Austria, caused a new feeling of horror akin to despair. For the holy and humble priest who was the mark for a vengeful socialist's bullet was the great statesman who preserved Austria as a political entity and thereby saved central Europe from conditions that might have seriously imperilled peaceful reconstruction of the whole of Europe.

A little more than two years ago when Chancellor Seipel took office after the fall of the utterly incompetent Socialist Government the world had given up hope of the possibility of saving Austria from chaos and disintegration. What is worse, the Austrians themselves despaired of political salvation. The irreverent and cynical Socialist gibe on the priest-statesman's taking up the heavy burden of office was that it was in accordance with the fitness of things for soon he should have to administer Extreme Unction to dying Austria!

That Austria did not die was due directly to the statesmanship and perhaps indirectly not a little to the sacerdotal qualities of her new priest Chancellor.

Observers in the chancelleries of Europe still recall Seipel's tour of the capitals in the summer of 1922 which was to turn the tide in Austria's favor. A "scrupulous Metternich," some of the references of the period averred. The world seemed convinced that Austria was dying, and a great part of the Chancellor's task was to convince it of the nation's vitality. Socialist leaders had already warned him that if the cost of living continued to increase they could not answer for the attitude of the working classes.

Bankers with whom he conferred told him the cure was a financial cure, and this was impossible without gold. So he set out with two objectives, namely: to overcome the international indifference to Austria and to float the needed loans.

Austere in bearing, clerically garbed, occupying simple, sparsely furnished rooms at hotels, Mgr. Seipel made his round. At Verona he hinted to the Italians that self-protection dictated that Austria form some new union, and mentioned Czechoslovakia. At Prague he sketched the same necessity, and mentioned Italy or Germany. He continued his memorable journey to Berlin, where word reached the other powers that he was in long conference with Chancellor Wirth. His tour began to attract attention. Hurried conferences were held in his wake at the capitals he visited, and not a Foreign Office but had taken cognizance of what was going on.

Dr. Benes, the Foreign Minister of Czechoslovakia, then boarded a train at Prague for Paris and later went to London. When he returned the principle of Inter-Allied intervention for the salvage of Austria was reported accepted, and his proposal that the financial rehabilitation of Austria be confided to the League of Nations became a working plan by general consent of the Powers.

"Like Dante of old," Chancellor Seipel observed meanwhile, "I am knocking from door to door for bread, and, like Dante, I am finding the taste very bitter."

Austria was in the way of salvation; but there still remained the difficult task of getting from Parliament all the extraordinary powers necessary to fulfil the conditions imposed. Chancellor Seipel was as successful at home as he was abroad. The conditions fulfilled, the international loan enabled Mgr. Seipel to finance Austria over the

crisis and the moral effect of having both funds and a reserve restored hope to the people and Austria's rehabilitation went on apace. The task was not easy. Vienna had been the capital of a great empire of sixty millions; now Austria was reduced to one tenth of that population nearly a third of which was in Vienna. The policy of retrenchment necessitated the reduction of the enormous imperial staff of civil servants which necessarily entailed misery and engendered bitterness. "Fascisti" and communists both turned on the Chancellor and a year ago stoned him in the streets of Vienna as he continued to extend the scope of his economies.

The result, however, economists unanimously assert, was eventually to advance the Austrian currency from the most unstable to one of the most stable in Europe, to wipe out long standing deficits, and to bring Austria back into the international money market with a tangible and respectable credit.

Under Mgr. Seipel's leadership treaties have been negotiated with many neighbors, including Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Italy. Great strides have been made in the domestic administration of the republic.

A LIMIT TO COMPREHENSIVENESS

Everyone is familiar with the Anglican apologetic that makes of the wide diversity of belief and practice within that communion a new mark of the Church—Comprehensiveness. With pride we were told that there was room for the High, Low and Broad churchman within that comprehensive fold. There were and there are those who claim that the Church of England—and the Protestant Episcopal, of course, as well—is the Church—or a branch thereof—commissioned by Christ to teach in His name; that it is Catholic, enjoying all the prerogatives of the Church Catholic. And there are those—millions of them—who, though they regard the Church of their baptism with sincere affection, are as thoroughly Protestant as private judgment and denial of any divinely derived commission to teach can make them. There are those who believe in the Mass and the Real Presence and there are those who look on these as damnable fables and dangerous deceptions. Illogical and self-contradictory as were these clashing beliefs and practices they were all blandly if not boastfully explained by that blessed word—comprehensiveness.

It used to be said that they were united in fundamentals. Now fundamentalists is a term of reproach and scorn, a by-word and a hissing to multitudes and even to many highly placed as preachers and teachers who not only scoff at all Catholic claims but who regard even the thinnest of Protestant creeds a millstone around the neck of spiritual progress. The revolt of the modernists has strained comprehensiveness to the breaking point. To deny some things, even many things, was the privilege, if not the vested right, of members of a comprehensive Catholic-Protestant Church; but to deny every thing distinctively Christian was going too far. To discipline the Christ-denying Modernists was no easy task, yet if this great communion was to retain the semblance of a teaching Church it must be done. An obscure clergyman in Texas was condemned. The Church authorities were taunted with a chorus of derisive invitations to deal with the "higher-ups."

And we are genuinely glad to note that they took up the challenge. Before a court of eight Bishops in Cleveland, Bishop William Montgomery Brown, retired, former head of the diocese of Arkansas, was placed on trial on formal charges of heresy.

Now 'heresy' and 'heretic' are generally assumed to be offensive epithets. Why we do not know unless it be that those who so consider them are quite ignorant of their meaning. These words come from a Greek word meaning to take

for oneself, to choose. "After the study of philosophy began in Greece," writes Hobbes, "and the philosophers, disagreeing among themselves, had started many questions . . . because everyone took what opinion he pleased, each several opinion was called a *heresy*; which signified no more than a private opinion, without reference to truth or falsehood." Now that is precisely what the great majority of people do today with regard to religion and claim the right to do. The press writers who are so scornful of "heresy-hunters" and so resentful of the charge of heresy being preferred against anyone are themselves boastfully heretical in the etymological sense of the word.

But by usage the word heresy has come to mean declared opinions which are opposed to the received and authorized doctrinal standards of any particular Church. To deny the right, nay the duty, of any Church to prosecute for heresy is to deny flatly to that Church the right to have any doctrinal standards whatever. But doctrinal disruption has gone so far in most Protestant Churches that it is impossible to keep even their authorized preachers and teachers from denying and flouting those very standards they vowed at ordination to maintain and defend. It is a chaotic state of affairs in which honesty and moral courage as well as religion goes by the board. So we are glad that the Protestant Episcopal authorities had the courage to put Bishop Brown on trial.

The charge was that Bishop Brown "did hold and teach publicly and advisedly certain doctrine contrary to that held by the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America."

This charge was supported by certain extracts from Bishop Brown's book "Communism and Christianity," the following amongst others: "2. On pages 32 and 33: 'Neither capitalism nor Christianity is anything, except in so far as it is a system of parasitism and as parasitic systems they have striking resemblances, nearly as many and close as indistinguishable twins.'"

"Both have gods, churches and priesthoods, and these are in each case nothing but symbols. "However, the god of capitalism, though only a symbol, is nevertheless real gold, below a real vault, and nearly all the world sincerely worships it."

"But the God of Christianity, though none the less symbolic, but rather more so, is an unreal, imaginary spirit, a magnified man without a body, above an imaginary vault, and only a very small part of the world sincerely worships Him."

"3. On page 51: 'Orthodox Christians say that Jesus founded their sectarian churches, though each sect insists that He had to do with only one Church, theirs. I doubt that He lived.'"

"7. On page 81: 'Gods in the skies (Jesus, Jehovah, Allah, Buddha) are all right as subjective symbols of human potentialities and attributes and of natural laws, even as the Stars and Stripes on a pole. Uncle Sam in the Capitol and Santa Claus in a sleigh are all right as such symbols; but such Gods are all wrong if regarded as objective realities existing independently of those who created them as divinities and placed them in celestial habitations.'"

"10. On page 90: 'The one God of the Jews and the trine God of the Christians, if taken seriously, are superstitions.'"

With all these nauseating blasphemies this Christian bishop still proclaims himself a professing Christian as this further extract quoted in support of the charge of heresy makes clear: "21. On pages 146 and 147: 'If you ask whether I am still a professing Christian, I shall answer: 'Yes, yet the Brother Jesus of the New Testament, Catholic creed and Protestant confessions, is not for me a historical personage, but only a symbol of all that is for the good of the world, even as the Uncle Sam of American literature is not a historical personage, but only a symbol of all that is good for the United States.'"

at the "medievalism" of the Protestant Episcopal bishops in putting Bishop Brown on trial in effect deny to all the other Episcopal bishops of the United States the liberty they claim for Bishop Brown. Are they not to be free to dissociate themselves and their Church from the anti-Christian rantings of the bishop turned materialist and communist? They could do no less; and as half a loaf is always better than no bread we rejoice that the Protestant Episcopal Church has had the moral courage to do its plain duty in the premises.

A MOVEMENT TOO LONG DELAYED

A movement has been initiated at Ottawa to provide English-speaking Catholics with something like adequate facilities for higher education. In this matter the important English-speaking Catholic population of the Capital and of the Ottawa Valley are much worse off than were their predecessors of a generation or two ago. This will be abundantly evident from the study of the two important documents on the subject which will be found in last week's and this week's numbers of the CATHOLIC RECORD. The situation is one that not only vitally affects the welfare of Catholics, whose mother tongue is English, in Eastern Ontario but concerns deeply the Catholics of all Canada and the interests of the Catholic Church.

Within the limits of the Province of Quebec our coreligionists of French speech have complete, untrammelled and unquestioned control of education. Naturally they make the fullest provision for the preservation and extension of French culture, the French language, and French ideals of education. And yet it is their proud boast that to the Protestant minority of Quebec is given the fullest freedom and the fairest treatment possible in the development of an educational system suited to its needs. Nor is it an empty boast. Facts, figures and official statistics as well as the testimony of Protestant educationists all show that the French Canadians of Quebec have been and are not only just but generous in financial and legislative provision for Protestant education in Quebec.

But there is another phase of the educational question which was lucidly pointed out and emphasized by the Very Reverend Canon Emile Chartier, M. A., Ph. D., LL. D., vice-rector and dean of the faculty of arts, University of Montreal. The other day, at the annual convocation of the University of Western Ontario, the learned Canon, whose address was very well received, pointed out the importance of developing in the French an appreciation of English culture and in the English an appreciation of French culture as well as a knowledge on each side of the other's language in order that a closer relationship and a more understanding sympathy may subsist between the two racial groups in Canada.

But, he added, "A system which tends to make an English-speaking child into a French child or a French child into an English-speaking child we must reject."

It will be noted that here the learned Vice-Rector of the University of Montreal bases his protest not on religion but on the fact that French culture is as distinct and separate from English culture as the French language is distinct and separate from the English language; and the protest implies the assertion of the right of the French-speaking child to an adequate French education and the equal right of the English-speaking child to an adequate English education. To the Protestant minority of Quebec that right, as we have said, is freely conceded. The tolerance, sympathy, generosity of French-Canadians toward the Protestants of their province is a glory in which as Catholics we are proud to share. But, unfortunately, this generous provision for Protestant education leaves an important phase of the thorny question of bilingualism untouched. Surely English-speaking Catholics have educational rights equal to those conceded to English Protestants; rights to an education that will not "tend to make an English-speaking child into a French child." Yet this educational problem remains unsolved in Quebec and in those parts of the English-speaking provinces dominated by French

Canadians. The tendency has hitherto been to stress religion exclusively as the basis of the right of English-speaking people to schools that provide adequate facilities for an education based on the English language and English culture. It is time that the right, opportunely enunciated by Canon Chartier, should be emphasized; that English-speaking children throughout the whole course of their education should be allowed to enter into that heritage which belongs whole and entire to each and every one of the hundred millions and more of this English-speaking continent and to each and all of the two hundred millions of the English-speaking world. That the majority of these millions are outside the household of the faith is but an additional and imperative reason for adequate educational facilities for English-speaking Catholics. The tendency, too evident in some quarters, to identify the Catholic religion with the French language and to identify the English language with the Protestant religion is as un-Catholic as it is unwise and untrue. The glorious title 'Catholic' is thereby debased and degraded; and the basic principle of the Catholic Church is thus violated. The Church of God looks to the conquest of the world to Christ; of all tribes and all nations and all peoples and all tongues. The English-speaking Catholics are the leaven that will, through the Providence of God, leaven the whole mass of the English-speaking world. So the highest and holiest interests of God's Church, the fulfilment of its high mission to a large and ever-growing proportion of the world's population, demand that Catholics of English speech be afforded in the fullest possible measure, adequate facilities for a thoroughly English as well as a thoroughly Catholic education.

God wills it. It is with genuine pleasure we note the fact that the venerable Archbishop of Ottawa looks with favor on the efforts, too long delayed, of the English-speaking Catholics of Ottawa to ameliorate an intolerable situation. May these efforts, inaugurated with ecclesiastical approval and authority, be blessed by God and crowned with that complete success which their all-important objective deserves.

WHAT ARE OUR SCHOOLS DOING?

BY THE OBSERVER
If our common school and college system can be expected to show results anywhere, it ought surely to show them in an increased power and accuracy of expression in the English language. But this is precisely the matter in which the fewest results and the worst are being shown. For example we may, we think, take for granted that in these days no young man is allowed to write for a paper in any capacity, even as reporter or as news correspondent, who had not had at least a good common school course. How is it, then, that we find the news correspondent at Montreal—presumably an agent of the Canadian Press Association or some similar organization—sending out the following:

Montreal, June 2.—The full list of conspirators in the laying of plans for the Bank of Hochelaga hold-up here on April 1 when \$142,288 was stolen and two men shot dead, will be given, as far as he knows them, by Ciro Niegro, self-confessed conspirator, when the trial of Giuseppe Serafini, on a charge of having murdered the chauffeur of the collection car, re-opens Wednesday morning, following the recommendation given by Mr. Justice Wilson, in the court of King's Bench, to R. L. Calder, K. C., crown prosecutor, towards the close of this afternoon's proceedings.

What did Mr. Justice Wilson recommend? Did he recommend the re-opening of the trial or did he recommend something else? Why do men who are supposed to know the rudiments of English composition disgrace themselves by writing such slovenly sentences. Observe the construction of that long, clumsy and altogether unworkmanlike sentence. Why do people write like that? We think it is because they want to jump the reader's attention at once into the middle of their story, and so to fix the attention on what they think is the important fact in the matter. And so it will not do to begin with Mr. Justice Wilson, or with Ciro Niegro, or even with Serafini, but the reader must be—so the corres-

pondent imagines—jumped at once into the list of conspirators.

Even so why be clumsy about it? Why not write a sentence which a school boy need not be ashamed to show in his exercise book? Why not say: "The full list of conspirators in the Hochelaga Bank case will be given in Court on Wednesday morning." That covers it, does it not? Or, if it is thought necessary to introduce Ciro Niegro at once, and he cannot wait, or the reader cannot wait, half a minute, why not say, "Ciro Niegro, one of the conspirators in the Hochelaga Bank affair, will give up the names of his co-conspirators on Wednesday." Surely that would be enough for one sentence, and the next thrill could wait for another short sentence.

Or, if it is feared that the reader will lose interest so easily, why bother him with unnecessary words? Why add to the very plain word "conspirators" the explanatory words "in the laying of plans." Conspirators always lay plans, that is the substance of a conspiracy—that plans are laid. And, why bother to add the very unnecessary words, "towards the close of this afternoon's proceedings?" Who cares whether it was at the beginning or at the end, or in the middle, of an afternoon's proceedings, that the matter was decided?

Sometimes the young men who make up the news columns of the daily press seem to have studied English composition in the guide lines of the motion pictures; though they do not do as well as the average of the guide lines. It is a very great pity that the press does not realize its responsibilities. It has responsibilities, surely, in respect of the standard of English phraseology and composition. But it would seem that few who serve on the staff of the modern daily paper care whether they write English with approximate accuracy, or whether they write an argot or a patois. And it is only too plain that those who employ them care as little as they do about the matter.

Reporters and associated press writers and correspondents write as a little boy tells a story. A boy runs home to his father or mother with a mess of hasty impressions in his mind, and he tries to tell all of them in one breath. The result is confusion, and his parent has to take him and perhaps shake him a little to steady him down before he can relate what he has to tell in a reasonably clear manner. And have not many readers of press despatches wished that they could take some enthusiastic young reporter or correspondent by the collar, shake him a bit, and say to him, "See here, Sonny, you have all day to tell this story, don't try to tell it from back to front, start at the first of it; now then, what is it all about?"

But why do not the men who hire—and presumably fire—the correspondents say something equivalent to them and get them down to some sort of imitation of the writing of English sentences? For, either the English language is wrong, or these writers are wrong. That is the plain situation put alternatively. If this is the way to write English; if this is even a permissible method of writing English, we may as well face the fact that we have been for centuries, and still are, teaching our school children lies and nonsense.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE CIRCUMSTANCE of a corporate body being met together to celebrate its Golden Jubilee, and at the same time to chant its obsequies, as the Presbyterian General Assembly is this week doing in Owen Sound, is an event probably unique in Canadian annals. For, whatever the future of Presbyterians as such individually, the Act of Union, if ultimately carried, as seems certain, puts an end to the body heretofore legally designated as "The Presbyterian Church in Canada."

THE REFERENCES in these columns within the past two weeks to the processes of beatification and canonization now in progress in Rome, recalls the fact that there is another of world-wide interest which concerns the person of the late Pope Pius X. Following upon the institution of the diocesan tribunal in Rome, to examine into the cause of his Beatification, there has now been inaugurated a similar tribunal for the diocese of Venice, meetings

of which have already been held at the Patriarchal Palace, under the presidency of Cardinal La Fontaine, Archbishop and Patriarch, and Pius X.'s own successor in that exalted office.

IN THIS connection it is interesting to record the Holy Father's appointment as consultant of the Sacred Congregation of one well-known in America—Father Paschal Robinson, of the Friars Minor. Though born in Dublin, Father Robinson has had a wide and varied experience in the United States as journalist and man of letters. Before entering the Franciscan Order he was for three years (1892-5) associate editor of the North American Review, in which capacity he came into touch with most of the literary men in the country. Since going to Europe as a Friar Minor, he has followed up his literary bent, and has had many academic honors conferred upon him, among them that of Fellow of the Royal Historical Society of Great Britain.

AFTER THE Armistice of 1918, Father Robinson was chosen by the Holy See as Apostolic Visitor to Palestine, where he carried out an important mission. The terms of reference of his inquiry were restricted to religious conditions in the Holy Land, but, notwithstanding that he kept strictly within the letter of these instructions, racial rivalries on the part of a group of Continental journalists sought to give a political twist to the mission and to embarrass the Visitor. That he should now be named as a Consultant of the Sacred Congregation of Religious is proof not only of the success of his Palestine mission, but of the high esteem in which this distinguished Franciscan is held in Rome.

DURING HER recent visit to Rome, the Rev. Mother General of the English Congregation of Our Lady of Sion (the religious institute specially founded to promote the cause of the conversion of the Jews to Catholic Christianity) obtained from the Pope his promise to say Mass for this intention during the Novena of Masses for the redemption of Israel to be celebrated in England, June 21st to 29th, the Feast of SS. Peter and Paul. The Holy See has ever manifested deep interest in the Jews and has been their advocate and protector in those times of stress and persecution which have from time to time through the centuries broken out against that much-tried, if "stiff-necked" people. It is fully in accordance with this traditional attitude, therefore, that a Pontiff of the wide vision and sympathies of Pius XI. should evince a lively interest in the cause of their conversion.

IT MAY NOT be generally known on this continent that a "Catholic Guild of Israel for the Conversion of the Jews" actually exists in England and on the Continent, and that though Catholics as a body in England have done very little to encourage it, it has made progress, and is extending its numbers and its boundaries. Its headquarters are at the Convent of Our Lady of Sion, London, but the opening of a branch at Manchester is contemplated, where Jews are said to be more numerous than in any other city after London. The work is described as uphill, the Jews not being amenable to conversion. Notwithstanding, more than thirty were received into the Church in England during the year 1923.

CARDINAL MERCIER GETS HIGHEST DECORATION

(N. C. W. C. News Service)
Paris, May 23.—The French Government has awarded to Cardinal Mercier, on the occasion of his jubilee, the cordon of the Grand Cross of the Legion of Honor, the highest decoration given by France and one which is customarily given only to heads of foreign governments.

The Ambassador of France at Brussels went to Malines to present the insignia to the Cardinal in the name of the President of the Republic.

The Primate of Belgium also received an autograph letter from M. Poincare.

A few days earlier, M. Poincare had written the following message to the Revue Catholique des Idees et de la Foi: "At the time when festive Belgium is preparing to ring her joyous carillons to celebrate the priestly jubilee of noble Cardinal Mercier, I wish to bring my respectful and grateful tribute to the illustrious prelate who, in the hour of the heaviest anguish which has