

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum. United States and Europe—\$2.50.
 Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.
 Editors—Rev. James T. Foley, D.D., Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.
 Associate Editor—H. P. Mackintosh.
 Manager—Robert M. Burns.
 Classified Advertising 15 cents per line. Remittance must accompany the order. Where CATHOLIC RECORD box address is required send 10 cents to prepay expense of postage upon replies.
 Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.
 The Editor cannot be held responsible for unsolicited manuscripts. Every endeavor will be made to return rejected contributions when stamped addressed envelopes are enclosed.
 The CATHOLIC RECORD has been approved and recommended by Archbishops Falconio and Sbarretti, late Apostolic Delegates to Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

LONDON, SATURDAY, DEC. 13, 1924

THE EVOLUTION OF PRIVATE JUDGMENT

When the Protestant Reformers discarded the divine authority which Christ committed to His Church they transferred it to the Bible; but they denied, at least in theory, any authoritative interpretation of the Scriptures. Private judgment alone was considered sufficient to interpret the Word of God. It mattered not that such a principle ran counter to all human experience, nor that it immediately bred clashing and conflicting sects. Some authority there must be in religion, and since the authority of the Church was denied, the authority of Holy Scripture was declared supreme and final. And this supreme and final authority each individual has the right to interpret for himself or herself. To this principle of Private Judgment all Protestants still adhere—at least in theory. It is the basic principle of Protestantism, its very foundation.

Nowhere in the world or in the history of the world has there ever been a country that adopted such a principle with regard to its laws, or to any law. Judges and tribunals have ever been found necessary to interpret and apply the law. If each and every individual were furnished with a printed copy of a law and given the right to interpret it according to his own private judgment chaos would soon ensue. Conflicting claims as to property or anything else would lead to searching of the written law which each claimant would wrest to the destruction of the other; to never-ending dispute.

That is precisely what private judgment has brought about amongst Protestants in matters of religion. If the disputes are less acrimonious than they used to be, it is because religion has come to be regarded by millions as a matter of little importance, if not of complete indifference; and the Bible itself as interesting, instructive literature, but of no authority even for its professional exponents. A concrete case that points the moral very effectively is furnished by the Baptist Bible Union of North America at its second annual meeting in New York. The membership is composed of Fundamentalists throughout the United States and Canada. The headquarters of this Union have recently been moved from Montreal to Chicago.

It used to be said in extenuation of the multiplicity of Protestant sects that they were all united on fundamentals. Now every Protestant denomination is rent into two factions—the Fundamentalists and the Modernists. And there is war to the death between them.

But we shall let them speak for themselves. The Baptist Bible Union held simultaneous sessions in two New York Baptist churches. At one the Rev. Dr. John Roach Stratton held forth on the topic "Monkey Men and Monkey Morals." He took up the address which John D. Rockefeller, Jr., delivered the previous Sunday morning before the Men's Bible Class of Park Avenue Baptist Church, of which he is Honorary President. Mr. Rockefeller contrasted religion of one hundred years ago with religion today with all his praise for the religion of today. During the course of this address Mr. Rockefeller declared that "adherence to the literal interpretation of the Scriptures is increasingly less possible in view of the discoveries of science." Dr. Stratton thus vigorously criticized his Baptist confere:

"When John D. Rockefeller, Jr., reflects upon the old-fashioned religion and says that this miserable modern thing is better than the religion that made our fathers and mothers saintly, pure and strong, then he is due for a 'come-

back.' Mr. Rockefeller has opened himself wide for just what needs to be said."

"The truth of the matter is that the Rockefeller money is the greatest curse that rests today upon the Baptist denomination. Through the infidel University of Chicago and the unbelieving Union Theological Seminary of this city it is doing more to blight us and blast us than all other forces combined."

"Mr. Rockefeller had a good deal to say last Sunday morning about the warmth and beauty of modern 'religion.' The sort of warmth and beauty that modern 'religion' has is the warmth of a putrid paganism which shows out through bare-legged girls dancing in the sanctuary and through 'bal bleu' affairs chaperoned by Mr. Rockefeller, Jr., and others at the Ritz-Carlton Hotel. He is one of the pitiful array of worldly minded protagonists who have usurped the places of leadership in the religious drama of the times."

"In order to offset the silly sentimentality and empty optimism of Mr. Rockefeller concerning what he thinks is the blessed influence of modernism and the new religion I will in my sermon next Sunday evening point out the real conditions in the world today."

"I would to God that John D. Rockefeller, Jr., might open his eyes to conditions as they really are and consecrate his millions to the true service of God through the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ."

"Conditions today are appalling, and are enough to awaken even a self-complacent and somnolent Modernist like John D. Rockefeller, Jr." In the other church where the Baptist Fundamentalists held a simultaneous session the Rev. Dr. William L. Pettingill, head of the School of the Bible, Philadelphia, spoke on "Neutrality in the Present Crisis," and the salient points of his address follow:

"The Baptist Bible Union is a protest against the false gospels of our day. The Word of God pronounced the curse of God upon the preachers of false gospels."

"Sometimes we are told that we ought not to enter into public controversy. It is really wonderful how some people hate a fight. We are told that everything must be done decently and in order and by this it is meant that everything must be quiet and peaceable. But how can we say, 'Peace, peace,' when there is no peace?"

"Baptists have less excuse than any other people in the world for turning from the Scriptures of God. There are other churches with highly developed organizations and with authoritative standards, such as books of church order, books of discipline, etc., but the Baptists have always stood for the one book and that alone. When a Baptist, therefore, loses his Bible he loses all he has, and he loses at the same time all excuse for his existence as a Baptist. There is no reason on earth why there should be a Baptist church anywhere unless that Baptist church means to stand for the word of God."

"Calling one's self a Baptist does not make one a Baptist any more than a man may make himself a Christian by wearing a label. A Baptist is a Christian and a Baptist Christian is a Bible believer."

"We have no personal grievance against our opponents. We are not nursing private injuries. The denial of the gospel of Christ has been open and flagrant; therefore we are compelled to deal with it openly and publicly. We must rebuke them in public in order that the public may know that we protest against this disgraceful desertion of the truth of God. How otherwise can people know but that all the Baptists have deserted the truth?"

"We have entered upon this war knowing that it is a war and not merely a skirmish or a battle."

The press gave publicity to Dr. Stratton's sensational statement that "the Rockefeller money is today the greatest curse that rests on the Baptist denomination." But that is not what interests us. It is the practical working out of the Protestant principle of Private Judgment. Has not John D. Rockefeller, Jr., equal right with John Roach Stratton to interpret the Scriptures?

Have not those preachers whose "denial of the gospel of Christ has been open and flagrant" the same right to their private judgment in the matter as the Rev. Dr. Pettingill?

By what authority does he brand their private judgment anti-Christian?"

The basic principle of Protestantism gives them all an equal right to search the Scriptures and interpret them. And the interpretations clash and contradict as they may, are equally authoritative.

In the light of the Modernist-Fundamentalist war the Catholic position with regard to the Bible stands out as not only logical and necessary, but as the only one consonant with right reason, common sense and human experience.

OLD HUMBUB REVIVED IN FRANCE

By THE OBSERVER

It is good to see the Catholics of France beginning to show a disposition to resist. They have too long allowed the bigots and tyrants of the Masonic lodges to dictate the terms on which they shall live in the country which owes its civilization to the Catholic Church.

One has some respect for a man who oppresses others in an effort to make good his affirmative convictions. But the bigots of France have no such convictions; so at least they say. They pretend to be neutral; they say they are not against the Catholic religion. If they admitted that they were against it they would be in a more respectable position. For then they would be oppressing in the name of a profound conviction.

But what is the world to think of a sect which oppresses others in the name of a mere negation?

That is their position if we take their own word for their position. But all the world knows well that they are not neutral. All the world knows that their measures are not neutral measures. Everyone knows that they are no more neutral than the woman who gave her little boy permission to go swimming on condition that he should not go near the water. It is the pretense of neutrality that reduces the policy of the Government of France to the proportions of a farce, and makes grave and serious-minded statesmen to take on before the world the appearance of farce actors.

What should we say of a government which should say to a physician, we have no objection to your practicing your profession, but we shall not permit you to enter a hospital unless the patient sends for you? The physician might answer, "The patient is delirious and is incapable of sending for anyone; his friends wish me to go and see him; and in any case I am appointed for the purpose of attending people who are sick and who do not know how sick they are." But the government answers, No, in any hospital over which we have control, no physician shall approach a patient unless that very patient sends for him. Would such a government be regarded as neutral in respect of the practice of medicine?

Do the French politicians think that the public opinion of the world has failed to see through the hollowness of the pretext on which they exclude priests from naval hospitals? Perhaps they have persuaded themselves that it makes no difference to them what the public opinion of other countries says about them and their bigoted policy. But it does matter and they will find out that it does. The European pot is not yet empty of the witch's brew of war. There will be war again. Again we shall be asked some day to admire the national motto of France—Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. Some day we shall be asked again to fight for France. The more fools we if we do. The Germans could not possibly have struck a more deadly blow at liberty, equality and fraternity than the French Government is striking at this moment. Canada is being admitted to the councils of the Empire and we shall have something to say as to whom we shall fight for or ally ourselves with in the future.

Meantime the old humbug of disloyalty is being propagated once more in France. The trouble with the Catholics of France is that they are too loyal. They should have put their foot to the narrow-minded tyrants long ago. Here's hoping they do it now. They can have a republic without allowing it to be run by the Masonic sect or by any other sect, and it is time they began to see to it. Ever since the day when the Jews frightened Pilate into giving Christ into their hands

by telling him that he would show himself an enemy to Caesar if he did not do so, the Church has been continually accused of treason. She was regarded as an enemy to the State in Rome and her martyrs went therefore to a bloody death. She has always been accused of treason. In England the fact of being a Catholic was made by the State to stand as presumptive evidence of treason.

Every tyrant who has in the past few centuries in some European country sought to exercise unbridled sway over his people has hurled against the Catholic Church the charge of treason. "Ye are scarce my subjects" said the blood-thirsty Henry the Eighth of England. His dishonest charge was repeated by the tyrants of several European countries; it passed into controversy all over the English-speaking world and one hears it yet echoing from sections that are remote from education and civilization. The charge was made in Mexico ten years ago. The Ku Klux Klan are making it today in the United States and the Orangemen in Canada.

But all these bullies and liars and tyrants are respectable compared with the Government of France, for this reason—they were and are all devoted to the establishment of an affirmative proposition; and that lends them a gravity despite the lack of logic in their contentions.

It has remained for the rulers of France of the past and the present generations to take a position before the world which has all the vice of the tyrants of other nations without the offsetting respectability of conviction upon an affirmative proposition. Other tyrants have never pretended to be neutral. They did not persecute upon a mere negation.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

SURMOUNTING EVEN international relations the cost of living question is still to the fore in Britain. The Ministry of Labor Gazette for November affirms that the average level of retail prices of the commodities taken into account in the statistics of that Department is approximately 80% higher than that of July, 1914, as compared with 76% a month ago, and 75% a year ago. The rise in the percentage in October is, it is declared, due solely to increases in the prices of food-stuffs. For food alone the average increase over the pre-war level was on November 1st, 79%, as compared with 72% on October 1st, and 73% a year ago.

SMITHFIELD (that is, London market) prices of certain classes of beef, mutton, lamb and pork advanced from 2d to 4d per pound on November 16th, and, according to the Daily (London) Mail, a further advance is almost certainly pending. So with bread—it was stated by the London Master Bakers' Society that the rise in the cost of flour more than absorbs the rise in the price of bread, and that a 4 pound loaf, which is now 10d, should be 10½d. It is generally expected in the trade that it will eventually pass that figure.

A CURIOUS light is thrown upon the position of the consumer in regard to fruit and vegetables. Apples which are very largely imported have already undergone advance in price, but this is said to be due to the falling-off of imports from the United States—this falling-off being no less than 20,000 barrels. In this connection one is inclined to ask if the Canadian product does not figure at all in the British market? And what of preferential trade relations? Potatoes are being sold in Liverpool at 5 lbs. for 8d., although the retailer buys at about 8 shillings per cwt. The consumer, therefore, pays about double the price realized by the wholesale dealer—a condition which, to say the least, would bear government scrutiny. It may be seen, therefore, that with the cost of living still rising six years after the return of peace, and the scale of unemployment unreduced in proportions, the Baldwin Government are confronted with a problem of the first magnitude.

FOLLOWING UPON the outbreak of intolerance in Scotland over the holding of an out-door Procession of the Blessed Sacrament at Carfin, Lanarkshire, a Catholic community, the opinion was expressed in these columns that repeal of certain antiquated and outworn statutes governing the matter was likely to be the result. This, as events

prove, is what has actually come to pass. Some weeks ago—prior to the late election—a private bill with, as is announced, Catholic and High Church backing, was introduced in the House of Commons, abolishing certain legal disabilities under which Catholics have continued to labor as relics of a benighted past. Although these prescriptions had long since become dead letters, practically, they were capable of invocation, and, as the event in Scotland proved, were actually invoked by mean and fanatical persons.

WE HAVE not heard if the bill referred to has passed through all the necessary stages, but if it has, or when it does, the way will have been paved for the abolition of that last remaining relic of an ugly past, the exclusion of a Catholic from the Throne. But apart from this the Bill would abolish the Act of Edward VI. which forbids Catholic books of ritual to be even kept within the Realm; the Act of George III. which prevents a Catholic priest from officiating in a place of worship with a bell and bell tower, or wearing priestly vestments outside a church or private house. It will also repeal the Act of Elizabeth which penalizes religious orders and declares trusts on their behalf to be void; also an Act of 1791 which declares unlawful all societies of persons professing the Catholic religion. Every one of these have remained on the statute books, and as such were part of English law. Notwithstanding, they have been infringed daily, and no one, save fanatics of the extremist type, but would have regarded their enforcement other than as a legacy of a time which enlightened Englishmen would fain forget. The little band of bigots in Scotland have thus, little as they intended, rendered a service to the cause of good government and incidentally (if we may be pardoned a lapse into the vernacular) "spilt the beans."

ANTICLERICALISM

DISGUSTS SELF-RESPECTING NON-CATHOLIC FRENCHMEN

Special Correspondent Edinburgh Catholic Herald

Paris, Monday, Nov. 10.

The attitude of the present French Government towards the Church is resented not only by the Catholics, whose rights and liberties are menaced, but by every fair-minded non-Catholic, and even by numerous unbelievers. Every honest citizen respectful of the rights of his neighbors—however he may disagree with his Catholic fellow-countrymen on questions of religion, education, and philosophy—is disgusted by the gratuitous revival of an aggressive anti-clericalism, not only unwarranted, but calculated to gravely compromise the interests of the country.

Many who, in principle, are partial to Separation realize with shame that they are being made morally responsible for an unholy war, engendered by the fanatics of Free-masonry, while audaciously presented in the Radical-Socialist press as a logical development of pure Republicanism and Democracy!

GROWING OPPOSITION

The opposition of such men to measures they notoriously detest has been up to the present somewhat supine indeed. It is likely to make itself really felt in the near future? So, at least, it would seem.

During the last few days there are signs that so-called moderate Republicanism is inclined to vigorously react.

The Democratic Republican and Social Party (of which M. Jonnart is one of the past presidents) have just passed a resolution calling on the Deputies which represent it to resist a policy which, they proclaim, undermines "State authority, discipline, and respect."

THE "TEMPS" SCATHING CRITICISM

The "Temps," which speaks with the authority of a semi-official organ, applauds this awakening. At the same time it publishes one of the most cutting criticisms that has yet appeared in France on the eloquent contrasts of the present Cabinet's acts.

This article merits reproduction. When a writer who scrupulously respects the "lay" laws, and has shown himself frankly hostile to any militant Catholic movement, feels forced to pen the protest given below, the Catholic descriptions of the situation cannot be accused of exaggeration. Here is the article:

"Two Embassies—two different decisions!" he cries. "The Embassy at the Vatican is suppressed; the Embassy in Moscow is resuscitated! Two sorts of Associations—two contrary treatments! The Congregations are not recognized, because they are illegal; the trades unions of public officials are recognized, although they are illegal. "The Government bases the suppression of the Embassy at the Vatican on the pretext that the

Pope has not rendered us any service since it was established. Let us accept for a moment this explanation, erroneous as it is.

"What service has the Soviet Government rendered to us up to the present? The Soviet Government was born of violence and amidst the shedding of human blood. Christianity was born of a gesture of love, with a message of Peace for Humanity."

"The instigators of the Communist movement hoisted themselves to power, the satisfactions and vanities of which they have known. The Creator of Christianity mounted on the Cross, the sufferings and opprobrium of which He has known. The adepts of Muscovite Communism have massacred their adversaries and lived—lived well—for their cause. The Christian martyrs, dying for their faith, blessed their executioners."

THE COMMUNISTIC BOAST

"The politicians hostile to the Embassy at the Vatican have approached the Papacy with exporting Catholic propaganda into this country and interfering in our home affairs. Is it quite sure that Communism will not mix itself up in our domestic politics? Yes, the Catholic religion has sometimes lacked tolerance and sought to impose itself on all peoples (sic). But does not the Communist doctrine, which is almost a religion, if not a fanaticism, pride itself on penetrating into every nation?"

"Is the letter of M. Bakovsky genuine? Is it a forgery? What does it matter; the manifestos of the chiefs of Russian Sovietism openly advocate the creation of 'nuclei' in all the cells of the national organizations everywhere."

OTHER CONTRASTS

"The contrasts are not less accentuated when one compares the lot reserved for the Associations of Public Officials with the treatment applied to the congregations. The Associations of Officials are illegal. The courts have pronounced their nullity on various occasions. By an act of the Executive Power—the 'Prince's prerogative'—and without asking the assent of Parliament, the legality has now been recognized."

"The Associations Law of July 2nd, 1901, in its 13th article, gives the faculty of dissolving the Congregations and compels them to apply for an authorisation, in order to be legally recognized. The law of 1884 on trade and professional unions, by its silence, refuses public officials the right to organize themselves into such unions. In September-October, 1924, this law of 1884 is ignored and violated for the benefit of the public officials. In September-October, 1924, the law of 1901 is applied to the Congregations."

A USURPED LEGALITY

The writer goes on to point out that Waldeck-Rousseau—author of both the Trades Unions and Associations Laws—whom the Radical-Socialists quote as their guide and philosopher, had not, in 1899, "two different sets of weights and measures." He declared in Parliament that any illegal association, whether "lay" or religious, should, without discrimination, be dissolved. "No two-faced justice for him." No penalties for one category of citizens and privileges for another.

"The Radical-Socialist coalition of 1924 accords to the Trades Unions of Officials a usurped legality, in other words a privilege that they refuse to the Congregations."

FRANCE

FRENCH MINISTER LAUNCHES BITTER ATTACK ON CLERGY

By M. Masiani (Paris Correspondent, N. C. W. C.)

It is with little short of stupeor that the public has learned of the speech delivered by M. Francois Albert, Minister of Public Instruction at the Congress held at Valence by the League for Education. This Association has for its object "the propagation and defense of secular education" and is of masonic and anti-clerical inspiration. The president is M. Albert himself, who is a very advanced and aggressive senator. Before becoming a cabinet member, this fanatical member of parliament devoted his activity as a journalist to denouncing what he termed the "encroachments of the clericals," to scanning all the pastoral letters of the bishops and to criticizing all the religious authorities. Having accused the Nuncio, one day, in an organ of the Left, of having prepared the elections, he drew a very formal and even scathing denial.

The speech at Valence is worthy of this past record. Nevertheless it caused a certain amount of surprise, for never, since the days of Combes, has such violent language been used. The difference between this diatribe and Premier Herriot's reply to the letter of the Cardinals is the difference between beer and vinegar.

JESUITS FIERCELY ATTACKED

The theme of the address was the necessity of defending State education. This education M. Albert believes is to be menaced by the Jesuits, who, he declares did every-

thing they liked under the regime of the National Bloc. Not only have they reopened all their establishments, he says, but they are striving to win over by meetings and propaganda the professors and students of the lycées.

Where does M. Albert seek proof of these assertions? In the fact that the university students meet on certain Sundays at Catholic colleges to take part in meetings promoting religious perfection, and in days of prayer and study.

M. Albert accuses the Jesuits of trying to seize the universities and declares that the Government will oppose this action with all its strength. To hear him, it would seem that the Herriot Cabinet wishes to attack the Jesuits alone. He assures us that "the good fathers have only a moderate sympathy for the secular clergy" and he claims that religion should not ally its cause with that of a religious order which, he says, was condemned by the Pope a century and a half ago. Hypocritically, he even went so far as to pretend that he has a high esteem for the clergy of France and that he believes them to be incapable of rising, of their own volition, against the plans of the government, but he represents them as being led on by "an advance guard of Church vagabonds."

Carried away by his polemical spirit, the Minister attacks in turn each of the cabinets of the National Bloc, the former Minister of Public Instruction, Leon Berard, General de Castelnaud, whom he terms "the plenipotentiary of the Society of Jesus" and lastly, what is more serious still, he attacks the Nuncio himself. This is the first time that a cabinet minister has ever attacked a diplomat accredited to this government. He reproaches him "for having departed from the habitual reserve imposed upon diplomatic agents in giving the support of his presence and speech to the Catholic Institute, the rival of the State colleges."

EVOKES MANY PROTESTS

No sooner had this extraordinary language become known than protests were raised on all sides. The opposition press, in reporting the Valence speech, presented it under the heading "A Civil Warfare Speech." Some papers wrote "the remarks of M. Francois Albert are odious and even ridiculous."

Mgr. Beaudrillard, Rector of the Catholic Institute, who was the fellow student and senior of M. Francois Albert at the Ecole Normale Supérieure, has corrected, in a public letter, and with great moderation, the error in giving the minister in attributing to the Nuncio language which he never used.

Lastly, The "Ligue des Droits du Religieux Ancien Combattant" (League for the Defense of the Rights of Religious who fought in the Great War), immediately wrote to the press to protest against the pharisaical manoeuvre tending to separate the Jesuits from the other religious orders. All orders are on a parity, the protest states, and all feel themselves threatened in the same way. It is not only the Society of Jesus, it is the one hundred and forty religious orders which were refused authorization in the time of M. Combes.

As for the secular clergy, it has protested with the same energy. Members of the League of Priests who served in the War, constituted in seventy-two dioceses, have all affirmed their union with the religious who have been attacked. They point out that the Jesuits did not take the offensive, and that the aggressor is the new government which, in its declaration of January stirred the Catholics by announcing the suppression of the embassies to the Vatican, the secularization and the strict application of laws on religious orders. In Parisian political circles, it is believed that the violent speech of M. Francois Albert was a manoeuvre premeditated in masonic circles to force the hand of the Premier and rush hostilities by bringing about a diplomatic incident with the Nuncio. The anti-clericals thus hoped to force the Papacy to make a gesture of protest which would hasten a rupture.

BELFAST PAPERS SUPPRESS TOLERANCE PLEAS

Dublin, Ireland.—Some notable speeches were delivered by Protestant clergymen in Belfast in support of the labor candidate in the west division of the city at the General Election. Rev. A. L. Agnew gave utterance to the following observations:

"All Christian ministers are not against labor. I curse in my heart those people who got it into the minds and heads of their dupes to go out and fight their Catholic fellow-countrymen. The opponents of labor are deliberately trying to set up sectarian strife and murder again in Belfast, and to set Protestants and Catholics against one another. The Protestant religion is said to be in danger. It is false. The only persons who will destroy Protestantism are the ten thousand Yahoos who run after various politicians shouting 'To Hell with the Pope!'"

Rev. Edgar J. Fripp denounced the "fanatical bigotry" of the Unionist Party. He added:

"The Die-Hard Conservatism of Ulster is a discredited and impotent factor in political life."

Rev. J. Bruce Wallace observed: