

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum. United States and Europe—\$2.50. Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, LL. D. Editors (Rev. James T. Foley, D. D. 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. 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 Sharrett, 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, OCT. 3, 1925

UNMASKING THE ISSUE

At the meeting of the grand dragons and titans of the Ku Klux Klan held at Buckeye Lake, Ohio, in the last week of August, the mask was taken off the issue raised in the Dayton, Tenn., anti-evolution teaching trial. The Klan has now claimed that issue as its own. Some of the Klan leaders attending the assembly at Buckeye Lake, according to the Associated Press report, announced it to be the intention of the Klan immediately to begin a campaign "to awaken the American conscience to the need of reverting to the religion of our fathers and mothers." The means by which the Klan hopes to bring about this reversion is the compulsory teaching of the Bible in the Public schools according to the interpretation of the Fundamentalists. There was a forecast of this national purpose of the Klan in the announcement recently made by the so-called Patriotic Welfare Committee of Virginia of its intention to have introduced into the Virginia Legislature at the coming session an anti-evolution teaching law, patterned after the Tennessee statute for violating which John T. Scopes was tried and convicted at Dayton. Represented in the Patriotic Welfare Committee are the Sons and Daughters of Liberty, the Patriotic Order, Sons of America; the Patriotic Order of Americans (a women's order), the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, the Daughters of America, the Order of Fraternal Americans, and the Junior Order of United American Mechanics. Patriots all! One not well informed about the strength of undercurrents in the United States would be inclined to think on reading the above impressive roster of organizations supporting the proposed Virginia statute that the movement which put itself into the limelight at Dayton was gaining in momentum and power. The fact, however, is otherwise. In nearly all sections of the country the forces of intolerance are being defeated at the polls and are being disintegrated. The attempt which will be made in Virginia, and in other States, to secularize the public education, therefore, does not signify an increase of influence for the forces of bigotry, but represents a last despairing effort to effect by law and force what could not be achieved by fiery crosses, hoods, night shirts, and other forms of persuasion. Having failed in their attempt to abolish the private schools by the policy which they sought to inaugurate in the State of Oregon, and, if it had been successful, planned to extend to other States, the forces of intolerance—what is left of them—are now boldly endeavoring to Protestantize the Public schools. Even though it be conceded that some who were prominently identified with the prosecution of Scopes at Dayton were not animated by intolerant motives, but were honestly striving, as they thought, to protect revealed religion from the assaults being made upon it by atheists and evolutionists, it should now be apparent that the primary purpose of most of those who are supporting this character of legislation is sectarian. That, we think, should be evident from the character of support the proposed anti-evolution teaching bill in Virginia is openly pledged. The special brands of patriots who are to push the Virginia bill have never been concerned, up to this time, about evolutionists and atheists. Their bogey has ever been the political "menace" to the United States of Catholics, Jews and Negroes. So when they get behind an anti-evolution teaching measure, it may be taken for granted, we believe, that they see in it the possibility of

advancing the cause to which from their beginning they have been committed and which has held them together. No one should be deceived about their purpose, and no one, we think, will be. However, as the mask now taken off the issue in Virginia may be put on again for expediency's sake when like legislation is proposed in other States, it is advisable that all Americans who treasure the tradition of religious liberty should have a very clear conception of the possible consequences of such legislation affecting religion and evolution as has been enacted in Tennessee, and is now proposed in the Commonwealth which enjoys the distinction of having given more Presidents to the United States than any other. It was the contention of those who supported the Tennessee anti-evolution law in the Dayton trial that they were defending their religion from an insolent minority that was attempting to discredit it by teaching in the Public schools a theory of the origin of man not consistent with the Biblical account of Man's creation. They resented the suggestion that the Tennessee anti-evolution law was in any degree intolerant. They argued that it is not unduly arbitrary for the State that pays the bills to prescribe the curriculum of its schools or make regulations governing the teachers in its employ. It is strange indeed that the lawyers for the defense did not take issue with this contention of the prosecution that the anti-evolution law represented the law of the majority in Tennessee. What basis did the prosecution have for that assertion? Certainly not the religious statistics of Tennessee. The United States religious census for 1916 gives the total adherents of all religious denominations in Tennessee as 840,183. This total includes the Roman Catholics (23,015), for whom, of course, the prosecutors would not claim that they had any authority to speak. The United States census for 1920 gives the population of Tennessee as 2,337,885. Allowing for the increase in population since 1916, when the religious census was taken, it must be clear that those who profess any religion in Tennessee are in a minority according to the census figures. It was pure presumption on the part of the prosecutors of Scopes to assert that they were speaking for a majority. Their answer to the census figures of Tennessee quoted above probably would be that the action of the Legislature must be taken as reflecting the will of the majority. But our prohibition experience has taught us how false such an assumption would be; for did not the Legislatures of California and Missouri ratify the Eighteenth Amendment after the people of those States at the general elections had voted down prohibition? But even if the prosecutors of Scopes had been warranted in assuming that they were speaking for a majority in Tennessee when they sought to have the court uphold the validity of the anti-evolution law, there would still be a serious flaw in their reasoning. It does not follow logically, as they apparently thought it did, that because a State that pays bills has a right to prescribe a course of study for its Public schools and to make regulations governing its employees, it is also justified in using the Police Power to enforce that law. There is a vast difference between insisting upon a certain teaching in the Public schools and prohibiting the employment of any teacher who gives an objectionable course of instruction, or refrains from giving a course which the school authorities desire to be given, and making the failure of the teacher to obey the rule of the school board a violation of law for which penalty is provided. A man may have a perfect right to prevent the intrusion of a stranger into his home and to insist that the intruder get out, but the right to eject the intruder does not include the right to impose a fine and imprisonment, nor does the State have such right unless the entering be with felonious intent. It is questionable whether any commonwealth, any more than any individual, has the right to use the Police Power of the State to safeguard itself against offensive action which can be curbed by peaceful process. The fact that the Tennessee anti-evolution statute declared that it shall be "unlawful for any teacher in any of the Universities, Normals and other Public schools

of Tennessee, which are supported in whole, or in part, by the public funds of the State to teach any theory that denies the theory of the origin of man as taught in the Bible and to teach instead that man has descended from a lower order of animals" does not make the evolution theory criminal in essence. The theory of evolution not being criminal in essence, the Tennessee statute is nothing more than an expression of the Tennessee Legislature's will with regard to the teaching of the theory in the Public schools of Tennessee. Public opinion in other States upholds the teaching of the theory as a theory. Tennessee by its statute merely recorded a conflict of opinion and of purpose. No act of a Legislature can make criminal a thing which is not criminal in its nature, and the use of the Police Power of the State to enforce any viewpoint would seem an unwarrantable invasion of liberty. The Tennessee statute, if upheld, might indeed prove a very serious infringement of individual and minority rights. If the Tennessee Legislature can impose a penalty on anyone who teaches the theory of evolution in its Public schools, it could impose a penalty for the teaching of any theory to which its members did not subscribe, and thereby conceivably not only corrupt public opinion, but endanger the liberty and property of citizens dissenting from its views. That would open the way to every possible violence of bigotry. For instance, if the State's right to penalize certain teaching in the Public schools be upheld, what is to prevent the extension of that authority to the Private schools? In this view—which we think is the right and sensible view—one may be in complete agreement with the late Mr. Bryan in his respect for and faith in the Bible, and yet be wholly at variance with him in the means he would have employed to promote that respect and increase that faith. It was to safeguard individuals and minorities from invasion of their natural rights by State Legislatures that there was inserted in the Fourteenth Amendment of the Federal Constitution the following clause: "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." Does the Tennessee statute, penalizing as it does the teaching in its Public schools of a theory which is not only not criminal in character, but which many, however misguided, hold to be the most plausible theory of Creation, constitute an abridgement of the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States guaranteed them under the Federal Constitution? That is the real issue of the Tennessee case—the issue which the United States Supreme Court will decide. Until the Supreme Court shall decide finally the issue raised by the Tennessee law, it would be the part of wisdom, we think, for the Legislature of Virginia to refrain from enacting similar legislation. Virginia has great traditions of religious liberty to preserve. James Madison, the "father of the Constitution," was still a young man when the Virginia convention of 1776 was held to adopt a constitution. George Mason presented to the convention for its adoption a declaration which he had drawn up on the subject of religious liberty. The Mason declaration provided that "all men shall enjoy the fullest tolerance in the exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience, unpunished and unrestrained by the magistrate." Madison saw the fundamental error contained in these words and opposed the Mason resolution. According to his belief there properly could be no recognition of religious rights by tolerance; no man could properly be granted permission to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience, for this was every man's right. Very early in his youth Madison had listened to several Baptist preachers from the windows of the cell in which they were confined because of their religious opinions, and this experience imbued him with a hatred for religious intolerance which continued with him through-

out life. It was Madison who, when the Virginia assembly met in the autumn of 1785, took advantage of the reaction which had set in against State interference with religion to introduce and bring about the passage of Jefferson's famous religious liberty bill, which had lain dormant since 1779. It was by the authorship of this bill and of the Declaration of Independence, and by the founding of the University of Virginia that Jefferson himself hoped to be remembered by posterity, these three acts being the only three distinctions of his life which he included in his self-prepared epitaph. Is Virginia disposed to disregard the wisdom of its world-famous statesmen to follow the advice of its kleagles and dragons?—N. C. W. C. Catholics of Canada follow with sympathetic interest the school troubles of their co-religionists in the States. But there is something more than sympathy or interest in this matter. Protestantizing the Public schools is something that is not confined to the States, but touches us here at home. Compulsory Bible reading from the Protestant version of the Bible is something to which Catholics have as much reason to object as Protestants would have if the Catholic version were imposed by law on Public schools. Again, the Protestant canon differs from the Catholic. And underlying all such legislation and practice is the assumption that the Bible is the all-sufficient rule of faith and guide in morals—which is the essence of Protestantism and the negation of the fundamental principle of Catholicism. Our Protestant friends are not only willing but insist that the State control education—provided that they control the State. But if the Public schools are to be Protestantized, the whole question must be dealt with straightforwardly and above board. So treated Catholics and Protestants might come to a mutually satisfactory working agreement. Public schools can not be both Protestant and neutral at one and the same time.

HUMILITY DENIED ITS PLACE

By THE OBSERVER. We are taught that the proud man has poor chances of entering the Kingdom of Heaven. And there is no doubt whatever about that. But, if we were to form our idea of the way to merit eternal happiness by accepting the dicta of the average person who lives in this world, we should have to think that the way to please God was to swell ourselves up with pride. What is our literature mainly about? It is concerned with pleasure, with profit and with pride. And pleasure and profit, both, tend to promote pride. The main aim and end of almost all our written matter outside of religion, is to glorify pleasure, to show how to make profit, or to increase mankind's admiration for the miserable carcass which the worms shall eat. Socially, there is nothing with which mankind are so concerned as in pulling one too many for someone else. The man who thinks well of himself is admired, provided only that he does not in so many words sing his own praises. Fathers and mothers in the presence of their children are heard to say that the wise thing to do in this world is to assert oneself, to make big claims for one's own merits or supposed merits. It is a vicious circle, in which cause becomes effect and effect becomes cause. People say that you will not be thought of unless you advertise yourself; and so, professional men vie with the makers of quack medicines in advertising their little successes. Point out to them that by this course the cheapest self glorification becomes substituted for real merit, and they will agree with you; but, they say, this is an age of advertising, and if we remain silent no one will think of us. Thus, the popular philosophy of the times is one of self-glorification and pretence. Men are not good witnesses in their own cases; and when they undertake to state their own merits they will of course exaggerate those merits. It becomes a competition in self-praise. We whirl around and around the vicious circle. A man thinks he must sing his own praises, and proceeds to do so. His neighbor thinks that because it is the fashion to advertise, though he dislikes the practice, he must follow suit.

Pleasure, profit and pride; and they, all put together, mean the increase of selfishness. They mean also the increase of shallowness and pretence. Young men come to rely, not on what they know and can do, but on the impression they can make on others as to what they can do or what they know. Humility is denied its place. Pleasure, profit and pride shove it out of men's minds, and by increasing the love of ourselves prevent the acquisition of its virtue. Pride is essentially selfish, because it is based on the love of self. Ninety of every hundred writers whose productions are before the public are busily engaged in making mankind think better and better of themselves; whereas what is most urgently required by mankind is that they should think less of themselves. Out of pride, pleasure and profit come all the ills that are in the world. From wars that devastate continents and nations to family quarrels that only affect a few persons, all man's ills can be traced to profit, pleasure and pride. Humility is the cure for a million evils, and mankind are so far from intending to try that cure that every year we live the world-wide chorus of self-praise swells ever louder. When we have nothing to say for ourselves for a moment, and we are seldom without something to say in our own praise, we gratify our pride in vicarious ways, by praising or listening to others praise our country, our race, our profession or our business. If we have no personal interest on hand for the moment we form an association of some sort to snatch a fraction of a composite laudation. We can point out to the world what the association of this or the society of that has done and will do for the world. We can boost ourselves as a municipal community and extol the value of our particular patch of rocks and weeds as a factor in the world's work and future. Pride, profit and pleasure—aye, they have devotes enough, but where is the humility taught by Jesus Christ?

NOTES AND COMMENTS

"SURELY the shade of John Knox must be troubled by the number of women delegates and others now flocking to the League of Nations assembly at Geneva," remarks the Edinburgh Weekly Scotsman. For it was at Geneva that the Scottish Deformer wrote his famous diatribe "First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women," declaring that "to promote a woman to bear rule is repugnant to nature, contumely to God, a thing most contrarious to His approved will and ordinance, and the subversion of all equity and justice." THIS SHAFT was directed mainly against Queen Mary, but, what Knox failed to calculate upon, it was taken by Elizabeth as personal to herself, and was the occasion of great offence to that worthy individual. Knox soon found this out to his sorrow, and the way he "crawled" (if we may be permitted the use of this latter-day parlance in this connection) when later he found it to his interest to curry favor with the English Queen sheds an interesting sidelight upon his character. Bess, nevertheless, though willing to employ him in her fell designs against Scottish independence, never ceased to regard him with contempt and aversion. Presbyterians are fond of quoting the Regent Morton's apostrophe of Knox as "he who never feared the face of man." His bullying of Queen Mary, on the one hand, and his obsequiousness to Elizabeth on the other, may be taken as instances of his exercise of this quality. The Edinburgh Scotsman gives a humorous turn to the episode by affirming that Knox actually wrote his "Blast" with his mother-in-law staying in the house. ONE of the "new" Saints of this Jubilee year is that beautiful character, John Baptist Vianney, known to all the world as the Curé d'Ars. The devotion of the late Pope Pius X. to the Curé, whom he so greatly resembled in character, is also well-known. During the whole of his pontificate this saintly Pope devoted himself to the Curé's "cause," and when on January 8th, 1905, he was able to pronounce the decree of beatification he considered it the happiest day of his life. In this connection an interesting anecdote

comes to us from a Roman correspondent. IT SEEMS that one of the Cardinals had used his influence towards inducing the Pope to place the parish priests of the world under the patronage of Blessed Bellesini, an aged parish priest of Genazzano, a town some thirty miles from Rome, though Pius X. had already placed the parish priests of France under the patronage of the Curé of Ars. In an audience accorded by His Holiness to a delegation of French priests two days after the beatification, the subject was broached again by the Cardinal, but the Pope, we are told, was not moved by his pleading. He pointed out to His Eminence that Blessed Bellesini had been a member of a religious Order, whereas the real parish priests are of the secular clergy, who by vocation, and in a definite manner are dedicated to parish work. Of such was the Curé of Ars. "THEN, HOLY FATHER," insisted the Cardinal, "give Blessed Bellesini as Patron of the parish priests of Italy." "I believe," replied the Pope, "that the parish priests of Northern Italy, of whom I was once one, want the Curé of Ars as their Patron." "Well, at least, Holy Father, give Blessed Bellesini as Patron to the parish priests of Rome." "The parish priests of Rome, Your Eminence," replied the Pope, "are worthy of all consideration. But is not this sufficient reason for placing them under the patronage of the Curé of Ars?" And so the parish priests of the whole world were placed under the patronage of their saintly brother of Ars. How it would have rejoiced the heart of Pius X. to have performed the crowning act of canonization! THAT PIUS X. himself will in due time be raised to the altar is the general opinion in Church circles in Rome. As weeks go by, we read, the call to that end becomes more insistent. Requests from bishops, priests and lay people have poured in from every clime, and this on the principle "Vox Populi, Vox Dei," is in the eyes of the Holy See one of the strongest arguments for canonization. AMONG the latest to join in this universal call for this saintly Pope's beatification are the Bishops of Korea, in far China, and the Hierarchy of Scotland, the latter, through Archbishop Mackintosh of Glasgow, having forwarded a petition to Rome to this effect. A third petition came from the Director and Assistants General of the Confraternity of the Sacred Heart, which bore the signatures of those officials for France, Poland, Belgium, Ireland, India, Spain, Germany and Switzerland. There are few Popes in the long line of Peter's successors who have so won their way to the hearts of the people. A beautiful character, which never lost its simplicity and purity, Pius X. stands in a place peculiarly his own in the history of the Church. RELIC OF SAXON DAYS PASSES London, Eng.—St. Olave's Church in Tooley Street, London, which stands on the site of a church built in Saxon times in honor of the saintly King of Norway, is being demolished, and the bodies of Catholics buried in the little churchyard are being removed to another cemetery a few miles outside the city. St. Olave (or Olaf), King of Norway, was a pagan when he made an incursion into England, but after sailing up the River Thames with his fleet, formed a friendship with the Saxon King Ethelred and was converted to Christianity. At that time London was in the hands of the Danes, who had fortified London Bridge. King Olave attacked the bridge and destroyed it. This victory mainly contributed to the restoration of Ethelred. King Olave returned to his own country filled with religious zeal and endeavored to convert his people to the Faith. They revolted, and the king was mortally wounded in battle. When the news of his death reached London, the citizens decided to erect five churches in his honor, and one was built in what is now Tooley Street, on the spot from which he set forth to do battle with the Danes. Ultimately this building fell into disrepair, owing to its proximity to the river. A second church was erected in 1740, but was subsequently destroyed by fire. The present church was built eighty years ago. In accordance with a bill passed by Parliament, the little church-yard is to become a public garden.

CALLES' WAR ON RELIGION IS PART OF HIS PLAN FOR SOVIETIZATION OF MEXICO

WANEFUL RESULTS OF POLICY ALREADY IN EVIDENCE. By Charles Phillips (Special Correspondent, N. C. W. C.) VIII. Mexico City, Sept. 18.—The war against religion in Mexico is more than a religious war. It is a social war. Its protagonists have more in mind than the mere persecution of the Church. The simple closing of churches and schools and the disfranchising of priests will not satisfy them. What they aim at is the destruction of the whole social fabric of civilization which Christian philosophy has built up through the ages. In short, the manifest hope and object of the present government of Mexico is to sovietize or Russinize Mexico. The persecution of the Church is only a logical outgrowth of the larger scheme which they have at heart. The Great War of our present age, the war between "red" Internationalism, as represented by the Bolsheviki movement, and "white" Internationalism, as represented by Christianity, is for the moment simply transferring its operations from Russia to Mexico. CALLES A BOLSHEVIK It is a public fact that the president of Mexico, Señor Calles, is a Bolsheviki. Of Oriental blood—he is half Arab—he is in full sympathy with the ideals of the Russian "Mongolists." He is a warm admirer of the Lenin theories, of which he has long been a student. Just how close is his contact and relationship with the Third International at Moscow is not known, nor how directly he operates under Soviet inspiration or instructions. But all over Mexico there is a common rumor of a mysterious visit made by Calles to certain parts, unknown of Europe, a rumor which is invariably whispered with a rising inflection on the query, "Where did he go, whom did he see?" The query remains unanswered, but in the meantime the Sovietization of Mexico goes on. And it goes on in a manner so manifestly modeled on the Russian style that there can be no doubt as to the purpose of Calles and his government. That purpose is the Russification of Mexico, and it is being pursued not alone because Calles is in sympathy with such an idea, but also because, to secure the office which he now holds, he made certain promises to the radical element of Mexico which political expediency now obliges him to fulfill. Perhaps, too, since it is well known that generous funds of Russian gold are being expended in Mexico for propaganda, Calles finds that he must make a showing for Soviet approval. In the fulfillment of his purpose of Russianizing Mexico the destruction of the church is inevitably part and parcel of the plan. In a Soviet State there can be no such thing as a free church. If a church exists at all it must be a nationalized tool of the government. PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS TRAMPLED ON But there are other details of the Sovietization of Mexico which must be considered, although in the long run these have an absolute relation to the persecution of the church. One of these details is the confiscation of large landed estates or "haciendas." A scheme of this kind, however, cannot be worked without, first of all, an attack being made on the existing social order, on the social ideas at present obtaining among the people. The idea of private property, for example, must be exploded; that means that the idea of private property rights must be destroyed. Therefore, in various parts of Mexico today we have the spectacle of imported communistic agitators working among the masses to inflame them against Christian ideas of morality and of individual rights. Inevitably the favorite method is to attack first of all the Church, the sole moral teacher and mentor of the people; to revile the priesthood, to impregnate the minds of the people with the idea that the church is their oppressor, the clergy their tyrant, the Pope their master, religion a narcotic, and so on. All the "old stuff," all the propaganda used during the past eight years in Russia, is being disseminated here in Mexico today, especially in the smaller towns and rural sections. HOW LAND CONFISCATION IS WORKING OUT Purely from a material point of view the scheme of land confiscation now being worked out by the Mexican Government means eventual disaster, agricultural paralysis, to the country. While most people here agree that something should be done to reclaim large acreages not now being cultivated and to give the poor a more personal interest in the land, I have yet to find one person who approves of the manner in which the problem is being met. As it is being worked out now, the movement toward land proprietorship among the poor is almost entirely artificial. In the State of San Luis Potosi, for example, where I made research into the agrarian situation, I found that in numerous cases peasants were forced