

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum. United States and Europe—\$2.50. Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D. Editors: (Rev. James T. Foley, B.A., Thomas Coffey, L.L.D., H. F. Mackintosh, Associate Editor—H. F. Mackintosh, Manager—Robert M. Burns.

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 8, 1920

"NURSERIES FOR BUDDING CRIMINALS"

The following despatch was given a very inconspicuous place in the press. That perhaps is not hard to understand. It is only after a good deal of hesitation that we have decided to refer to anything so repulsive, so loathsome; but considering all the circumstances there seems to be good reason for considering the subject in its bearing on our whole educational system.

Saskatoon, April 8.—Declaring our public schools were nurseries for budding criminals, Dr. C. K. Clarke, Dean of the Medical Faculty of the University of Toronto, told 800 teachers in convention here today that upon them fell the duty of saving the race from juvenile delinquency. Speaking particularly of knowledge brought to his attention in Toronto public schools, Dr. Clarke mentioned incidents of thirteen-year-old girls being unmarried mothers, and others of the same age commencing lives of shame. He said that even students of sociology would be shocked with the worst cases which had come to his attention. Even at the tender ages of twelve and thirteen girls were found suffering from venereal diseases. Boys, too, he added were found who had acquired habits associated with most people with only the most hardened moral perversity. He ascribed feeble-mindedness as the biggest contributory factor.

Dr. Clarke is easily the most outstanding medical man in Toronto; and we understand that a weekly clinic, which he was instrumental in establishing, gave him exceptional opportunities to know whereof he speaks. It is inconceivable that he would make such sweeping charges at a great convention of school teachers without realizing to the full their gravity; nor that he would base general conclusions on exceptional cases. We are forced to the conclusion that Dr. Clarke entirely believed in the truth of his charges and in the necessity of stating that truth publicly.

Our concern is not with the Toronto public schools; nor do we desire to insinuate that Dr. Clarke's arraignment went further than he intended; though the circumstances of his grave indictment of public schools as nurseries of budding criminals could hardly be justified if he had Toronto schools exclusively in mind. The teachers of Saskatchewan could draw no other conclusion than that the moral education of Canadian children imperatively demands greater attention.

There is something wrong with the system. In the first place we believe that the assumption that the school alone educates is fundamentally false. Many thinking men and women will readily admit this; but the popular misconception of education is largely responsible for the laxity of the Home and the Church in doing their essential part,—indeed it is not laxity often but utter neglect.

Despite the popular parrot cry of educational progress there is no thinking man or woman who does not recognize that so-called illiterates may be much more highly educated in all the essentials of right living and right thinking than the graduates of our schools. That is no argument in favor of illiteracy; but it is an argument against the popular conception of education.

There is room here for vast improvement in education. If Ministers of religion would concentrate their efforts on developing the sense of parental responsibility as well as on the direct teaching of religion and of morality based thereon, they would contribute far more to educational progress than

they do with their present choice of subjects. For there is no effective teaching of morality that is not based on religion.

And alas, the hold of religion on the masses of the people has become so weakened that this necessarily affects all teaching of morality whether in the school, the home or the church.

Indeed, present day divorce of education from religion is practical unbelief, State-sanctioned. Follows "independent morality," that is morality without religious basis. How utterly impossible this is non-Catholics are beginning to realize.

Serious minded men of no religion are now disposed to agree with that great Pontiff Leo XIII, whose far-seeing vision swept the world and thus depicted what he saw:

"Contemporary unbelief does not confine itself to denying or doubting articles of faith. What it combats is the whole body of principles which sacred revelation and sound philosophy maintain; those fundamental and holy principles which teach man the supreme object of his earthly life, which keep him in the performance of his duty, which inspire his heart with courage and resignation, and which, in promising him incorruptible justice and perfect happiness beyond the tomb, enable him to subject time to eternity, earth to heaven. But what takes the place of these principles which form the incomparable strength, bestowed by faith? A frightful scepticism, which chills the heart and stifles in the conscience every magnanimous aspiration.

"This system of practical atheism must necessarily cause, as in point of fact it does, a profound disorder in the domain of morals; for, as the greatest philosophers of antiquity have declared, religion is the chief foundation of justice and virtue. When the bonds are broken which unite man to God, who is the Sovereign Legislator and Universal Judge, a mere phantom of morality remains; a morality which is purely civic and, as it is termed, independent, which, abstracting from the Eternal Mind and the laws of God, descends inevitably till it reaches the ultimate conclusion of making man a law unto himself. Incapable, in consequence, of rising on the wings of Christian hope to the goods of the world beyond, man will seek a material satisfaction in the comforts and enjoyments of life. There will be excited in him a thirst for pleasure, a desire of riches, and an eager quest of rapid and unlimited wealth, even at the cost of justice. There will be enkindled in him every ambition and a feverish and frenzied desire to gratify them even in defiance of law, and he will be swayed by a contempt for right and for public authority, as well as by licentiousness of life which, when the condition becomes general, will mark the real decay of society.

"Perhaps We may be accused of exaggerating the sad consequences of the disorders of which We speak. No; for the reality is before our eyes and warrants but too truly our forebodings. It is manifest that if there is not some betterment soon, the bases of society will crumble and drag down with them the great and eternal principles of law and morality."

Who today surveying the world without passion and without prejudice will question the fidelity to truth of the great Pope's picture of Christian civilization. He saw in its root-cause that decadence and ruin which we are now witnessing. Leo did not affirm that "from the beginning there was a set purpose of destroying the principle of Christianity in the heart of society;" nor do we attribute malice aforesaid to the authors and promoters of that system of education from which religion was banished.

But education without religion it is which has led a courageous and eminent citizen to declare that our public schools are nurseries for budding criminals.

It is only by the restoration of religion to its all-important place in education that a remedy will be found for the conditions which he deplores.

You cannot gather the fruit of Christian virtue from the tree of practical atheism.

Every day it is becoming evident even to the most prejudiced that the voice of the Catholic Church is the voice of the garnered wisdom of nineteen centuries, even if they do not recognize therein the living voice of Christ speaking through the Church which He founded; and

which is forever guided by the Holy Spirit of God.

And the constant teaching of the Church, the constant practice of her loyal children, is that the divorce of education and morals from religion is an evil which must be avoided at the cost of any sacrifice.

As to feeble-mindedness as a contributory factor to immorality amongst school children we shall have a word to say at another time. Here we may be pardoned if we recall an incident which happened just a few years ago.

A Catholic Bishop in the discharge of his duty as Chief Pastor of the flock committed to his care urged his Italian subjects to send their children to a Separate rather than to a Public school. During the course of his exhortation he pointed out that even so far as secular subjects were concerned more was to be expected from those fully qualified Sisters who had consecrated their lives to the work of educating the young, without hope or thought of reward in this world, than from those who taught for the salary received. The Bishop had not the remotest intention of belittling the work of secular teachers; he wished to make his Italians understand what English-speaking Catholics—yes and English-speaking Protestants too—appreciated fully from experience, that is the single minded devotion of our religious teachers to their work. He wished to allay any fears the Italians might have of inferior teaching in the Separate school. As a matter of interesting fact it may be noted that the Bishop succeeded entirely in his object.

"He blasphemeth!" was the cry raised in the press and elsewhere. Ideas are associated sometimes by contrast. The silence which greets Dr. Clarke is in striking contrast to the outcry which greeted the Bishop.

OTTAWA AND SAN REMO BY THE OBSERVER With the opening of the Conference at San Remo, the divergence between the English and the French views in regard to Germany's non-fulfillment of the Treaty of Versailles, became a most interesting subject before the public in connection with the late War.

Despatches from Ottawa, curiously enough, say nothing as to what Mr. Rowell or Sir George Foster think about the matter; and we must get along as best we can with what we can glean elsewhere. If Canada is having any say in the grave matters at issue, it must be by some mysterious operation of the new sisterhood status, not visible to the ordinary discernment; for, in point of plain fact, it seems quite certain that no one at Ottawa is troubling his head as to whether Germany has two hundred thousand soldiers or two hundred millions; or as to whether she has destroyed her airships or is about to break them up and offer them to France for fuel in place of the coal she agreed by the Treaty to deliver and didn't.

The United States is not out of European politics quite so completely as we are, for the American Secretary of State still writes a letter once in a while; but it does not appear that anyone at Ottawa is even doing that much. And we have not had any George Washington to fall back on, either, when it became prudent to give up "European entanglements."

Now, if we were right in going into the War, and if we are in the least serious about our new place in the British Sisterhood of States, and if we really think we'd like to be in the League of Nations, we might very well have an opinion on the rather hasty smashing by Germany of the freshly-signed Treaty.

We do not say that it would make any particular difference to anybody if we had an opinion. We have no reason to suppose that Mr. Lloyd George, "the Premier of the Empire," as someone called him the other day, would, in any case, sit up past his usual bed-time to wait for a despatch from Mr. Rowell or Sir George. But we are a little concerned for the logic of things.

Just where do we stand, anyhow, in respect of these new responsibilities which we so recently assumed, or tried to persuade ourselves we were assuming? Are we leaving the "Premier of the Empire" to assume our views, and to speak them at San Remo? Are we so easy-going about our new status that we are satisfied to be "incorporated by reference" as lawyers say; or have we anywhere in, about, or around our Government, a policy, or an idea, or an opinion, other than those of Mr. Lloyd George?

Have we any suggestion to make officially? Does anyone know? Ottawa is busy with many things. Great Britain and France have recently come rather dangerously close to a serious disagreement and the signs are not wanting that Germany is quietly laughing at them; and that she is beginning to reckon that she can get by without carrying out those provisions of the Treaty which are vital to France, and that Great Britain will let her get by.

It is not disputed that the Treaty is broken, in several very important respects. Germany is holding on to her big army; under the pretext of the necessity of repressing Bolshevism. But there is a very marked absence of news of the alleged Bolshevik danger; and it seems clear that we should have plenty news of it if that were the ground of Great Britain's extraordinary indulgence of her violations of the Treaty. The London press and the press agencies would see to that.

Germany is not delivering the coal she agreed to deliver to make up to France for the coal mines she destroyed in northern France. Does the alleged Bolshevik danger account for this also? Or, is the nation of shopkeepers "beginning to think of Germany in terms of trade and commerce?"

These are some of the interesting questions of the moment. There is little light to be had on them; but there is a little. Not, however, from the direction of Ottawa. We are, of course, not expecting the revelation of "diplomatic secrets," though we may doubt whether there are not too many of such secrets just now.

No. We should be a little better satisfied if we knew that Mr. Rowell was conscious of the existence of San Remo; had located it on the map; and was in some sort of touch with "the Premier of the Empire." If we could only be sure that he said to Mr. Lloyd George and that Mr. Lloyd George said to him, something,—anything,—we should feel that at least Canada was not a sister-in-law only; though she might turn out eventually to be only a sister-in-law—sister-in-treaty law, so to speak.

But what is San Remo to Ottawa, or Ottawa to San Remo? That is what we want to know, and if it be too presumptuous to make a demand for actual knowledge, can we not get some sort of shadow of a hint? Sister or Premier of the Empire? We do to Germany, or may prevent France from doing to her, on the score of the quickly-smashed Treaty. We paid our share in the settling of Germany; in coin; and in blood; and in suffering; and in bitter recollections.

Whether we are, or are not serious, about our Sisterhood and about our place in the League of Nations, we can hardly fail to take seriously a situation as real as the smashing of the Treaty of Versailles; at least in the form which the violation has taken.

The future safety of France is the future safety of the world; or we have been wrong all the time since 1914; and have made our sacrifices wholly in vain.

Has Canada a policy, a voice, or an opinion? In the League, or out of the League, we were in the War anyhow; and if the Treaty to which we are supposed to have been a party, is not to be carried out, we have the right to know why not.

CATHOLICITY AND NATIONALITY

Having fallen by their threats to terrify the Irish people, having rejected all their overtures for self-determination, those now in control of the British Empire seek an issue which computes neither with its honor nor its interests nor its self-respect. The issue which they now make, as far as they make any, is, in words, the crushing of all Irish self-assertion and the maintenance of the "integrity" of the British Empire, which in reality means forcing all the overseas Dominions to unite with England's Government in a war against the independence and integrity of the people of Ireland. This is the aspect the question now assumes. It is a policy conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity; and no universal dictatorship self-conferred for the adjustment of the affairs of the whole world will make it as other than most unwise, illiberal, dishonest and unjust. We may be mistaken, but we cannot help thinking that it behooves the British Government leaders to remember that in their oppression of Irish national aspirations they are

encountering the moral anathema of the world over of the great landwehr of the Catholic Church. Watery-brained would be the statesman who would belittle the vague yet vast and ineluctable power here involved. You may crush civil liberty; you cannot muzzle Catholicity. One cannot help commending to their personal experience of that other very representative Prussian, Erich von Ludendorff. ("Ludendorff's Own Story—August 1914, November 1918.")

Following the German conquest of Poland, it had been Ludendorff's ambition to systematically incorporate the conquered people into the "integrity" of the German Empire. He went about it with extraordinary thoroughness, and war conditions afforded him facilities which even Cromwell might have envied. Yet he ran against a "snarl." The Catholic clergy, he says, were the pillars of the Polish and Lithuanian national propaganda. He cannot understand why they were allowed or contrived, even under the Russian knout, to make their religion the bulwark of their nationality. He found the Evangelical clergy on the German side, and he flattered himself that the Catholic priests of Lithuania might be brought to terms, but the Polish and Lithuanian Catholics were most unreasonable; they even had ideas about the education of their own children; they demanded a university at Vilna, but "I refused permission." (The University of Vilna is now an accomplished fact—to the credit of the Republic of Poland.) One is reminded somewhat of the tribute to the "undying" qualities of a nationality impregnated with Catholicity submitted years ago in Lord Durham's Report; at all events, the Prussians encountered in Poland and Lithuania the same adversary that "withstood them to the face" in Belgium, and the impression that disengages itself, now that the smoke of battle has cleared away, is not to the discredit of the Catholic Church.

"Take care," warned Count Beugnot in the French Senate in the crisis when the Papal Nuncio was driven out in 1907, "take care,—the Church is an anvil that has worn out many a hammer."

M. Douclet presented his credentials as Plenipotentiary of the Republic of France to the Vatican. The struggle is over: but British statesmen familiar with the diplomatic history of the War and not wholly ignorant of the developments in Syria and Asia Minor will readily confess that the prophecy of Beugnot was in full measure indeed fulfilled. Let them take heed therefore with regard to Catholic Ireland: "the Church is an anvil which has worn out many a hammer."

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE NUMBER of lawsuits over Government contracts during the War, which are either in the courts or pending, tend to show how great a part King Graft had that time of stress. The world is paying now for the greed and rapacity of the contract manipulator and the profiteer.

A MEMORIAL to the men of Irish regiments who fell in the War is to take the form of a chapel in Westminster Cathedral. No more fitting form could well be conceived, and no more appropriate place selected than in the great cathedral which stands as a mute witness to modern England of the imperishableness of the Faith which in centuries long past made her a Christian nation. Westminster Cathedral is within almost a stone's-throw of the venerable Abbey which, though alienated from its original purpose, also stands as a witness to what England once was. And the Irish memorial in the new Westminster may some day, when the clouds of controversy and misunderstanding have been dispelled, have its own part in directing the footsteps of the nation back into the old paths.

THE BISHOP of Northampton, Mgr. Keating, in a public reception recently tendered to the Catholic soldiers of his diocese, home from the War, called attention to the fact that nearly all of them, from all parts of England, went to the War in its early days. The proportion of Catholics in the ranks in the first and second years of the War was far larger than in the later, showing that they had not waited to be fetched, but had volunteered. They had in this effective way shown their love of country and true patriotic spirit. They recognized

their moral obligation to fight for their country, and they did it willingly and joyfully. Not in noisy declamation but in act and deed they had done their part, and more than their part in the nation's cause. This, the Bishop said, was to their everlasting credit and to the honor of their faith as Catholics. And what was true of England was true of their fellows in the Faith in all the Allied armies.

THE STORY of how an English Franciscan Father piloted a French battleship through dangerous shoals off the coast of Scotland during the War is told by the English correspondent of an East Indian contemporary. Father Alexis Calderbank, Guardian of the Franciscan Monastery at Olton, near Birmingham, was asked to undertake the duties of liaison officer with the French ships in an Allied squadron of British and French war vessels. While in discharge of this duty the squadron was ordered to return to its base at Scapa Flow. When off the coast of Scotland bad weather was encountered and the ships became separated. The French flag-ship on which Father Alexis was serving got into difficulties, and the ship's navigators, not being familiar with the coast, which is very dangerous in rough weather, got out of their course, and were heading for a reef of rocks. In this contingency Father Alexis, who had some knowledge of the coast, informed the ship's commander of his danger and volunteered to pilot the ship into port. This offer being accepted, the priest assumed command, and brought the ship into harbor with perfect safety. For this achievement Father Alexis was thanked by the French Government and had the Cross of the Legion of Honor bestowed upon him.

AS EFFECTIVE a demonstration of the chaotic state of Protestantism as the most cynical philosopher could wish for is afforded week by week by the advertising columns in Saturday issues of the big city dailies. In the Toronto Star of April 24th, for example, no less than twenty-four specific brands of Christianity are offered for the detection of the public, with perhaps a dozen more, framed by nameless aggregations, each of which claims to have "the real thing" in religion. One such advertisement a short time ago was headed: "We've got the Goods." And the persistency with which some of them press the assurance that they "stand for the old-time Gospel, and a full salvation," so far as it is indicative of anything, may be said to betray consciousness of the apathy of Protestantism in the main from primitive Christian teaching.

IN PLACE of this "Bishop Molony"—save the mark—fresh from China, tells the people of Ontario that a native movement has been started in China, known as the "China for Christ Movement," which, like the big "Forward Movements" on this continent, is to "Christianize China in the next five years." A big contract certainly, for a congeries of jarring sects, still groping for "truth," and stripping Christianity of every vestige of the supernatural in the process. Bishop Molony recommends that a similar movement be started in Canada. But is he not a little late in the day? The good people have been inaugurating "Canada for Christ in five years" movements for at least fifty years, and seem to have produced nothing more than a harvest of the baldest materialism.

ACCORDING to figures published in the Literary Digest the budget of the Interchurch Campaign in the United States for 1920 totals the prodigious sum of \$836,777,572. Of this no less than \$140,788,000 is allotted to the Baptists, which fact is accounted for by John D. Rockefeller's membership in that denomination. The oil magnate's son is indeed vice-chairman of the General Committee. This is what is termed by the same committee, "an expression of spiritual power." Having regard to the materialistic complexion of the age let us rather term it, what it is in effect, a huge financial dolebauch masquerading in the clothes of religion.

The heart into which Jesus Christ enters frequently should be as pure as the foam on a central ocean—far like before it touches the earth, as the living water gushing from the rock, as the sun ray that penetrates foul places and purifies.—Rev. J. Havens Richards, S. J.

SIR BERTRAM WINDLE, F. R. S.

By Canon William Barry, D. D.

I find it is beyond me to read the striking volume of Essays reprinted by Sir Bertram Windle ("Science and Morals," Burns and Oates) without equal gratification and regret. We may take pride in owning a representative author whose attainments in the province of physics give him unquestioned authority, while his devotion to the Catholic Faith is absolute, and his defence of the only sound philosophy in a day of confusion must win converts among men of good will. These distinctions, however, which set Sir Bertram in a place apart, lead me to wonder at the unkindly fate thanks to which he dates, not from University College, Cork, but from St. Michael's, Toronto. We desire the progress of Catholic education in Canada; yet why should it cost Ireland a man of whom I make bold to say that, take him for all in all, his superior does not breathe on Irish soil? What Sir Bertram has accomplished for Cork, for Munster, and for the whole country, would fill many a shining page. To me it has long appeared that he laid deeply to heart the far-flung, coherent, and constructive principles brought to light in Newman's Dublin "Lectures"; not only so, but that, happier than Newman, he was able to build upon them an actual working system, destined to grow in power and extent until Cork College was perfectly fitted to be the University of Munster. On the views of men like Professor Patrick Geddes of Edinburgh and Bombay—views widely accepted—we who aim at repairing of even reconstructing the social order must begin at home, close to the earth and the habit whence we have sprung; and by such methods multiply centres of learning as of life, not sacrifice the provinces to the overgrown Capital. For myself, I am entirely of this way of thinking. I grieve that Cork College is not yet the Southern University, and that Sir Bertram Windle, instead of being acclaimed its first Rector, should now have resigned and crossed the Atlantic. Canada certainly pays him well-deserved recognition.

MISGUIDED SCIENCE—SOCIAL PERILS

How much, in a real sense, we have lost by his migration or exile, these vivid chapters will show. For the man who wrote them is himself a source of energy to be exhausted by no writing. The Essays indeed are admirable fragments; but what, even so, to the abiding converse, the illumination ever ready, of a intellect untouched by pedantries, well balanced in its governing ideas, at once clear and deep? We live, I said, in a time of mental anarchy—Materialist here, Spiritualist there, Agnostics clustering about Bergson for assault, or turning him to a sort of underground shelter. There is fierce fighting over the spoils of Darwin; and Mendel the pious Benedictine abbot who discovered laws where Darwin saw nothing but chance variations, would be smitten with horror could he have anticipated the foul, inhuman policy derived from the experiments by the Eugenists at large. Now Sir Bertram strikes in, not as at blindman's buff, but with choice and effect, singling out positions on which the battle is being fought, and on which he has a whole mass of won or lost. He has intellect, method, style, spirit, all genuine; nowhere an atom of affectation, his own experience giving the sense of reality so often wanting in abstract arguments. There are just these two sovereign issues, or questions concerning the first and last things for us to decide—the supremacy of Mind over Matter, and the absolute rule of Morals over Conduct. He has small company of Doubters (as Bunyan would term them), or even of Deniers, are thronging round the gates of Mansoul, bent on taking our city and beating it flat to the ground. Legions they are of "Chaos and old Night," strangely possessed by a delusion worse than many forms of insanity. By the aid of consummate long continued studies—that is, of most highly wrought reasoning—the very Mind they are using, is nothing but a bye-product of elements, physical and chemical, into the origin and constitution of which Mind does not, and never did, enter. Under no circumstances will these new Mendelians allow that "intellectual determination" is required to account for the order of things on which they are insisting against the chance variations of a Darwinism now rapidly falling out of date.

PHYSICAL SCIENCE NOT THE GUIDE OF LIFE

Having thus put from them belief in a Creative Mind as "the market metaphysics," in plain words, as an indefensible falsehood, these prophets of the New Life begin by laying down a doctrine of Death, writing as its title "Survival of the Fittest." That is the first and greatest Commandment; and the second, a rather terror-stricken one, is "Thou shalt slay the 'Link.'" It is the way Eugenics comes to be Mendelism armed with a sword. "It will be very surprising indeed," we hear Professor Bateman calmly saying, "if some nation does not make trial of this new power. They may make awful mistakes, but I think they will try." To all such aberrations Sir Bertram opposes the Gospel, which has at once raised and consecrated the rational idea of the Family. The physical science can never be the right Rule of Life; that "Nature," thus conceived, is neither moral nor immoral, but indifferent; that the revolt from Religion has