

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum. United States and Europe—\$2.00. 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. 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 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.

In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mr. M. J. Dwyer, 171 Union St. In Montreal, single copies may be purchased from J. Milloy, 241 St. Catherine St. West. In Ottawa, Ont., single copies may be purchased from J. W. O'Brien, 11 Nicholas St. In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be purchased at McLeod's Bookstore. In Glace Bay, N. S., single copies may be purchased at McLeod's bookstore.

The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and canvass for the CATHOLIC RECORD: General Agent—Stephen Y. James, George J. Quigley, Miss Bride Saunders, Resident Agents—H. Chamberlin, Hillside Ave., Ottawa West; Phono Sherwood 238 W. J. McLean, 2363 Mance St., Montreal; Miss Anne Hogan, Hulton P. O., St. Vital, Man.; John H. O'Farrell, 113 Carter Ave., Quebec City; Thos. Lavelle, 531 Casgrain St., Montreal.

LONDON, SATURDAY, FEB. 16, 1924

BISHOP MANNING AND THE MODERNISTS

Thoughtful Catholics do not rejoice in the disintegration of Protestant Churches and they see with deep sorrow the growing tendency on the part of ministers to reject altogether the supernatural in religion. Though they may not have the fulness of truth one would have to be blind not to see the influence for good exercised by those retaining their belief in Jesus Christ the Eternal Son of God and the Saviour of mankind. Half a loaf is better than no bread in religion as in other things to which the homely proverb may apply. It is then with a great deal of interest and sympathy that we read Bishop Manning's sermon dealing with those Modernist clergymen of his who vociferously claim the right to deny from their pulpits the basic facts of Christianity. He does not temporize; he does not evade the vital issues raised; he states clearly and unequivocally that the truths called into question "are matters of life and death to the Christian religion."

But we shall let this Protestant Episcopal bishop speak for himself. He begins by referring to differences of opinion on minor questions which were within the sphere of liberty; "but the questions before us now are different."

"They touch the very soul and centre of our faith as Christians. They relate to the person of our Divine Lord Himself, His supernatural birth, His bodily resurrection, His ascension into Heaven. Men are right in feeling the importance of the present questions. These are not matters of doctrinal detail or opinion. They are matters of life or death to the Christian religion. They are the basic facts upon which our faith in Christ rests, without which the Gospel would cease to have reality or meaning."

We know many of our readers will be glad to have the Bishop quoted rather than condensed or summarized, so we shall quote the essential passages.

"In these recent discussions," says Bishop Manning, "three questions have been clearly raised:

"1. Does this Church believe and teach the Gospel of Christ as divinely given from Above, a supernatural revelation from God, which is vital to mankind, and on which the hope of the world depends? Or does this Church regard the Gospel as the product of human reason and speculation?"

"2. Are the ministers of this church under obligation to uphold and teach the Christian Faith as contained in the Creeds and the Scriptures? or are they engaged only in a search after truth and commissioned to teach whatever their own private opinions may dictate?"

"3. What latitude of interpretation have we in our acceptance and teaching of the Church's Creed, and is there some necessary limit to what may legitimately be called interpretation?"

Here it must be admitted that the questions are clearly and fearlessly stated; they are quite as clearly and fearlessly answered:

"No one can be in any doubt as to the answer of this Church to the first question. This Church believes

and proclaims the fact that 'the Jesus of history is none other than God and Saviour, on Whom, and on faith in Whom, depends the whole world's hope of redemption and salvation.'

"With the Apostles, with the New Testament, with the whole Christian Church from the beginning, this Church believes that it was the Eternal One Himself, 'God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God,' 'Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man.'"

Here Catholics will recognize the Catholic faith stated in Catholic terms. Intimately familiar, also, will be the following:

"To reject the supernatural from the Gospel is to reject the Gospel itself. Our religion as Christians is not a matter of mere belief in doctrines, or of assent to intellectual propositions. It is a matter of relationship with the risen and reigning Christ. This is the very meaning of our religion. We believe in Jesus Christ, crucified for our sakes, risen and ascended. We believe in Him not only as He was here on earth, but as He is now at the right hand of God.

"This is the Gospel as this church has received it. This is the Gospel with which the Christian Church is put in trust by her Lord and head, and which she is commanded to preach to all the world."

To the second question Bishop Manning in answer quotes and upholds this extract from the Bishops' Pastoral Letter:

"It is irreconcilable with the vows voluntarily made at ordination for a minister of this Church to deny, or to suggest doubt, as to the facts and truths declared in the Apostles' creed."

Quoting the vows of ordination the Bishop goes on to point out that in addition to them every minister signs this declaration:

"I do believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, and I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrine, discipline and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America."

Whatever be the faith or lack of faith on the part of Modernist ministers it is very difficult to see how, if they retain any regard for the natural virtue of honesty, they claim the right to use Episcopal pulpits to undermine and subvert the creed they have solemnly and freely vowed to uphold and to preach.

Bishop Manning continues:

"This present movement does not mean only rejection of the virgin birth, of this or that miracle of the Gospel. As Bishop Gore has so ably shown, it has its roots in a determined presupposition against the possibility of miracle, against the supernatural as such, and so against the very message of the Gospel as declared in the New Testament. A Christ who was not born of the Virgin, who did not rise in the body on the third day, and who did not ascend into heaven is not the Christ of the New Testament, not the Christ in whom this Church believes and has always believed."

"The Creed is all of one piece. It all centres in the one supreme truth of the Deity of Jesus Christ. We cannot deny or set aside, one of its articles without injuring or endangering the whole. The occurrences of the past few weeks have, I think, helped to make this clear.

"Conferences are being held for the full and careful consideration of these issues. But while these conferences are in progress a statement still more gravely disturbing in its character than those previously made has been sent out from one of our Theological Seminaries in a pamphlet widely distributed. It is there proposed that the Creed of the Church shall now be made permissive, to be believed and taught, or not, as different congregations, or their clergy, may decide. It is difficult to understand how such a proposal can be made by those who are ministers and teachers in this Church. It would seem that those who make it cannot fully realize what it is that they suggest. Why should the Church retain her Creed at all if she is ready to relegate it to a merely optional use?"

"If this Church should cease to hold the truth about Jesus Christ, as declared in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, she would cease to be the same Church that she has always been, she would cut herself

off from her own past and from fellowship with the rest of the Anglican Communion, she would repudiate her heritage as a part of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church throughout the world."

From all of which it is manifest that Bishop Manning does not shrink from clearly defining the Christian faith. That in itself is consoling in view of the fact that too often his Church speaks with a stammering and uncertain voice or is silent altogether when vital questions are in issue, taking refuge often in that dubious boast of "comprehensiveness." The great difficulty is that the Episcopal Church like the parent Church of England has adopted more or less wholeheartedly two antagonistic principles: the Protestant principle of Private Judgment and the Catholic one of a Church founded and commissioned by Jesus to teach in His name and enjoying according to His promise the guidance of the Holy Spirit of God who abides with her forever.

These principles are not only incompatible, not only antagonistic but necessarily destructive of each other.

Bishop Manning has clearly defined the faith of his Church; and we rejoice to read precisely what every Catholic believes with regard to our Lord Jesus Christ, the Creeds and the Gospel.

But the clearer the Bishop's definition the more imperative is episcopal action. Failure to act now will be a graver scandal than the denial of Christian truth by the Modernist ministers in the first place. Such inaction when "matters of life or death to the Christian religion" are at stake would be a confession of impotence or a betrayal of the trust confided to one who believes that he is legitimately charged with the office and duties of a bishop.

WOODROW WILSON

Six years ago President Wilson was the central figure of the world. All nations and peoples and tribes and tongues turned toward him with hope and confidence, with love and reverence. For he was the prophet of the new freedom, the new reign of right and justice which should forever and everywhere prevail over tyranny, injustice and wrong. Politicians and diplomats and those in the seats of the mighty may have regarded him with suspicion and fear; but the common people of the world looked upon him as their prophet and political savior. Their hearts had thrilled in response to his eloquent and noble vindication of their ideals of freedom and justice. Great as the head of a great nation wealthy and powerful in a war-broken world, and infinitely greater as their spokesman and champion wielding their invincible power in the cause of right, Woodrow Wilson seemed destined to bring to the world a new and better political order.

Then failure or apparent failure hurled him from the high place his ideals had won for him. Wounded in the house of his friends, his inadequate plan for world peace rejected by his own people, broken in health, if not weakened in mind, he passed into obscurity.

Mistakes, of course, he made; he was human. But it has always seemed to us that the greatest, the one fatal mistake, was to go personally to the Paris Peace Conference. From Washington he would have exercised a power over the Paris deliberations infinitely greater than he did by his presence in Paris. Some one writes:

"Wilson was in Paris the same man he was in Princeton, Trenton, Washington. Only like the giant in ancient Greek mythology, he had lost part of the strength he had sucked from his home soil and therefore could be overcome and conquered in a to him alien element by people who were far from being demi-gods like Hercules, who lifted up and in the air crushed to death Antaeus, who with his feet on his own ground was invincible."

He failed to achieve all he proposed. That was an impossible task. But he succeeded in a measure that history will appreciate; that the world is already beginning to appreciate.

"Wilson felt, thought and spoke as before him never did the head of a great State. The poorest and mightiest, hushed and awed, hearkened to his word that seemed to sound from the threshold of a new era of purified political morality.

This will come, because it must come."

When it comes history will record the mighty influence of Wilson's ideals in bringing it to pass.

The heartfelt recognition of his greatness by his own countrymen is something much deeper than what his death would have called forth had not the seed of his high ideals and noble effort taken root in the hearts of his own people. Only so also may we account for that recognition which was world-wide.

Countless tributes to Wilson's work filled the press. From them we select, as of especial interest to our readers, one or two from his Catholic fellow-countrymen: Alfred E. Smith, Governor of New York, said in part:

"Woodrow Wilson has passed to his great reward. . . His lofty ideals and his high conception of public duty will always remain a lesson and an example to the youth of all the world until eternity dawns upon it.

"He gave his life to the great Republic just as valiantly as did the men who fell on the field of battle at his command. . .

"His memory will live forever and his deeds will ever make bright pages in American history. A nation bowed in grief receives its consolation from the universal belief that Almighty God in His wisdom and in His mercy solves for the just man all the mysteries of death as life everlasting."

Bishop Molloy of Brooklyn in the course of his appreciation said:

"We recognize the passing of a noble character, who, in accordance with his honest judgment, consecrated his splendid intellectual and moral powers to the welfare of his beloved country and to secure the priceless benefit of justice and peace for all mankind.

"Time alone will afford, of course, a clear and true appraisal of his statesmanship, but we, who have enjoyed the appreciated privilege of being his contemporaries, may give present testimony to his lofty idealism, purity of motive, sincerity of conviction, and unswerving devotion to faithful fulfilment of duty."

It may well be that the death of Woodrow Wilson will mark the resurrection and new life of his nobly conceived ideals of world cooperation and world peace.

FLAPPERS AND FLAPPING

By THE OBSERVER

A writer whose articles are published in a Nova Scotia paper under the initials "P. D. L." voices the careless confidence in the supreme integrity of corrupt and fallen human nature which is the popular heresy of the age. Sometimes writers of this class lay themselves open to the suspicion that they do not really care whether young men and women fall into the sins of lust or not. It would seem, sometimes, that they have no adequate conception of human responsibility, or of the real meaning of the weaknesses of human nature, and of the eternal consequences of the indulgence of those weaknesses. They seem to regard human existence as a sort of experiment, in which they are willing to back their opinions, looking on the result as not fatally grave whether it be good or bad.

To such writers no human vagary comes amiss; the mere fact that it is a departure from rules of conduct that have been tried and proved, not once only but a hundred times in the course of the world's life, seems to suggest nothing to them except that men and women are on their way to "freedom"; in other words that they are trying to throw off some rule or other, and that therefore they must be making progress.

The writer we are now remarking upon, tells us that the "flapper" displays brazenly her maiden charms, puts her feet on the mantel, swigs "hooh" and goes unchaperoned on automobile "petting parties;" in other words she goes off half intoxicated, or at least exhilarated, to be hugged on a joy-ride. Let us quote a few words:

"In the judgment of the shallow-minded she is an immoral, depraved little degenerate. But in reality she is no such thing. Because freedom has taken possession of her she realizes no fetters; has become an intense individualist. She is a Napoleon, a Mussolini, living life as she sees it to the full, fulfilling the immediate desire unconscious of right or wrong. Having taken the bull by the horns, what the bull thinks no longer bothers her. I, for one, do not fear the flapper bearing

hooch in a flask. The hooch and the flask are temporary excesses similar to those which have marked all revolutions. They will pass—as the guillotine did in Paris and the Red Terror in Russia. But the freedom they have won will remain; out of which will grow a franker, freer, more self-reliant womanhood. Such progressions are written all over the pages of history for those who will to read."

To be half drunk, therefore, and half naked, and to be free from supervision and to do as she pleases without shame and without thought, are not very reprehensible in the eyes of this writer who is admitted to the columns of a paper which circulates in the homes of thousands. What does he mean, exactly? Does he mean that these things are not active means of temptation both to the "flapper" and to her male companion? Or, does he mean that such temptations are of no importance? Does he mean that the sins of lust are of no importance? Does he deny all past human experience which has made it the commonest of all human knowledge that indecent exposure, the lack of reticence and modesty, in speech or in action, are the natural and proximate occasions of the sins of impurity.

Sometimes we think that such writers are careless as to what happens to the morals of the young. If they are not, they show a very strange lack of appreciation of facts which are well known to even the most ignorant people who live in a world which is full of evil. Just consider the folly, if it is no worse than folly, of this writer. We know nothing about him. He may be aiming at the promotion of free love for all we know; the devilish work is going on all over the world; but we shall take him to be as honest as a man may be supposed to be who lives in the world and talks as he talks.

We shall, then, suppose that he imagines that when a young girl goes out at night half drunk, and half nude, in the company of young men who are as eager as she is for "freedom," the situation is adequately summed up as he sums it up. But, we may ask, when did the demon of human lust agree to be restrained by a half drunken "flapper" in the arms of a half-drunken man? When did it become possible or likely that weak human nature would be restrained under such conditions?

When we think of those obvious reflections, we are tempted to think that such writers have in their heart no real regard for purity; feel no obligation to place themselves on the side of decency and virtue. If we go too far in that, the alternative conclusion is not such as can be pleasing to a man who thinks enough of himself to try to inform the public on public questions. For, if such writers are not dishonest and if they do not favor sin, and despite virtue, they are under the influence of an ignorance so profound and so comprehensive that they are wholly unfit to have their existence in a world which is so full of evil and of the results of human wrong-doing.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

In the course of a discussion by an anonymous writer in the latest issue of the Edinburgh Weekly Scotsman on the ethics of the raffle and other speculative money-raising schemes we find this choice morsel: "The promoters of a raffle are *pro tem* Jesuits. The cause is good, therefore the end justifies the means." Which is but one more testimony to the vitality of a lie.

CANADIAN HOUSEKEEPERS may be interested in knowing what a Scots-woman with some experience in Western Canada thinks of them. Writing to the Edinburgh Weekly Scotsman she expresses herself after this fashion: "The Canadian kitchen, both in the town house and on the larger farms, is generally a very comfortable place; the mistress often spends part of her morning there, even if she keeps a maid, for in Canada, especially in the West, the housewife does a great deal of the daily work herself. She does not mind what she puts her hand to, no matter what her social position"—a fact, one would say, very much to the credit of the Canadian housewife.

"THE WIFE of an important member of a Provincial Government," she goes on to say, "will open the door to her visitors, and will quite frankly admit at her dinner party to her many guests that she is responsible for the cooking."

Under the different social conditions which have so long prevailed in the Old Land, it need not be wondered at that this should be considered matter for remark. That under the rapid processes of change which the great War set in motion it will continue to be so is quite another question.

A DOCTOR's wife in Winnipeg, she tells her countrywomen, who had gone out to Canada some ten years ago, said she found it much easier to run her good-sized house there than in England, and when asked why replied: "I think it is due partly to the fact that we all, my husband and the two boys, as well as myself, share in the work. My husband does all sorts of things here that he never thought of doing at home, and no one thinks the worse of him. He stokes the furnace, shovels away the snow, chops wood, and if I have to be out in the middle of the day he puts the dinner on the table. Then the boys take it as a matter of course that they shall clean the boots and knives before they go to school. And there is practically no dirt or dust in the house. We burn hard coal or coke in the furnace, and have no open grates. No Englishwoman probably can conceive the difference this makes."

AFTER SKETCHING in a graphic and interesting way social and economical conditions in the North West the Scotsman writer concludes: "The English housewife who wishes to succeed in Canada has much to learn from her Canadian sister who is methodical in her ways, quick—perhaps an unkind person might call her bustling—and very strenuous. She knows her job, and because of this, housekeeping is not a burden and a worry to her. She will often work hard all the morning, and enjoy herself all the afternoon; she will cook, wash, mend and make clothes, but she is never a drudge, and rarely a butterfly."

WHAT is described as "one of the most charming meetings at the Vatican for many months" was the audience granted by the Holy Father to the President and Council of the Milanese section of the Italian Alpine Club. As Don Achille Ratto, the reigning Pontiff was an active member of the Club for many years and regarded as one of its most fearless climbers. Although now having the weight of the Church upon his shoulders, and confined to the limits of the Vatican, he has lost none of his keenness for the mountains. It will be remembered how interested he was in the Mount Everest expedition of last year, and that, mindful of that interest, its participants later sent him a memento in the shape of a piece of rock, suitably chiselled and inscribed, from the highest point reached by them, which was also the highest point of the earth's surface yet reached by man.

TO THE members of the Milan delegation the Holy Father discoursed for some time upon the benefits of mountain climbing. He told them how it elevated the mind, enlarged its knowledge of nature, and brought man's soul to realize the majesty of the Infinite. It was indeed evident from his every word, as a member of the Club afterwards stated to the press, that Pius XI. loves the mountains now no less ardently than when he set out with two others to climb the Matterhorn and, later on, Mount Blanc.

CONVERSION to the Faith has certainly not lessened Gilbert Chesterton's penchant for paradox or gift of satire. "Need newspapers talk nonsense," was the subject of a recent address delivered by him at New-castle. "If there could be a paper," he said, "that consisted entirely of open and avowed nonsense it would be a glorious institution, much more valuable than many of the papers that exist, and affect to instruct the public."

THE METHODIST Mission in Rome has fallen upon rather evil days. The Roman people seem to have fully awakened to the real purpose of its propaganda, which is an insidious form of proselytism. Premier Mussolini has formally forbidden the erection of their projected temple on Monte Mario, a hill directly overlooking the Vatican and St. Peter's. Such project, the Government considered an insult to the Holy Father and to the Catholic people of the city. The prohibition therefore has proved to be very

popular with the Romans, the effrontery of this American sect having got upon their nerves. It has been in Rome since 1870, but notwithstanding the millions lavished upon it the "converts" it has made, says a Roman correspondent, could be hidden under a blanket. Now we are told the Premier has set himself to investigate the activities of that other proselytizing body, the American Y. M. C. A.

ON CALLING ONESELF A CATHOLIC

Joseph Clayton, F. R. Hist. S., in February Catholic World

AS late as the nineteenth century the Church of England was still proud to label itself "Protestant," and visitors to St. Paul's Cathedral, in London, may see in the south aisle the statue of Bishop Middleton, and note the inscription beneath: "First Protestant Bishop in India." Middleton was sent out to India by the Church of England and labored in Calcutta in his calling. He did not imagine that he was a Catholic bishop, and nobody at that time suggested that the excellent man was other than a good Protestant. The words beneath his statue—"First Protestant Bishop in India"—were carved in all honesty, conveying an item of news of historic interest.

Then came a time when earnest men of good repute in the Church of England found that in their reformed Book of Common Prayer much of the Catholic Faith was yet enshrined. On the strength of the decent order of service and the fact that the English Reformers had adopted the Episcopal rather than the Presbyterian form of church government, the Oxford High-Churchmen decided that the Church of England was both Protestant and Catholic: Protestant in its rejection of papal supremacy, its denial of the doctrine of transubstantiation, its dislike of the popular devotions of Catholic Christendom; Catholic in its loyalty to the defined creeds of the early centuries and in its adherence to an episcopate.

But nowadays members of the Anglican communion will be called "Catholics," and at the suggestion of being Protestant feel either bitterly reproached or grievously insulted. In England we have even a federation of "Free Catholics," Protestant non-conformists, Congregationalist and Unitarian for the most part, anxious for the restoration of sacraments in the public worship of "Free Churches." Of course, neither Anglo-Catholics nor Free Catholics pretend to any uniformity of doctrine and discipline. Indeed, they speak and write quite frankly of the varying degrees of Catholicity within the Anglican communion: of this man as being "more" Catholic than his neighbor, the "moderate Catholic" in the next parish. (The Christian who is moderately Catholic may be likened to the moderately honest man, the moderately virtuous woman, and—the moderately good egg.)

The point is, do we become Christians and Catholics merely by so styling ourselves? Is anything else required? Am I a Catholic because I see my way (as the phrase goes) to accept certain items of Catholic truth and to profess a belief in various articles of the Catholic Faith? Can any number of men and women of their own accord and at any time start a Catholic Church as they might start a social club or philanthropic institute? Am I free to select such doctrines of the Catholic Church as commend themselves to my private judgment and to reject the doctrines that do not commend themselves to me; and, while so selecting and rejecting, to call myself a Catholic? How much of the little of the Catholic Faith must I believe before I can call myself a Catholic?

These questions may be briefly summed up: Do I make myself a Catholic or am I made one by God's admitting me to membership through His accredited ministers? Or to put it another way: Is the Catholic Church created by men, or are men made Catholics by the Church?

DIVORCE NOT POSSIBLE IN FASCIST ITALY

One of the striking political occurrences of the day is the attitude of the Roman Senate in again re-affirming the sanctity of the marriage laws in Italy. At present the Senate is considering the reform of the Codex, the corpus of Italian civil law. One day last month the Minister who is in charge of the matter in the Senate, the Hon. Oviglio, expounded the attitude of the Mussolini Ministry in terms that left no chance for misunderstanding or misconception. The discourse of the Minister in question was remarkable for two very clear utterances, which are indicative of the straightforward policy of the Government. He said that the indissolubility of marriage was a sentiment so rooted not only in the laws of the country but also in the hearts of the people, as to permit of no effort, direct or indirect, to allow divorce to be introduced into Italian legislation; and he further said that the family was an institution surrounded by religious sanctions and that its integrity should be protected and